WEST HAYDEN ISLAND ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT HEALTH ANALYSIS WORK SESSION

OCTOBER 22, 2012 FROM 12:30 - 4:30 PM OXFORD SUITES ~ HAYDEN ISLAND

FINAL NOTES

Attendees:

Chris Hathaway, LCREP; Gary Oxman, Betsy Clapp and Moriah McGrath, Multnomah County Health Department; Tia Henderson, Upstream Public Health; Heidi Guenin, Upstream Public Health; Steve White, Oregon Public Health Institute; Andrea Hamberg, Oregon Health Authority HIA Program; Jon Ostar, HILP Legal Advisor, OPAL; Nicole Iroz-Elardo, School of Urban Studies and Planning, PSU; Judith Mowry, City's Office of Equity; David Breen, Port of Portland Air Quality; Ed MacMullan, ECONW (Author of Cost/Benefit Analysis); Sarah Armitage, DEQ; Phil Allen, DEQ; Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland; Brian Owendoff, Capacity Commercial Group; Bob Sallinger, Audubon Society; Andy Cotugno, Metro; Tom Dana, Hayden Island Resident; Eric Engstrom, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, Mike Rosen, Bureau of Environmental Services, Paul Van Orden, BDS Noise Control Officer; Sam Imperati, Institute for Conflict Management; Melissa Egan, Institute for Conflict Management; Don Hanson, PSC; John Gillam PBOT; Victor Viets, HiNOON.

Overview and Purpose

Eric Engstrom, BPS, acknowledged the health team and thanked the Multnomah County Health Department for their work. They were the primary authors of the study. In light of the adoption of the Portland Plan, which states that public health is a high priority and should be a greater consideration in planning, this is the first time BPS has done this type of work in an effort to better understand what potential health impacts would be.

Betsy Clapp, Multnomah County Health Department, said they looked at best practices, visited the island, consulted with other health experts and came up with recommendations for BPS, as listed in the draft report. They built on information and data already gathered for this process. The analysis was done with the health team and having weekly meetings with Upstream Public Health and Oregon Public Health Institute, who helped co-author the report. The team based their analysis on the WorleyParsons concept (two bulk terminals, one auto terminal- 300 acres and 500 open space). An obvious challenge is that there is not currently a development proposal so we do not know who the tenants will be. . Also, they considered the Janzen Beach Mall re-model and the CRC.

Their goal with the report was to look at impacts regarding the most salient human health concerns, such as air quality, noise and vibration, light, traffic safety, physical activity and employment. The health team also consulted with DEQ and PBOT.

Betsy provided a brief summary of the report, noting the possible health benefits, the negative impacts, and populations most likely to experience health impacts due to the proposed Port development, who are the residents who live nearby and vulnerable populations such as children, the elderly, people of color, and those with low incomes.

Gary Oxman said he wanted to provide some background for the numbers and context for the health risks, particularly as related to the cancer risk expected from pollution. In reviewing the report, he asked the group to be cognizant of a number of things: these numbers are based on DEQ's computer models with embedded assumptions. For their analysis, it sets benchmarks that are very protective of human health – specifically one additional case of cancer among a population of a million people exposed over a lifetime (70 years). This throws a lot of uncertainty in there. These estimates are difficult because they are based on assumptions. In the report, levels of pollution are expressed in "cumulative times over benchmark.

Using the cumulative impact standard, a model will tend to over-estimate what the actual impact is. Also, we considered the baseline, in which you consider what would happen without regard to Port development. Baseline rates of cancer are that roughly 1 out of 2 men and 1 out of 3 women will experience some sort of cancer in their lifetime. This is a very high number per million. In the WHI health report, we see 20 per million to 60 per million for air toxins. If we consider the population on Hayden Island and consider the development scenario roughly 1/10 of one cancer case could be attributed to the development scenario.

Gary also noted the model accounts for natural occurrence of cancer, e.g., cancer that is not attributable to pollution. He stressed that folks *should not use these numbers as though they have specificity or accuracy.* But what one can conclude is that the model suggests pollution could increase by a factor of 3, so it is reasonable to estimate the health impacts would also increase roughly by a factor of 3, but the numbers are not precise.

Don Hanson: question regarding the tripling of impacts; he is having trouble delineating between context and site. What is the impact of the context and what is the impact of those 300 acres?

Gary Oxman: clarifying – you mean do the impacts come from the proposed Port development or the whole constellation? His understanding is they are from the whole.

Phil Allen: noted that potential impacts from the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) were not included in the Portland Air Toxics Solutions (PATS) analysis.

Victor Viets: sounded like you said the criterion was not to allow an increase of more than 1 in one million. So, the island will have more pollution, and a very vulnerable population right near the development. He is not sure this is taking into account the vulnerability of this population. What's too much? That 33-50% of island residents can expect to get cancer is way too high. Where do we draw the line?

Gary Oxman_: that is the policy question. Your observations are correct. There are too many diseases of all kinds in society, even if the numbers we see in the study are small compared to the baseline, there is too much risk.

Susie Lahsene: question regarding the tripling of impacts; from an air quality standpoint, is this just for diesel? Or broader?

Gary Oxman_: it is the cumulative air toxins as predicted by the model, which includes solvents, asphalt, etc. Diesel is the largest contributor.

Phil Allen: noted other pollutants, such as benzene and 15 PAH also of concern.

Tom Dana: comment regarding the tripling of cancer. Is this also for asthma and heart disease?

Gary Oxman: we cannot say exactly, but it is reasonable to assume that as pollution rises, health risks rise. We cannot say if it is exactly 3-fold.

Ed MacMullan: how do we think of the health effects relative to other things? For example, if CRC increases health impacts by a factor of 8, then is it additive?

Gary Oxman: yes, additive. However, a better answer is to model it, since CRC was not modeled.

Jon Ostar: comment regarding CRC and related traffic and construction. CRC punts on the construction impacts. Why can't this project these?

Phil Allen: we did not run the model for this analysis. We ran the model for PATS. We datamined what we already had and applied it to this, taking data from Terminals 4 and 5 to create a hypothetical scenario based on the concept plan and applying it to this. Again, we did not run it specifically for this proposed development on WHI and did not include CRC.

Jon Ostar: nowhere in PATS did we include construction impacts. And to follow up on Victor's point re: risk assessment, there is a lack of clarity around cumulative impacts, vulnerability and synergistic effects. Thus, we miss a lot of non-cancer effects. The tripling effect might be the rate for a white, healthy, 160 lb man, but it could be much greater for vulnerable populations.

Gary Oxman: the benchmark approach builds in a safety factor and the 1 per million is intended to include vulnerable populations. People look at scientific literature, and have to come down with a judgment as to how much risk there is. The issue of vulnerability is built in. Also, regarding the issue of exposure, the model assumes 70 years of exposure, which is not realistic. The risk data is not a precise picture of reality; it is a shadow of reality.

Susie Lahsene: it would be helpful for her to understand the context of WHI compared to the rest of Portland. Her understanding is that it is a lot better off than the rest of the city. What would a health analysis look like for the Pearl?

Sarah Armitage: the PATS model looked at Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington Counties. We saw lots of variation. Air pollution tends to be concentrated in certain areas or corridors (e.g., highways, transportation hubs, industrial areas).

Sam displayed a map of all sources of pollution concentration; Sarah described how areas compare to each other.

Victor Viets: how did Clark County data get in there? Did you model in Vancouver?

Sarah Armitage: we included Washington data because we are one big air shed. We did that so they could also learn more about their air quality, and because we partner with them.

Eric Engstrom: Gary talked about the distinction between the overall risk for cancer, what we will all experience (the baseline), what is related to PATS risk factors. It is the PATS air toxics risk that is tripling.

Tia Henderson: exactly; the overall cumulative is tripling, but we do not know precisely what at this point. We know that the cumulative air toxics will be increasing.

Don Hanson: is air quality better in the Gorge because the wind is blowing?

Phil Allen: in the winter, yes, but in the summer, a lot of Portland air toxins flow up there. So it is seasonal.

Victor Viets: this does not include any of the planned development on the Vancouver side. When you include the Port of Vancouver, which will impact WHI, then one would imagine we will see an even greater increase in negative health impacts.

Phil Allen: PATS included Clark County emissions; as he noted before, for this WHI health report, we looked at data from Terminals 4 and 5.

Victor Viets: he was referring to new development; it looks like we are not considering Vancouver new emissions.

Phil Allen: that would have to be a separate study.

Sarah Armitage: we did project to 2017 and applied a growth factor, including marine, transportation and other additional activities, but not new facilities.

Gary wrote out a chart to further illustrate the data. He reminded the group to not pay attention to the numbers precisely, rather to think of them as a representation of the order of magnitude. He summarized the chart, and said the increased risk is not ignorable, but not very large.

	Female	Male
WHI Population	1,100	1,100
Overall cancer cases	363	550
Pollution Related	7	11
Cancer Cases	,	1 1
Estimated Additional		
Cancer Cases at	0.022	
20X PATS	0.022	
Benchmark (WHI		
Baseline)		
Estimated Additional		
Cancer Cases at	0.0715	
65X PATS	0.07 10	
Benchmark (WHI		
Baseline)		

Tia Henderson, from Upstream Public Health, reviewed the WHI Health Analysis Summary Tables, as found on pages 58-59 of the full-length report, or on pages 9-10 of the Summary version. She said the health team used existing literature and real data where they had it (noise, air quality, traffic, etc.). She noted again that there were limitations to their analysis, in that they did not have an actual development plan to work from. They used current conditions, and then relied on their expertise in public health, supplemented with other experts, and made a judgment call.

She described the chart, explaining how they used the terms likelihood, uncertainty, and intensity of effect. There are a lot of ways to characterize impacts, and they used "intensity" to do so, because there are both positive and negative effects. She explained several negative factors and potential ranges of impacts; her colleague Steve White explained some positive impacts on employment and public health. Tia said it is important to remember that these summary tables are what would happen without any mitigation measures.

Heidi Guenin noted a correction to the chart.

Paul Van Orden: comment regarding populations disproportionately impacted on all factors but noise.

Heidi Guenin: that is an error; it should be the same as the other factors.

Susie Lahsene: question regarding the summary on page 35 on light. Summary seems to show minimal health impacts but table shows increases in health risks.

Heidi noted several additional corrections to the chart. The revised draft will include an updated chart.

Chris Hathaway: comment regarding positive health impacts and traffic safety; how much is attributable to the development scenario and how much to CRC?

Heidi Guenin: traffic safety is the least developed part of the report. Improvements are mostly related to rebuilding North Hayden Island Drive.

John Gillam, PBOT, from the audience: emphasized that this represents the unmitigated conditions. He would say most of the change is related to the CRC and build-out of the mall and street structures.

Tom Dana: you said the location of benefits does not matter – it matters a lot. Some benefits will be on island, some to the whole region. Compare apples to apples.

Tia Henderson: agree, we thought about separating the chart to represent local and regional impacts, but did not have time.

Victor Viets: agree with Tom.

Heidi Guenin: agree; there are regional effects that are also positive.

Steve White_: a lot of positive impacts are local, e.g., recreation access and employment examples. Most people work off island and the jobs will be created on island and in the region. He expects that more will work on island as connection to region improves, and we add more jobs to island.

Heidi Guenin: you mention the impacts of the POV; we will also have reciprocal impacts on Vancouver residents.

Victor Viets: would really appreciate two tables. Also, before you make assumptions about recreational benefits, the City and the Port have made no commitment to building anything. The only thing they can take credit for is bike and sidewalk improvements on NHID.

Andrea Hamberg: echoes comments about the difference between regional and local impacts. She also has questions about recreational activity, and the relation to the loss of green space. It is great to consider bike and ped access, and as the roads get busier, design is critical to safety.

Jon Ostar: comment regarding disproportionality. PSC cannot do anything with this table. We have robust economic and environmental analyses; but on this, the table does not give us much. We need evaluations for local manufactured homes and at the regional level. We need more on this before the PSC can deal with the equity component - that has to happen.

Eric Engstrom: to Victor, the IGA does include commitments and the amount in there reflects the cost estimates for recreational improvements from the Worley Parsons, the concept plan consultant.

Sam Imperati: at the right time, we will need to take the table and compare it to the IGA before PSC, and before final AC. True up the info to current status.

Susie Lahsene: question re: decrease in injury and increase in injury – explain, please.

John Gillam: traffic safety counts for all kinds of traffic; when this analysis looked at modes separately, it is possible to have different conclusion for vehicular safety and bicycle safety.

Susie Lahsene: how was it rolled up?

John Gillam: a study was done for vehicles and the bike/ped. The tables represent unmitigated approach.

Heidi Guenin: what the analysis is saying is that there will be benefits and costs. Improvements will be made, but there will also be more truck traffic. Think of crossing a major freight route as a pedestrian, no matter your ability, is more dangerous.

John Gillam: these are unmitigated conditions; with mitigations, you can assume improvements.

Heidi Guenin: yes, and again, it is important to remember traffic is the least developed piece.

Chris Hathaway: streetscape design will be so important.

John Gillam: it will be key, and it is part of the IGA to add bike facilities.

Chris Hathaway: there is no mitigating design currently.

John Gillam: they are trying to create a better, buffered situation for bikes, and will be worked on in project development.

Chris Hathaway: this relates back to physical activity; and then we are developing a major truck route, which detracts from improvements.

Steve White__: noted improvements to system connectivity. We have to get NHID correct or the system will not work.

Chris Hathaway: agree, and that goes to my original comment. The improvements do not relate to the Port development, they relate to the mall and CRC.

Tom Dana: we are going to lose a mile of beach. No one will want to walk an additional mile to get to the beach. He thinks those who don't need it will use it, those who need it won't. (E.g., a 75 year old with a cane vs. a 25 year old athlete.)

Jon Ostar: comments regarding page 56, likelihood of change and confidence in causation. He fails to see how the second component is built in, and the first component doesn't really say anything. He thinks a better framework is:

- 1. Is health determinant present?
- 2. What's the causal confidence?
- 3. What are the current circumstances to make a determination of how likely it is?

This, to him, seems like a better framework to make these judgments. Again, page 56 makes no sense to him and he does not understand how the triangles on the chart were determined.

Steve White: the research tells us if you do improvements, people will exercise more, even those who tend not to. And obviously, the more you exercise, the better your health will be.

Tia Henderson: would like a conversation with Jon Ostar and the health team; another piece not in this draft is the pathway diagrams, which trace health determinants to health outcomes and logical plausibility. It is not in the draft, just due to time. The is based on current conditions, scientific literature, and if we had data.

Jon Ostar: further comments about methodology and the apparent inconsistencies in the definitions, and how it goes into every single judgment call that was made in the charts.

Tia Henderson: the words made sense to them when they applied them. Open to discussion.

Andrea Hamberg: in the document, the discussion of health assessment vs. health impact assessment a little distracting; she understands you stand behind the methodology you used, however that section might be more useful in the appendix.

Victor Viets: what does the future look like for this HA or HIA? It seems we are pushing off a detailed analysis. There are multiple steps that have to be permitted separately. The Port has to have infrastructure in place to attract tenants, and they have to permit. But at that point, there will still be no information on the tenant. When they do come in, the tenant will do their own permitting, as will all tenants. This is probably the best decision point we will probably have.

Judith Mowry: question regarding analysis on vulnerable populations; how does an equity lens work here? It should put vulnerable populations first. Say more.

Betsy Clapp: we had limited time; we took a general population approach. It was certainly not a lack of wanting to do that.

Judith Mowry: seems like we still do not have the information that is most important to folks.

Break

Public Comment

Donna Murphy, WHI Resident, thought Portland was "green" when she moved here. It really takes a long time to get over a sinus infection because of where she lives. She's still coughing from the one she had in July. She wants you to know you are looking at flat maps; if you live there you see it, hear it, taste it and smell it. It will go away if the terminal goes in. Many of her neighbors are selling. You are not seeing that people live there and walk on sidewalks. There is no room for bicycles. There are not even sidewalks all the way to Safeway. Sidewalks are not mitigation. \$25K for the entire island for a whole year? What is that? And all the trees being cut down are going to make it worse. People know to not go out when it is polluted. You can see the pollution especially in the summer. It is not haze it is smog. She has lived in LA, she knows. People are going to be dying. We are overburdened with all the cumulative stuff. She is tired of hearing you guys whine about what you cannot do.

David Redthunder, WHI Resident, is deeply concerned about the western meadow lark. He sent pictures to the Port, and everyone is acting like they did not get them. What is happening is they are pulling catfish out with 1000 times the arsenic? He is worried about the animals. What you do to them you will do to humans. The western meadow lark is beautiful. The Port of Portland's sewage is going into the Willamette. He is not a scientist, he has not gone to school, but the creatures back there – he does not want to lose them.

Pam Holt, does not live on the island but is buying property and evaluating her decision today. She is new to this process, and what she is learning today has her concerned. On tables 1 and 2, mixing the regional and local impacts does not seem right. The positive seem to come from the mall and CRC and the negatives from the annexation. She is concerned about using cancer as a benchmark. It happens over a long period of time. She noted several other important factors that have immediate impacts (light, noise, etc.). She is disappointed by what she is seeing today.

Deborah Heckhausen, VP of the WHI Homeowners Association, complements the Multnomah County Health Department and thinks they did a reasonably good job, even with the flaws. This report illustrates why the Port had dragged their feet – this is exactly what we want to see. We have a higher cancer risk on the island. Portland gives a lot of lip service to "green' – this is the dirtiest city she has ever lived in. This whole process has devalued our health and our living conditions. It is a good illustration of what we have been complaining about for years. Regarding exercise, despite her respiratory problems, she exercises daily. Except sometimes she cannot go outside. People stay there because of economic reasons. She is not supposed to exercise when the pollution is bad – it causes damage to her lungs and her whole system. She suffers already and she cannot image how it will be when it gets worse. This summer, it really reminded her of Orange County. It is because of the geography. There is no mitigating this. We are unable to mitigate for the 20x over the benchmark, we need to really become a green community and a cleaner community. We have some serious pollution problems, including superfund sites. We can provide real jobs in this community by doing cleanup. She sees a lot of lip service in Oregon; we need to get it done and clean up our mess.

Stefan Karlic is a disabled, retired veteran. He has lung disease and he is on 17 medications a day. He got this disease by working around diesel. He said no one has taken into consideration that you want to build on a 300 acre flood plain, right next to residential. It is not a deep water berth - not one of the ships in Japan and Korea can navigate the Columbia. We have to stop throwing money away. The Port subsidizes Terminal 6. The ships that are being diverted from

Terminal 6 are being sent to Seattle and Tacoma because of the strike. The Port of Portland thing is a debacle. It should not be built.

Bob Sallinger, Conservation Director of Audubon Society, will provide comments in writing. We are 23 days from the Planning Commission hearing. The City proceeds forward as though it is wrapped up. He appreciates this good faith effort and the work done. But there is so much left to be done. The hearing is in 23 days, which is not enough time and we are not even close to resolving most issues. The Port has not put a meaningful offer on the table yet. His comments are for the PSC and City - we need good process. Additionally, we have a forest today, and we are going to cut that down. That forest is mitigating for the pollution that exists today. So, when we cut it down, everything will degrade.

Nicole Iroz-Elardo: noticed the lack of HI specific health data. We can address some of that through partnerships with Multnomah County, the City, etc. She does not doubt the experiences she has heard about, and knows residents want to know more. Maybe we can drill down into the data and see what's there. And if not, then we have to have a discussion.

Jon Ostar: we are seeing what limited time and resources get you – not much. We should be looking at block group data. It is a pretty concise set of four neighborhoods. We have solid anecdotal data of what some of the concerns are. There has to be some way short of hard data to get at this info. Have we looked at ambulance/emergency response rates?

Betsy Clapp: we did look at that, but it is not in the report. Two other sources are a health insurance company, but we are not able to find out how generalizable it is, and then we also looked at our own data, and we had less than 10.

Susie Lahsene: seems like there is confusion around the development scenario. She wants to be sure we are using the same assumptions.

Chris Hathaway: there have been many comments about what is not in the report and what will be in it. Can we hear more about next steps?

Eric Engstrom: we will debrief comments with the team, and then update the report based on feedback.

Tom Dana: then we need another meeting to see where we are after the revised draft.

Victor Viets: one of the fundamental building blocks we still have to work on is the development scenario. This project will not be initiated for another fifteen years. We need to forecast what existing conditions will be. And the POV will also be developing. Aircraft are forced to fly over the Columbia River, over Hayden Island every flight. This community gets a significantly greater amount of aircraft emissions. This has not been analyzed. We need baseline conditions established before we can proceed. We have to go through CRC discussion. There is going to be almost continuous discussion. Before we can do any real analysis, we have to make sure the scenario is right. The Port is the last one in the door. All the other impacts will happen before the Port develops the site.

Andrea Hamberg: had a challenge with the lack of baseline conditions. You included some population-based healthdata, and included information about specific vulnerable populations on the Island, but did not tell the reader about how health outcomes for these vulnerable populations may differ from the general public. s. She understands you cannot include

information that might breech confidentiality, but feels there could be more context given to help the reader understand possible disparate impacts.

Ed MacMullan: we have heard information about baseline data and geography, and to this he would like to add the concept of time. The development is set for 2026. It would help us get from where we are today to where we will be there.

Don Hanson: interested in Jon's info about sub-districts, and Andrea – obviously we could get data forever, but his question is, is the info we do have accurate? Do we just need more detail?

Jon Ostar: the only base info you have referenced is population, which comes from 2010 Census. So he would assume that is accurate. The majority people on the island are in a dense community.

Don Hanson: so if we had an east side chart and a west side chart, they would be different?

Jon Ostar: yes; that is the nature of environmental justice.

Judith Mowry: source for projected population?

Betsy Clapp: 2035 Metro data.

Nicole Iroz-Elardo: understands the logic of putting off the mitigation discussion, but this looks like this is going forward to Council, it is irresponsible to not connect mitigation to health impacts.

Jon Ostar: re: Metro 2035 data, it is hard to apply this to the manufactured home community. Additionally, there is an important point on page 34, that undue focus on harder factors can obscure the importance of softer factors. The way the synergic factors are discussed is doing that. He suggests "cumulative risks" to get at how environmental stressors impact health and what happens when you have a confluence of factors. He referred to a Robert Wood Johnson study linking negative thinking about the quality of one's life increases the number of strokes. We have to consider cumulative risks.

Post-meeting note: see study at: http://www.rwjf.org/content/rwjf/en/research-publications/find-rwjf-research/2011/10/dispositional-optimism-protects-older-adults-from-stroke.html

Victor Viets: until we add a column or two that says what the Port is willing to do, you don't have anything for mitigations. He thinks we need to hand that list to the board. We need items the Port is willing to commit to. They have been very careful about spending money on this project, and it has just been said recently that if there isn't enough money to make it competitive, then all the benefits will be cut.

Transportation: questions, comments concerns

Ed MacMullan: comment regarding the CRC, page 43. We know it can change, but is there any one big aspect that would change these results?

John Gillam: a phased approach to implementing the CRC is the current strategy; if the first phase is long-term, it may change some conclusions. It would change NHID from target entrance to freeway.

Tom Dana: page 41; the first thing is says is traffic will increase by 110%. For his community, need NHID specific info. NHID currently has about 2000 cars and trucks a day, and it will go up to 10,000 per day. So these numbers are deceptive in the report.

Susie Lahsene: the summary says it is reasonable to expect a decrease in collisions, which needs to be clear in the table. Also question for clarification about the safety analysis.

John Gillam: safety analysis and collision data is based was on NIHD and freeway ramp system.____.

Jon Ostar: references to street network improvements, to Tom's point, overall improvement rates might overlook a "hotspot." Also, he wants to focus on truck and vehicle estimates. He thinks a range instead of just one number would be more accurate. Described issues regarding truck trips as an example.

John Gillam: he'd been asked to come up with a specific number; he can provide a range. He believes there's 10 - 20% variability in the numbers. With trucks it is harder. It was based on a high-impact scenario, but the current development scenario is not the higher impact scenario. So, these numbers will be reduced. He noted that some of the numbers came from the IGA. He described the differences between the two-auto one bulk and the two bulk, on auto development scenarios

Susie Lahsene: this gets to her point about the development scenario. So, when we do this, we have to do a worst-case-scenario, not what is most likely to be built. This makes analysis challenging.

John Gillam: The differences between the high impact scenario (two auto and one bulk) and concept plan scenario (two bulk and one auto) are not that significant for projected vehicular safety analysis. And for peds, it is also not that different. For example:

High impact scenario: 516 trucks/day from the development (this represents approx. a 50-50 split-trucks/vehicles.

Concept plan scenario: 360 trucks/day from the development (this represents approx. a 60-40 split-trucks/vehicles.

Current IGA: there is a proposed cap on heavy trucks to 175/day.

From a roadway design approach whether we have 360 trucks or 516 /day the road design specifications will be the same.

Victor Viets: the report dismisses separate access road to service terminal, which would take care of all this; and secondly, before you operate it you have to build it, which means you have to fill. If you have to do it by truck, that is over 100,000 truck trips. By barge, it is several hundred barges. No one has said how they intend to do that. We need to get the development scenario better defined and have the Port's commitment before we know about truck numbers. These impacts from construction need to be part of the analysis.

Eric Engstrom: there are a number of ways we look at this, and we intend to represent the lower end of the most likely scenario. We have to model the worst case for the state, but we don't have to reflect worse case numbers in the plan.

Nicole Iroz-Elardo: can we get a table that represents all this? TO DO.

Jon Ostar: would like to see the truck data in a per minute, including peaks TO DO Despite the high rate of truck increase, the report concludes otherwise, but he doesn't see that in the street design.

Heidi Guenin: to Victor's point about the bridge, and Susie's about the development scenario, it is mentioned on page 60.

Tom Dana: would like to see the baseline numbers of today and projected baseline: predevelopment, and post-development. TO DO

John Gillam: This information is available in the Phase I report as scenarios 2B and 3B. .

Jon Ostar: question regarding the bridge, he thinks the Health Department could have looked at an alternative scenario with the bridge; since they didn't, he is not sure why it is referenced.

John Gillam: the Phase I report did look at that, but was not carried forward.

Jon Ostar: issue of older drivers; wonders why it says older drivers are less at risk, does not seem correct to him. Also, age distribution on the island, not sure if that is correct. He described what traffic is like during holiday shopping. Wonders how we can reflect whether or not improvements will affect driver behavior.

John Gillam: drivers 65 years and older do have a lower crash rate of than all others. As to designing facilities for holiday shopping season, the City does not do that anywhere.

Jon Ostar: wants to see more focus of pedestrian safety as it relates to older populations on this. TO DO

Chris Hathaway: factor in bikes and peds.

Noise and Vibration: questions, comments concerns

Nicole Iroz-Elardo: knows you did development scenario, but imagines the build out would be just as significant. Should be noted.

Jon Ostar: thinks there's good language about vulnerable populations, but what we are really talking about it the manufactured home community – just say it. TO DO

Susie Lahsene: wants to see consistency in how we address who is impacted by the noise. TO DO

Don Hanson: main conflict is between manufactured home community and rail. A specific site impact.

Susie Lahsene: the rail traffic is going to exist whether it exists on WHI or just passing through.

Don Hanson: good point.

Tom Dana: the noise level is not just the main line; the rail loop part of the terminal will have noise impacts.

Light: questions, comments concerns

Jon Ostar: this section could use more development. The housing stock is very susceptible to 24-7 light.

Susie Lahsene: identification of cancer as a health impact of light is not supported (read a Port statement); also noted impacts to wildlife. Thinks we are drawing a conclusion that is not supported.

Heidi Guenin: there is a mistake in the table; also, research on humans has not been done on manufactured homes. Page 34, light is a fairly new area of research, and we should be concerned about the "hard medical outcomes" and judging the intensity. The data they have is substantive, but it is laboratory research.

Susie Lahsene: thinks more exposure will come from streetlights outside the house.

Heidi Guenin: tried to take a step back from making assumptions.

Jon Ostar: this factors into the synergistic impacts, going back to the RWJ study he mentioned.

Don Hanson: does not think there's a light impact on residents, perhaps only on nocturnal species.

Nicole Iroz-Elardo: Pathway document should be in there, please. TO DO

Heidi Guenin: light is definitely part of the synergistic impacts. We can have a more robust analysis in the report.

Physical activity: questions, comments concerns

Jon Ostar: mentions the CRC, it should not, especially since it only mentions benefits not negatives. Also, does not understand how the folks there will access them, if they are on the other side of the 300 acres of development.

Steve White_: maybe we could do a survey of the island, but what we have to go on right now is that there's relatively unimproved space, we are going to make improvements, and research suggests it will increase rates of physical activity for folks near. It is a generic assessment. Also, there will be transit service, and increasing connectivity should also help.

Jon Ostar: but what we've done is cherry-pick the positive potential benefits, but not the negative.

Susie Lahsene: it is private property now, so in reality, folks should not even be there. She thinks it will decrease people's stress to no longer be trespassing on private property.

Don Hanson: there's going to be a trail and beach access. Does the same access exist along the mobile home community?

Tom Dana: its private, only partial access.

Eric Engstrom: the physical activity benefits are from recreation and also walkability. Agrees we need apples to apples. Need to look at positives and negatives, and he has heard the critiques about this. Also, NHID is attributable to this project.

Judith Mowry: comment regarding vulnerable, historically marginalized communities. She's hearing concerns from all sides and not wanting to be reckless about data. She's heard that this is a start and it is not deep enough. She knows there's a lot of pressure, and we need to check our assumptions. From an equity perspective, we need that baseline before we can assess the impacts on vulnerable folks.

Nicole Iroz-Elardo: wants more numbers in here; how many miles of beach and trail, before and after, etc. TO DO.

Chris Hathaway: how it gets build and implemented is crucial. It will determine if people use them or not.

Tom Dana: concerns about beach access with development.

Community design and housing: questions, comments concerns

Susie Lahsene: she is not seeing the supporting documentation about the development scenario to the assertion that it will negatively impact housing prices; also, how will health people analyze this? It's a real estate matter.

Jon Ostar: there is plenty of research supporting that it not "may" decrease but "will" decrease property values. The key recommendation to make this section better is what are the impacts on household stability. They are treated as homeowners for the report, but they do not own their land. Described the issues.

Ed MacMullan: suggests separating the development phase from the long-term, again focusing on consequences at each transition. Noelle has done a lot of work on this. TO DO

Susie Lahsene: geography matters; described what exists today and noted that WHI development is away from residents.

Employment: questions, comments concerns

Nicole Iroz-Elardo: add age distribution, it makes it clear who will get the employment benefits.

Jon Ostar: agrees. On page 49, "it is likely that many of the new hires would see their income increase." Plus "it is likely they will come from similar work," so, an implied benefit but not sure where the increase would come from if they are doing similar work. Suggests looking at BOLI data, etc.

Steve White: we can represent that for Port jobs, but not so much for others. We need more information on the job numbers.

Ed MacMullan: comment on direct and induced jobs studies; in ECONW study, they talked about local vs. regional jobs and where they would come from. Already noted that geography is important for this analysis.

Eric Engstrom: agree; you may have longshoreman jobs, but are they just changing jobs or is it new? North Portland is an area of chronically high unemployment, so in theory, WHI is well positioned to help with that.

Ed MacMullan: does changing jobs impact health?

Synergistic effects: questions, comments concerns?

Tom Dana: mentioned Dr. Richard Jackson on City Club.

Public Comment

Deborah Heckhausen, recreational aspects, she does not like the assumption that building a trail will actually mitigate anything. People like to kayak and have beach access. It is private property and also a breeding ground. The value of that is not even mentioned in any conversation. She does not care that the POP owns it. The land has value as it is. We do not even know what we are mitigating for. Recreation has to respect the wildlife of the area. She sees arrogant assumptions and feels it has been missing.

Bob Sallinger, question to Sam and Eric, please give us an idea of when we'll see a final HIA, ESEE, and zoning code. You have 3 iterative steps that have to occur.

Eric Engstrom: cannot unilaterally make that decision. Have to meet with the health team. He is not prepared to say. There is a public hearing in November for the draft that was out in August.

Bob Sallinger: timeline would be helpful. Lots of people will be showing up on the 15th, and hopes all the materials will be available.

Eric Engstrom: there may be additional hearings.

Chris Hathaway: you are not expecting anything new before Open house or PSC? What about IGA and zoning code?

Eric Engstrom: changes will be made based on PSC feedback. Initial proposal was made in August. It is likely revisions will be made.

Chris Hathaway: he and other AC members work with boards and as you well know, we need time for feedback.

Eric Engstrom: yes, he knows. Described the process steps, noting the AC recommendation will come through a report from Sam.

Bob Sallinger: why are we doing this whole big meeting if it does not inform the PSC? Except for after the fact? Bizarre.

Eric Engstrom: it is being incorporated through the PSC.

Public Comment

Chris Smith, Planning and Sustainability Commission, one of the issues identified under traffic safety is bicycle collisions. The right hook is the most dangerous. A side-under-run bar prevents this. You could require this of the regular truck to this facility.

Next Steps and Adjourn

Sam Imperati listed the topics we did not talk about today, including air quality and mitigation recommendations.

Eric Engstrom: thanked folks who already have made comments. Please get additional comments in over the next couple days. The AC will take this up on 11/9. If there are mitigation ideas it would be particularly helpful.

Jon Ostar: have to be able to connect mitigation to specific impacts. He is very uncomfortable with the mitigation package moving forward and he cannot comment on it, because he cannot separate local from regional.

Nicole Iroz-Elardo: it is so drafty at this point it is difficult to know even where to begin. In the current state, it looks like a laundry list that will be shoved aside.

Susie Lahsene: highlight the proposal to develop agreements with rail roads to decrease diesel emissions. From an air quality standpoint, they are under regulation to address diesel emissions already. Also, they are going to be going through this area regardless, so for one train to have to meet other standards is not reasonable and particularly challenging. Perhaps we can look at the Class I; this is a state level conversation.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35.

Draft Notes Submitted by ICM's facilitation Team