

Audio Transcription

Meeting: City of Portland- Portland Harbor Superfund Public Forum

Date: June 30, 2016

Location: University of Portland, Baccauio Commons

Commissioners in Attendance: Mayor Hales, Commissioner Fish, Commissioner Fritz, Commissioner Novick

Charles Hales: Let me kick it off. Good evening everybody. Thanks for your patience while we got here and got organized. We appreciate your coming to participate in this forum this evening. I'm Charlie Hales. I'm your Mayor. I'm here with Commissioner Fish and Commissioner Fritz, and we're looking forward to hearing from you on this big, important, difficult subjects. We're here tonight to hear from you about what you think about the Environmental Protections Agency's proposed plan to clean up the Portland Harbor Super Fund site. There's a lot at stake in this cleanup. Your voices are important on how we move forward. The testimony tonight will help the City of Portland develop our comments to the EPA about this proposal.

In order for your comment to count in the formal comment period, you need to send your comments directly to EPA. Obviously ours will go there, too, but if you want to do that personally, there is information at the back table on how you do do that and we strongly encourage everyone to submit their individual comments to EPA as well as letting us know what you think the City Of Portland's position should be. As a community. So I want to thank you again for coming. Feel free to I think we've got cookies to keep everyone going over here. Not every food group, but at least a cookie and water as well. Come closer if you'd like. Get closer and be comfortable and obviously let us know if you want to speak our facilitators will help you with the process, but first I want to turn it over to Commissioner Fish who has the Commissioner charge of environmental services is one of our point people in this very important work. So Commissioner Fish.

Commissioner Fish: Thank you, Mayor and Commissioner Fritz, and thank you all for coming out tonight.

I want to first say that—

Female: [Inaudible].

Commissioner Fish: We wish we weren't quite so high up and over here, I think it was well-intentioned by the event people because they wanted to make sure that everyone could see us, but in a perfect world we would not be fifteen feet high, here so I have some thank yous before I get started. First I want to thank the University of Portland for hosting us. Let's give them a round of applause.

[Applause]

Commissioner Fish: Go Pilots! We really appreciate their hospitality. I want to thank Resolutions North West which will be facilitating our meeting with all the folks who are facilitators raise your hands, so we can acknowledge you.

Male: thank you.

Commissioner Fish: They are the best in the business. Let's give them a round of applause.

[Applause]

Commissioner Fish: The City staff including Annie and all of the folks who work so hard to organize this. Annie would you raise your hand and others, thanks very much. Thanks for your service.

[Applause]

Commissioner Fish: And most important we want to thank you, the members of the community for coming out tonight. We—I believe this is the most important environmental jobs and justice issue facing the city today and into the future. The EPA has put out a proposed plan. It's been a long time coming and now we're basically in a sprint where we'll all be organizing their comments and submitting them. As the mayor said, we're looking forward to hearing from you tonight and your comments will be formally recorded. If you don't testify but want to submit written comments. Over on the table there are on both tables you can get a piece of paper and share your thoughts with us on a comment card. And all comments that we get will post on the city's website. Is that right Annie? And on my website, so we will make it as transparent as possible so you can track all the commentary we're getting. We have some elected officials and candidates in the room. Would you raise our hand if we have any elected officials or candidates?

Over here. We normally as a courtesy allow people to come up earlier in the process so I'll leave that to the Mayor and finally we are going to—we were planning to do this by lottery, it maybe however, that we can get to everybody tonight. I think it's quite likely that we'll get to everybody. We have this space until 9 o'clock and at 9 o'clock we have to leave because the University of Portland has security and rules and other things. We're going to get as much in as possible. I think colleagues will probably be able to hear from everyone who is there. Therefore again, thank you for joining us and I'm going to turn it over to our friends at Resolutions Northwest.

Theresa Logan: Thank you for having us here. Again, my name is Theresa Logan. I am—this is [Jamie Sandberter] and we are facilitators with Resolutions Northwest. We are not part of the city. We are a non-profit community resolutions service. We provide mediation and facilitation services to the community. We also do school based restorative justice services and lots of training on all things conflict resolution, equity inclusiveness and anti-oppression. If you're interested, we have some of our materials on this table, but again, that's not why we're here tonight. We're here to hear from all of you about your thoughts about the Harbor process.

So we're going to start with a little bit of show of hands to see who's here tonight. So if you can raise your hand if you identify with any of the following statements. Who here is from North Portland. Raise your hand.

Female: A lot from North Portland. Maybe a third of the hands in the room.

Theresa Logan: How about east side of Portland.

Female: Good handful.

Theresa Logan: West side of Portland?

Female: Another good handful.

Theresa Logan: And outside of Portland. Who's here from outside of Portland.

Female: About five brave souls.

Theresa Logan: All right. So how many of you live near Portland Harbor? Great.

Female: Maybe about half of the room.

Theresa Logan: How many of you work at Portland Harbor?

Female: Maybe a dozen hands.

Theresa Logan: How many of you use Portland Harbor for recreation?

Female: Again, maybe twenty hands.

Theresa Logan: How many of you fish in Portland Harbor?

Female: About six.

Theresa Logan: And how many have been following this process for the last fifteen years?

Female: Most of the room.

Theresa Logan: Do we have elected officials in the room. I know we just asked that. Anyone show up since then? City staff? A couple of hands in the back around the sides. Media.

Female: One lone hand over here. Good.

Theresa Logan: And if there are any elected officials that are just coming in that want to speak, at any time you can come and join us at the front. And you can check in with us here. Raise your hand if you're here to listen tonight. Just here to listen.

Female: Most of the hands in the room.

Theresa Logan: And if you hope to give testimony tonight.

Female: Most of the hands in the room.

Theresa Logan: Great. Thank you.

Female: So thank you all for coming out. We're going to make our part as brief as possible so we can get to hearing from all of you. A couple of things we do want to clarify, and I think we heard this from the Mayor and from Commissioner Fish already and want to say one more time the things this forum is a little bit different. This is not an EPA forum. This is not part of the EPA's comment period. It's not an EPA information session to provide details about the proposed cleanup plan.

If you do need more information about the proposed cleanup plan from the EPA it's available on the back table where you registered. And I know for some folks it might be frustrating. You might have come here tonight hoping to receive more information that what is on the paper. I'd also encourage you if you're interested there is links to the website. You can pull out your phone and you can Google the EPA's page if you'd like more information about the proposals and the plan. And just to reiterate. This is a city process where the city wants to hear from the public to inform the city's comments to the EPA. And the city also wants you to give your comments directly to the EPA so they can be registered there as well.

Is that clear to everyone that this is part of the city process and not the EPA process. I see heads nodding. If you have any questions, feel free to grab someone in the back.

Theresa Logan: And we will also be taking written comments, so if you can't stay the whole time or you're not comfortable giving public comments, there are comment cards available for you on both sides. We already said that in the beginning as well, but just to reiterate, if you need to leave early or anything, or don't want to be part of the lottery, feel free to leave your comments there and those will make it into the proper places as well. Also, housekeeping there's no break tonight. It looks like we might be able to get to everyone, we're hoping, but in you know for the sake of getting to everyone here, we know that's important, we are not going to take a break. There are refreshments over in this area. We will be closing this at nine. There are restrooms if you go the opposite direction then you went when you came in the doors, here, then the restrooms are just on the other side of the lobby, there.

All right, and we are going to have three different kinds of groups of testimony tonight. At first we're going to hear from Government agencies, which is the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. If any other elected officials appear, then they would get to testify here as well. Then we have some invited testimony from stakeholder groups that the city has identified, to come and present information from their constituents. And then we're going to move on to the public testimony that would be by lottery and quite possibly have a chance for most everyone in the room to have a chance to speak tonight.

First up on deck—

Female: First up we have the Director of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Joni Hammond. Is Joni here? Right here and we also have [inaudible] Matt Quincy as well from ODEQ.

Theresa Logan: And as we call folks up to testify tonight, we're going to ask you to come to the microphones on either side of the stage. And when we get to the public testimony part and we're calling numbers, we'd like you to come down to the first row of seats so we don't waste too much time in the turnover.

Joni Hammond: Mayor Hales, Commissioner, thank you for inviting us. I'm Joni Hammond, DEQ Deputy Director.

Male: Can you get a little closer to the microphone, Joni.

Joni Hammond: Should I start again?

Male: Yes.

Joni Hammond: Good evening Mayor, Commissioners, thank you for inviting us. I'm Joni Hammond of DEQ's deputy director. Not director. We have an interim director in Pete Sheppard. Tonight we're pleased to provide some comments to you and as you know DEQ's comments will formally be provided as a part of the state's consolidated comments. With me tonight is Matt McClincy, our Portland Harbor Project Manager who will provide some brief comments.

Matt McClincy: Thank you.

Male: Thank you for being here.

Matt McClincy: Good Evening. Thank you for the invitation and opportunity to provide DEQ's perspective on EPA's proposed plan. The short story on this is that we're still reviewing the plan and developing our perspective on it. I want to first say that DEQ plays two important roles in the project. First is we're designated as lead agency for source control. This is identifying upland and upstream sources of contamination to the lower reach of the river here, cleaning those up and controlling them so that when the plan that we're talking about this evening gets implemented it doesn't get recontaminated or fouled. We also are support agency, the EPA. We've been working with them from the beginning on the project. Working with them to determine the nature of the problem, what the risks are associated with the candidate sediments in the river. We'll be working with them once the remedy is selected to oversee the construction of the cleanup and the performance monitoring of it as well.

So the plan that EPA just released. It just came out on the 8th. We've been looking at it for three weeks now and it also has a large supporting document and an updated feasibility study. This is really a modification of a concept remedy that EPA released or proposed to the national review board last fall. DEQ working closely with a number of other state agencies such as health authority, marine board, state lands, fish and wildlife, business Oregon, etc., reviewed that concept remedy last fall. Provided comments to EPA, identified concerns that we had with that so at this point in the project, we're back with our sister agencies, taking a look at this updated plan to see how our initial comments were addressed and what modifications were made with the plan. That's very much a work in progress right now. I think all I can do is identify some of the major topics that we're focusing on as part of that review. First and foremost, is the plan protective of public health and environment. That's DEQ's charge as well as EPA's. That's something we want to get right on the project. There are also some very real environmental justice issues on the lower river here. We know that folks are actively harvesting and consuming fish. Consumption of fish is one of the main risks drivers for human health on the river here and we know that simply posting signs and warning people about consuming fish is not going to

really get at the problem here. One of the comments that we had provided the EPA early on is making sure that the plan provided resources, for outreach and education about fish consumption. Another topic that we're now just starting to take a look at is there are ways—where are people most using the resources, here. Where are they collecting fish and is there a way to sequence or design the remedy around that so as fast as possible we can reduce the contamination in these areas and reduce the tissue concentrations down so that where the folks are collecting these fish and try to accelerate the reduction in [inaudible] and therefore lower the risk.

Some of the other topics are implementation. We know that it's kind of at two levels. Will the proposed plan that EPA presents provide incentives or in certainty for the performing parties to step forward relatively quickly after EPA selects the remedies so they will enter agreements with EPA to conduct the design work and construct the work as soon as possible and not get into litigious position.

The remedies also in some sense are very generic remedy across ten miles. It's laid out in a series of flow charts—if/then statements and the situation they'll cap or dredge and also where it is in the river.

DEQ staff have been working quite closely on a number of these upland sites and we know the geology, the geography, the contaminated issues there so one of our tasks is looking at this remedy and making sure that we think it's getting at the local problems. Is it implementable. We're also looking at what are the impacts to the uses on the river both during construction and long term and what will the restrictions and limitations be to use in the river. We certainly would like to minimize that as much as possible. For example, if you have a sediment cap will there be use restrictions for recreational boating over the top of that cap.

Longterm, another element of the remedy that EPA has proposed is this natural recovery, much of the river bottom is put into this category letting the river naturally recover once the higher areas of contamination are actively managed. This is a big controversial from what we're hearing and so we're looking to see the remedies speaks specifically to how they're going to monitor the effectiveness and reliability of that and I guess given where we are in the project and the time tonight, it's about all I have to provide for feedback. Thank you.

Male: I just want to ask a little bit of a question here. I appreciate your points, some of them are in effect technical like how do we monitor to see if there's natural recovery concept is actually doing what is proposed it will do. There are technical and subsequent questions like attending to environmental justice. I get that. But one of them struck me as almost tactical which is your third point about will the plan provide incentives and certainties so that the parties will actually perform versus litigate. And that sort of how do we get the polluters to pay instead of go to court. And I'm just struck by that. It's a good point and I'm not quite sure how we evaluate that in advance but I think it's important that you brought it up. And how do we as a city enforce that outcome because maybe we don't agree on everything but we agree that getting it cleaned up versus going to court. I'd rather see it get cleaned up so if you want to expand on that at all now, I'd certainly like to hear more on that tactical focus on that point.

Matt McClincy: I probably would not get into the specifics as much as we've identified—DEQ has identified it and the state has identified it to the EPA. It has got some traction and as far as the need for the implementation strategy and you know there are things maybe to break up the project in pieces that the performing parties are going to say that's my problem. I'm willing to

step forward and take ownership of that versus ten miles of the whole problem. Folks want to see they don't want to be tired to a billion dollar remedy that's not part of their issue and as well as I think they want some certainty in planning—it needs to be clear when they're done and how they complete their obligation and get out of it. If it's not clear then I think there's less incentives to step forward.

Male: Good points. Thank you very much. Thank you very much for being here. We appreciate it. Do you have other agencies lined up?

Theresa Logan: We do have more invited testimony that will be coming up next and just a little bit more information. I just wanted to check the volume—sound. Can you all in the back hear okay? Yes. I'm getting thumbs up from back there. Next we're going to move onto the invited stakeholder testimony. Jamie if you want to read off the first four names that we're going to hear from.

Jamie: Sure. The first four names we'll be hearing from tonight if you can come down if you're not already here are from Jim Roberson with the Portland Harbor Community Advisory Group. Is John Foxwell here from Apex Companies? Okay. Travis Williams with Alana [Urbakeeper]. Bob Salinger with Audubon Society of Portland is here. And then Is Willy Myers here with Columbia Pacific Building Trades. Willy Myers if you wouldn't mind coming up. We'll get started with those first three and we'll list off some more.

Theresa Logan: Great. And just a couple of details, briefly. For this invited testimony we're going to give you a limit of three minutes to provide your testimony. We do have a timekeeper with us, our volunteer Laurie is sitting up here at the front. Laurie could you raise the signs that you have. She's going to give you a heads up to help you keep track of your time. She's got a green sign to give you a one minute warning when you have one minute remaining. A yellow sign, when you have thirty seconds remaining and a red sign when your time is up. I know you'll be looking at the Mayor and the Commissioners as you provide your testimony, but if you'll keep an eye over here to just kind of help you with the guide post of how much time you have please do that.

We also have heard that this issue in particular can get a bit acronym heavy and there is the glossary of acronyms at the back table if you need one. You could also flag down one of our volunteers. We could get you one if that would be helpful and there's also a big list over here that has some of the most common Portland Harbor Super Fund Acronyms if you can see those are here, if you can't see them we can get you a copy of the glossary and also another of our volunteers is going to help us out. If we hear any acronyms that are not on this list up here, we're going to write them down as you're speaking, we're not going to interrupt you but when you're done we might check in with you just to help us understand what those acronyms were.

Female: So I may interrupt you because I need to know what a person's talking about before they continue. So if you could try to avoid acronyms that would be really helpful.

Theresa Logan: Try to avoid them. It's really helpful. For those of you that live and breathe this stuff, sometimes it's almost impossible. So we'll try to help check you on that. A couple of other reminders. All perspectives are welcome and even if you don't agree with something we want to

be respectful to each other. If you do agree with something has to offer, we encourage you to not applaud but to show your agreement with a jazz hands some people love it, lots of people hate it and it's really helps us keep moving. It doesn't interrupt the speaker and it is actually much better visual for the mayor and council to see how many people are agreeing with a particular comment. And in addition if you try to stay about four to six inches away from the microphone that is about the distance where you can be best heard and with that we'll turn it over to our first speaker.

Jim Robertson: Mayor Hales, Commissioners Fish, Fritz, I'm Jim Robertson, Chair of the Portland Harbor Committee Advisory group. I want to thank you, first off, for having a hearing today to hear from those of us in the community about what we believe the city's response to the proposed plan of the EPA should be. And I want to just touch on a couple of major points. There are a lot of details I could get into but I won't get into those details. I want to touch on one overall goal. Our overall goal really is to get to a point where we can say that the fish advisory that applies to the lower Willamette River can be removed so we can have fish that are healthy again in this section of the river.

Now some people will say you'll never get clean fish. You'll never get a clean river. I don't accept that. I don't accept never as an answer. What I would like to see is that at some point there is the end goal of that fish advisory that applies to that section of the river is removed. There may be other fish advisories for the entire river but that's not what I'm looking at for our goal on this section.

Now getting there we need to have a long term focus on effectiveness of the cleanup. When we talk about long term effectiveness, we have to think about what is being left in the river that potentially could be uncovered again at some point in the future, recontaminate the river and material that if it's not removed would be a problem for generations in the future. Do we want to tell those generations ah, sorry we couldn't quite clean everything up, or do we want to have a river that we can be proud of and that future generations can be proud of.

So the long term effectiveness we have to think about what does monitored natural recovery do, since most of the area of the cleanup site is to be handled through monitored natural recovery, we need to take a real careful look at how effective that is. We've seen in other areas that it's generally not very effective.

We need to be certain that it will in fact result in a cleaner river. Now monitored natural recovery—there are three components to it. There's the actual breakdown of chemicals, there's what I call natural covering and what I call natural removal. The breakdown of chemicals is fine for those chemicals that do breakdown in a reasonable amount of time. What we have in this river is persistent chemicals that don't break down quickly. Monitored natural covering is just saying we're going to cover it up and at some point down the road it will get uncovered again and monitored natural removals really just letting it wash away down the river so it becomes another problem. Since many of these chemicals are bio-accumulative they get into the fish wherever they in the river.

We need to ensure that this is a long term effective cleanup and it gets us to a final goal of being able to day, we have fish that are clean enough to eat.

Male: Thank you Jim.

Theresa Logan: Thank you, Jim. Okay. Next up we have Bob Salinger with Audubon Society of Portland.

Bob Salinger: Good evening. My name is Bob Salinger. I'm the conservation director for the Audubon Society of Portland. Is this too loud?

Theresa Logan: It's okay.

Bob Salinger: Okay. What—[laughs]. So we're here tonight to address our concerns about this plan. You know no one in this room has never known anything but a contaminated river. That's been contaminated since before anybody was born, and too often, I think we view contamination as something that is part of the status quo. We live in a green city, but the deep, dark secret of the city is that it's a very contaminated city. We have bad air quality. We have bad water quality and from our perspective clean air and clean water are not a luxury. They're not something that's nice to have. They're a basic human right. And they're a human right that's been denied to our communities for far too long. Especially to the most vulnerable in our communities. It's time to clean up the river. This is our only chance to do it. If we don't get it right now, we're never going to get an opportunity to come back and do it again. This isn't a situation where we can push it down the road and hope people come back and do it right if we don't do it right this time. It's taken a long time to get there.

I think when we talk about the river, too often we talk about balancing. Let's balance the interest of industry and balance the interest of our health and our environment. We shouldn't be compromising the health of our environment. We shouldn't be compromising the health of our community. It should not be the cost of doing business. We should insist that industry step up, take responsibility and clean up the river.

When we think about this plan, the word that comes to mind is disappointment. First of all we're disappointed in the EPA. The EPA dropped the ball. They came back with a plan that leaves 92% of our river contaminated for generations to come. They proposed to take some of the contamination that they are going to remove, what little contamination they are going to remove and put it in a dump back in the river. Something they know the community objects to.

They are clearly intimidated by the PRP's. When they talk about this plan, all they talk about is how they brought down the cost and they're going to leave much of the river contaminated. We know that they canceled their press conference last week, specifically because they were concerned that the PRP's would show up. And so they didn't even come here to present their plan. We're disappointed in the political community right now. Too often the political community has been talking about what are the costs to our industry. Speaking from polluter talking points, focusing exclusively on the economics side of the equation and we're looking to the political community, City Council, especially, to start talking about are we doing what we need to do to protect our community and protect our environment. It's not just about the cost. Most of all we're disappointed in this plan. This plan fails this community. It leaves our river contaminated. It says trust us, we'll come back later and clean it up if we don't get it right this time. No one can trust the EPA to come back in five, ten, fifteen or twenty years. It only gets more complicated. It only gets more remote. It only gets harder to find the responsible parties. We want a plan that gives us certainty, that restores our river to health, protects our community and especially protects the most vulnerable in our community and we want city

council to take a stand on behalf of our community. We want city council to step up and tell the EPA that this plan is inadequate and we want you to come back with a plan that is going to clean up our river and protect our communities. Thank you.

Male: Thank you. Is someone's phone going off?

Laurie: My timer.

Male: That's what it is.

Theresa Logan: Thank you. Bob. So next up we have Willy Myers from Columbia Pacific Building Trades and after Willy I think Travis Williams from Willamette River Keepers has gotten here so he's going to go next. Is John Foxwell, here yet from Apex Companies. Is Peter Defer here?

Audience: Peter was [inaudible].

Theresa Logan: Thank you. So after Travis, then we'll have Tawna Sanchez from Native American Youth and Family Center. Okay. Thanks Willy.

Willy Myers: Thank you. My name is Willy Myers and I'm the Executive Secretary/Treasurer of the Columbia Pacific Building and Construction Trades Council. Thank you for inviting me tonight for testimony and thank you for hearing all of our testimony.

I currently represent 18,000 men and women in the construction, unionized construction industry. The Willamette River is home to Oregon's largest Seaport that directly employs about 30,000 people. The EPA spent more than fifteen years studying how best to tackle this ten mile stretch of our river that's now in question and has issued it's findings. We think that the EPA has the cleanup right both on the cleanup for the environment—the environment of our river and providing an atmosphere of future development and commerce without demanding the port—excuse me—damaging the port and local government, business, and energy providers and the current jobs that they provide our community. We are—we hope that the work matches the numbers the EPA proposed. We have the have an opportunity to deliver this cleanup with high roads standards that include prevailing wages with family benefits to the workforce with a focus on diversity, equity and opportunity by utilizing the most skilled productive, diverse and equitable workforce in the industry and that's the Columbia Pacific Building Trades. We take pride in doing the job right the first time and I can't think of another job where those words impact our community more. I would like to thank you again for the invitation and the opportunity to testify.

Male: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: Next, Travis Williams from River Keepers.

Travis Williams: Mayor and Commissioners, I appreciate the opportunity to offer a few comments tonight. I think CERCLA has to implement the ARS through BES.

[Laughter]

Male: We have translators.

Travis Williams: So I'm with Willamette River Keepers. We work on this process for the past fifteen and a half years. And I think the city of Portland has a unique opportunity to both protect the public trust and also participate in this process as a potentially responsible party. Those who hold liability in this process. I think we've seen some good signs from the city in terms of its work on Mall 11 East working with some of the landowners there or rival entities to move a concept for a cleanup therefore we're going to take that—that's showing leadership. It's my hope that the city can do the same thing throughout this process. Hopefully it will not have to adopt a posture anywhere near what we've seen some of the antics from the other PRP's over the past several years. And I think you guys. You know the difference.

So I hope you can go there. What I would say is that what we have seen in this draft cleanup plan is something that is—it doesn't get us there. We do need to lift if there's one common goal in this process, let's lift that fish consumption advisory relating to resident fish in Portland Harbor. We're going to go through a lot of effort, over the next few years to begin implementation of something let's hope that that something results and lifting a ban on a date certain. So that if you do go down to the river and consume fish, you're not increasing your cancer risk. That's the human health nexus in this whole thing. I also don't think that we need to—we should forget—you should forget the fact that this is also about area wildlife.

It's not just a fish consumption issue in that respect. Oftentimes it gets boiled down to that because it's about PCBs and it's related to cancer risk and it's very important. We have very real ecological risks in this process. So I would encourage you to remember that as a city deliberates it's rule. I would also say that I think involving the community throughout the process and continuing to offer dialog is very important. I think we're going to see a pretty robust level of public comment by September 6 which will hopefully yield something that is much stronger than dredging 150 acres of contaminated sediment out of over 2,000. In our view, you have a unique role. You are a unique entity and Portland has an opportunity to show it's progressive on these issues and I would remind us if we're thinking about cost which is often the first thing people mention in this conversation, the city spent what 1.4 billion on the big pipe? For this we're looking at 750 million, that's a big number. I get that. If you take it in context, over multiple years of construction, many, many entities paying in, it provides some perspective. Thank you.

Male: Travis, I wanted to respond to one thing you mentioned and I appreciated that you noted that we have a unique role as a PRP. And I know there was some concern about where we would land with the feasibility study and if we would be bringing legal challenge after asking for some documents. I think it's important to note while other PRP's are free to make their own judgment on that, the City has chosen not to challenge the feasibility study.

Travis Williams: And obviously I think it would be a difficult decision for any PRP to do given the complexities of any legal challenge of a Super Fund product.

Males: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: Thank you, Travis. Okay. Tawna Sanchez from Native American Youth and Family Center.

Tawna Sanchez: Are we good. Good space.

Male: Yes.

Tawna Sanchez: Thank you Mayor Hales, Commissioners. You know I have a bunch of notes, but everyone has said all the things that really do need to be said except for the fact that this is native land. We're sitting on somebody else's land. Even myself as a Shoshone-Bannock and Yute. I'm a visitor. I don't speak the language. You know, for the hundreds of years we've been here we've taken it upon ourselves to contaminate somebody else's space, to make their fish inedible, to make the land around it toxic. And it just behooves us to take responsibility. To take full responsibility and to not allow those big companies who are the—what is it the PRP's to not take responsibilities.

We have amazing potential here. You heard from the trades, they have the people who can do the work. We talk about that all the time. We need work. We need jobs. We are the city of Portland. We are right now the most unlivable place in the country for poor people and we still have a lot of poor people. So we have an opportunity to create jobs, to clean something up so that we don't leave it for the next generation and the next generation and the next generation to come and to make our city a more livable place. Why wouldn't we do that? Why wouldn't we hold people accountable? Why wouldn't we move forward so that we can have something happen in the city that we have all been trying from lots of differentness to make happen. Right? Why wouldn't we do that? I think we have a responsibility to make it happen and anything less is unacceptable.

Male: Thank you very much.

Theresa Logan: Thank you Tawna. Also the last few invited testimony names are do we have Marion Haynes from Portland Business alliance, Marion do you want to come up here? And do we have Adam Lions from the North East coalition of neighborhoods is here. Great. So we'll start with Marion. Once she gets here and did John Foxwell ever make it? No. So these will be our last two invited testimonies and then we'll be able to move on to the public testimony.

Female: I think we heard one of those acronyms a lot the PRP which I had to read the list up here. It's Potentially Responsible Party.

Marion Haynes: Good evening, Mayor, Counsel members. My name is Marion Haynes and I represent the Portland Business Alliance. I'm going to have to take off my glasses to read. The Portland Business Alliance represents close to 1,900 small and large businesses that employ about 350,000 workers in the Portland region. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. The alliance does strongly support cleaning up the Portland Harbor Super Fund site to protect public health and the environment. We also support doing so in a way that is mindful of the impacts on the economy, jobs and other important local priorities. The cost of the cleanup will be borne throughout our community. In 2013, the alliance commissioned a study that looked at the economic linkages from marine industrial businesses. We looked at vendors and service

providers, suppliers to just five large marine industrial businesses. At that time 42% of the goods and services purchased by these five businesses were derived from local businesses, often small businesses. In all about 300 local businesses are part of the supply chain for just five of the large marine industrial businesses in the harbor.

And it's not that local businesses or just that local businesses and local workers will be impacted. Local taxpayers and ratepayers will also be impacted because public entities like the city of Portland and utilities are also potentially responsible parties. We all have a responsibility for this. As to the proposed plan, we do have a few concerns. We're concerned about its cost effectiveness and whether the proposed \$746 million estimate is accurate. Reasons were there were little changes to the actual plan that resulted in the cost, the revised downward cost estimate. And other Super Fund cleanups we do know that EPA's estimates have been understated and with so many critical issues facing the city around affordability and those things we ought to have a really accurate estimate to make to base our decisions on. We're concerned what the cost is based on assumptions that may prove unrealistic such as nonstop dredging for seven straight years which could hamper business operations and recreational opportunities during that time. Finally we are concerned that the plan is not sufficiently flexible to allow site specific remedies. Contamination and risks are not uniform throughout the harbor. Flexibility would allow the cleanup to take into account changes in the river and site specific risks in a more cost effective manner.

The legacy contamination in the harbor caused by our activities going back over a hundred years has become the responsibility of this generation to fix, and we should do that. But we should do it in a way that is protective of human health, the environment and our local businesses, workers, taxpayers and rate payers. We need to be using our public and private resources wisely and we can only do that in a plan grounded in sound science that provides flexibility to address the site specific risks. Thank you.

Male: Thank you very much.

Theresa Logan: Thank you. Next we have Adam Lyons from Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods.

Adam Lyons: Hello commissioners and mayor. Thank you for inviting us to do this. My portion of this really is about the public involvement process or lack thereof. Thirty days and a thirty day extension is great, but we're really here to ask you to lobby for more time from the EPA so that we can do a full throated public feedback beyond the traditional groups and individuals that comment on this type of thing.

We're currently working with community groups such as Audubon and Willamette River keepers. They're laying the groundwork to hold community workshops in both English and Spanish throughout the summer. NECN has been and will continue to do multilingual outreach to try and get as diverse feedback as possible in this complicated and massive plan. Because of the scope of the proposed document and it's jargon heavy language we are asking for at least if not more sixty additional days to comment. This is to ensure that all communities, especially those that rely on the Willamette for subsistent fishing get a chance to speak. Lower income communities, under engaged communities and non-native speaking communities can take longer to—feedback. Did I just cut out. I think you probably got the idea.

So from a equity and health safety lens it's critical that we get the extra time to ensure that all of these important voices are heard. Thank you.

Male: If I can clarify something. Originally it was a thirty day clock. EPA extended it to sixty days. I understand they just added thirty days. Now we're on ninety days. And in addition, under Mike Jordan's leadership and at the request of a number of community groups, the city put together a pool of small grant funds and have distributed now I think a little over \$60,000 to groups that ask for funding to do some outreach work and to make sure that underrepresented groups are able to participate in this process. So I appreciate your point.

Theresa Logan: All right. Thank you. We're going to move on to the general public testimony now. Um. A couple of reminders. The mayor and the council want to hear what is important to you. What has been. There's a lot of information and a lot of details. If you're not someone who is fully fluent in all of this list of acronyms, we still want to hear what's important to you about the cleanup process, even if you're not fluent in all of the specific tables. What are those interests and those values that you want to see in the city's proposal, comments about the proposals.

We do also want to ask, is there anyone. I know a lot of you have been waiting for a long time already and we're going to get to you. I'm just curious if there's anyone who has child care or elder care requirements who can't stay until nine o'clock tonight. If that is you. I don't see any hands. We're going to move onto the lottery draw. We've drawn the first few numbers, so we're going to start with numbers 29 and 16. We'll have number 29 go to this mike and number 16 go to the mike over there. And then the rest of the numbers I'm going to call, please do come on down to the front and sit in one of these reserved seats. The next up will be 30, 11, 8, 14, and 2. And a reminder for this part of the testimony you do have a two minute limit.

Number 29 come on down and you are—it is apparently optional tonight whether you state your name, but we'd still like you to if you're willing.

Ann Littlewood: My—I'll try again. My name is Ann Littlewood. I live in Northeast Portland. My family has lived in Portland for five generations. From what I have seen of this plan so far, and we waited sixteen years for this, is it looks a lot like let's don't and say we did. But at least it's cheap. I know cleanup will be costly and painful. When ecological sins are committed the correction is going to hurt. The alternative is leaving the river that's at the very heart of our city and our communities as a toxic waste site. I think we need a much more thorough cleanup than the current plan proposes and I would like to point out in regard to the notion of storing toxic waste alongside the river. I just want to say 1996. I think you know what I mean. Thank you.

Male: Thank you.

Kristen Younce: Hi, I'm Kristen Younce. I'm with cable radio and I want to let you know that I've been following this for sixteen years and more. More intensely in the last three years and the thing that keeps coming up for me is you have a company like [Arcama] who's share price is 68 Euros per share. They have an operating budget in the billions of dollars. They're crop science, the ones that give you pesticides and all kinds of lovely things that I think a lot of Portlanders can't stand hearing about. Their operating budget is 46 billion dollars a year. And Cargill, the largest agricultural multinational corporation in the world has an operating budget of well, it's income is 1.5 billion and I keep hearing from the Portland Business Alliance, from the Chamber

of Commerce that this process is going to cost jobs and cost money for the city and for the ratepayers and I seriously believe that there is a disconnect in that. And I would really like to see the city move a little bit harder to put the people who are at fault and actually have the money in the position where they have to pay. And that's all I have to say.

Male: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Theresa Logan: Okay. So numbers 30 and 11. Do we have 30 and 11 up here? Is number 8 up here. Number 8. You can take the other—

Ben Po: My name is Ben Po. I'm with the St. Johns Neighborhood Association. Thank you for hearing my comments. I've been tracking the Super Fund process for about four years now. I really have to say that I tip my hat to the community advisory group and those folks that have been volunteering their time for nearly sixteen years now working on this. Willamette River Keeper and Audubon and the folks from the tribes. We're the folks that are often referred to by the EPA as their community partners. It's interesting and disturbing to me that the choices that the EPA put out there, which amount to do nothing, do next to nothing or some pie in the sky dredge the river bank to bank, that nobody supports, none of those represent anything that was endorsed by any of the so-called community partners and in fact our suggestions were quite pointedly left off of that list. I feel that the EPA has betrayed our trust and that they have sold out to the interests of the perps, or the PRPs if you prefer and to their political cronies and this is not acceptable to our community. St. John's is you know right in the trenches on this. This is our backyard. And we're not going to sit still for this. This is utterly unacceptable and thank you for your time.

Male: Thank you. Thank you.

Stephanie Taylor: Good evening, Mayor Hales, City Counselors—

Male: A little closer.

Stephanie Taylor: Sorry I'm short. My name is Stephanie Taylor and I am here to ask the council to take affirmative action in demanding a stronger cleanup plan from the EPA. I'm thirty three years old and I fear I and my children will never know anything but a toxic river. Portland residents have waited patiently for sixteen long years for the EPA to come up with a sound scientific plan that would clean up our river. We have waited for the solution to the toxic habitat that the wildlife residents of Portland depend on. We were given on June 8th—what we were given on June 8th was a slap in the face. Portland City council has a huge responsibility in protecting Portland's resources from industrial profiteers. The toxicity of the river is not the fault of Portland communities but of businesses exploiting Portland's resources and it's residents.

Those businesses responsible are financially liable to fix this disaster. Entities with liability for the pollution must be held accountable and pay for a comprehensive cleanup plan that will protect the health of our communities, our environment and our wildlife. As you know one of those responsible parties is the city of Portland. Portland residents are trusting of the city Council will depend Portland residents and demand at least 1,000 acres of polluted sediment be removed from the River. Enough to lift the fish advisories forever. People depend on this River

for sustenance and these people see the toxic signs and must make the choice to abide by the signs or go hungry. This is absolutely an environmental justice issue. It is now your choice about how you will proceed about advocating for Portland. Please demand that the EPA and the responsible parties clean up the Willamette River 100%. Thank you.

Male: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: All right, next up we have numbers 14 and number 2. Is number 2 here. All right and on deck we have a new set of numbers drawn. If you have number 26, 19, 27, 8 or 20 won't you come on down please and sit in the front row.

Tim Heller: Good evening. My name is Tim Heller. I live on Hayden Island. I'm a research scientist, professor of research methods and Chair of Doctoral dissertation research projects in the College of Doctoral Studies in Grand Canyon University. It is from this perspective that I've reviewed the final remedial investigative report and the subsequent recommendations and in my professional evaluation of these many studies findings and interpretations, I've found fundamental research flaws throughout the remedial investigation of the Portland Harbor Super Fund site. These include untested theoretical frameworks to guide the scope of the study, the research methodology and design issues, specifically with the samples and locations, data gathering methods and data analysis that have led to incomplete and inaccurate findings that cannot be considered as valid and reliable.

Further, to take make interpretations, draw conclusions and present specific recommendations for action based on this fundamentally flawed research is not only very bad science but also highly irresponsible public policy and a waste of assets. I recommend that in order to fully understand the flaws of this study that you commission a panel of scientists to thoroughly study this again. Not the whole project but just these reports and recommendations so that you'll know what is junk and what is actionable. Thank you.

Male: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: So we have number 2. So for those of you who are leaving right after you testify, we do have some evaluation forms that are for our facilitation. Have nothing to do with the harbor. If you're willing to fill it out that is always helpful feedback for us to have. Thank you.

Allie Berman: Hi, Mayor Hales, commissioners. My name is Allie Berman. I'm going to read. The Willamette is one of Portland's largest habitats and it's so contaminated we have to put signs up that warn people against eating too much fish because the PCPS, DDT, lead, mercury and arsenic could prove disastrous to their house, but there's no such thing as a fish advisory for wildlife. The ospreys, great blue herons, otters, beavers, belted kingfishers, bald eagles and fish species who depend on the river have no way of knowing that just by living around the Super Fund site they face developmental and reproductive health issues. They may not be voters, but it's their river as much as it's ours. I'm here tonight to ask city council to demand a better cleanup plan. One that prioritizes the health of the public and wildlife over the deep pockets of polluters. They made this mess. Now it's their responsibility to clean it up.

This is our once in a lifetime chance to make a huge impact on the health of our river. If we miss it, no one in this room will ever get another one. Please stand up with the public and demand a substantially improved plan that removes at least 1,000 acres of polluted sediment from the river. Stops relying on monitored natural recovery and takes the toxic dredge sediment to an appropriate off-site landfill. The Super Fund site is a stain on Oregon's green legacy. We need you to help change that and get the Willamette the cleanup it deserves. Thank you.

Male: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: And I hear that those of you who are following instructions and doing Jazz hands rather than applauding feel like it's hard for the mayor and council to see you when you're doing that.

Charles Hale: We see them. It's helpful.

Theresa Logan: You can see them?

Charles Hale: Yes.

Theresa Logan: Just checking. Okay you are being seen. Thank you for checking in. Number 26 and next up on the other mike we will have number 19.

Ellen Baily: Good evening. My name is Ellen Baily and I live in North Portland and thank you for being here tonight and listening to this. The potentially responsible parties that phrase is amazing because the whole reason we're here is because they have not been responsible and they're refusing to take responsibility. They're spending a lot of money. They've cowed the EPA and they're putting all their money instead of into cleaning up they're paying attorneys to try to prevent having to do any cleanup or to do as little as possible and the EPA has apparently buckled under and chosen proposal I. And it would be much better if we go with proposal H and actually get more toxic waste removed. Those companies made a lot of money and they didn't clean up after themselves and they want to just walk away. And toxic waste needs to be removed, not put in the side of the river in concrete, but removed to a toxic waste facility and properly taken care of.

We can't just cover the whole side of the river with concrete. It needs to be as natural as possible for all the wildlife. We need to keep going until the fish are edible. I wouldn't dream of eating a fish out of that river. Any ocean near land, either, unfortunately. We really need to get the toxic waste out because just sitting and watching it is not going to clean it up. PCBs and dioxin. Agent orange, all this stuff. It doesn't break down. It's not natural. It's not going to become natural. Fifty years from now, it's still going to be toxic. We have to remove it and they have to pay. They have to take responsibility because they are responsible and hire locally. Lots of people would like jobs and you know good all around. Thank you.

Charles Hale: Thank you. Thanks very much.

Theresa Logan: We have number 19 over here and then we're going to have 27 and 18 on deck. If you have those numbers please come to the front row. If you also have number 20, 17, 18, 16,

25, 21, 9, 7, 1, or 3. Any of the numbers that are listed up here, please make your way down to the front so we can keep our transition time short. And just a thought if you're not sure your jazz hands are being seen and you're able, feel free to stand up with your jazz hands. It doesn't cut into the speakers time that way.

Charles Hale: Even though we're up here in this lofty perch, we can see you. Actually that helps. Go ahead.

Allison Margion: Good evening. My name is Allison Margion. And I've called the Portland Metro area home for twenty three years now.

I grew up exploring the banks of the Willamette river with the occasional swim. And I grew up knowing that if you go into the water, you need to keep your mouth shut, because the water was dirty. This cleanup is a singular chance to get it right for generations to come. I want to see my children feel safer in the river than I did. I want to tell them that the city that we call home did right by the community and I mean the whole community. The current proposal leaves nearly 90% of the contamination on site. Which means that we can't expect the water to be safe for my child or even their children. The current proposal also keep the fish advisory in place for at least another ten years. This is particularly troubling for families who would rely on the river for food resources and particularly for pregnant women. For whom fish is highly recommended source of nutrients, providing that the fish isn't contaminated.

As a pregnant person I am unable to consume any fish from my local rivers. Fish as a food product is incredibly healthy and it's also culturally relevant to many communities. It's also hard to access for low income communities. The current cleanup plan disproportionately leaves out the needs of these families and denies full populations access to a valuable food source. We need to consider our whole community regardless of income. We need to consider the wide reaching effects to our natural environment, regardless of what's expedient or convenient. This is called environmental justice and I don't see it in the current proposal. Thank you.

Charles Hale: Thank you. Congratulations.

AM: Thank you.

Tom Parwalke: Number 27. Tom Parwalke, university park neighborhood association, vice chair. Welcome to the hood. This is our neighborhood. We welcome you to it. And if you just look outside, if you take seventy five steps you'll find and see what you see and he's standing in front of it right now, in the suit coat, but if you moved just about two inches, you would see that that's the only area that's going to be—this little area between us and Swan Island are the only section that's actually going to be dredged. That's 90% of all the dredging that's going to be done. There's some issues on enhanced recovery as well and that would—is right adjacent to it. So there's some real concerns that maybe that doesn't work next to all that active dredging. Plus there will be maintenance dredging because this is an active navigation. So this is a little concern. And it will impact it. One of the concerns, also is the and this has been borne out by the Columbia—the citizen's advisory group expert. The EPA did not consider airborne toxins that would be coming from the dredge material. And we just finished with the University of Portland's here a very robust modeling system that was far better than the DEQ's with the issue of volatile basically [inaudible] and vigor. Vigor of course is cleaned up their act. We can

actually model that stuff a lot more and you may actually want to talk to the University of Portland about modeling some of this aspect, because there should be some airborne and we'd be very concerned about that in this neighborhood in particular and also this is probably the neighborhood that is likely along with the overlook to be the most impacted in the entire cleanup under I.

We think however, maybe another cleanup would be more suitable, because this one doesn't really do the job.

Charles Hale: Thank you, Tom.

Tom Parwalke: One question. How long do we have for the neighborhood associations and so forth to provide comments to you as to what we'd like to see in your—

Charles Hale: How long is the record open for that?

Theresa Logan: My understanding is it's just tonight.

Charles Hale: Well—

Male: No. There's been an extension by the EPA, but—

Theresa Logan: Well, to the city. My understanding is that the city is taking comments tonight. The BPA is open until August something that I don't remember.

Tom Parwalke: I would ask for at least one week so that the neighborhoods could some of them were not aware that we would have to have the written comments in today.

Male: So Tom we'll say at least a week and we will also post, given that the EPA has extended the additional thirty days and that happened recently. We're going to recalibrate our time but you can assume at least a week to get neighborhood comments in and we'll confer with commissioner Fritz to make sure that we have a fair time line and we'll get that out to all the neighborhoods.

Theresa Logan: Okay. Do we have number 20. And number 18 will be up next. Is number 20 here, still. Great.

Pat Hanes: First do no harm. I wish to sincerely thank you for providing this opportunity to address you. My name is Pat Hanes. I'm a resident of North Portland and a member of the community advisory group. I'm a retired professional engineer with extensive experience including surface hydrology and hazardous materials. At one point I was the fire chief of a small department and I managed a project in a British Petroleum Refinery which had better air quality than Portland. But most importantly, I'm a grandfather concerned about the safety and welfare of my community. As I consider what I might say this evening, I felt a bit conflicted. I felt that you probably wouldn't hear much technical testimony from other citizen engineers and scientists. You see they may feel threatened unless of course they speak for the PRP's. But in this limited time I want to talk about ethics. First do no harm. We require this oath of our doctors, why not of our public officials? How is it possible that we live in one of the worst EPA Super Fund sites

with some of the most polluted air in America and are burdened by a government that does not appear to be acting in the interest of its citizens?

I respectfully request of you along with the other PRPs and their legion of highly paid consultants to meditate on this. This is after all Portland and we can meditate.

[Laughter]

Pat Hanes: First do no harm. In conclusion I leave you with an unanswerable question. Why have you required confidentiality agreements of our city employees. Why has a freedom of information request had to be filed. It gives the impression of collusion with the other polluters. What are you hiding. I spoke with the EPA lawyer. They don't require this. Why have you done this? Is this concern about former war department nuclear materials in the study area? Anyone can understand the necessity of for instance keeping possible PRP dollar liabilities confidential so that their stock valuations are not damaged. I can understand that. But the city's response should be to restore public confidence in the transparency of this process.

Most citizens that have been following this process have lost trust in their government. We depend on you. First do no harm. Thank you.

Male: Sir, can I ask you a question just so we're clear on the record?

Pat Hanes: If I can respond to your question.

Male: Have you or the CAG filed a freedom of information request for any documents?

Pat Hanes: We have not at this point.

Male: And so what freedom of information request are you referring to.

Pat Hanes: The understanding that the Audubon Society has filed one.

Male: And do you know that the city has produced documents in response to it?

Pat Hanes: I haven't seen any of this.

Male: I'd be happy, off line to share that with you.

Pat Hanes: Have you sent them to the CAG?

Male: I don't know that the CAG asked for them, but we if the CAG wants the documents that we furnished to the Audubon, I think we can make them available.

Pat Hanes: It's a challenge because as a member of the citizen's advisory group, how can I fulfill my duties to the citizens if I don't know what's been going on behind closed doors for the last twelve years so I would ask you just to [inaudible].

Male: I'm not here to debate. We're here to listen. But if you feel there's been a lack of transparency and there's a document that you want, would you please let us know.

Pat Hanes: A specific document?

Male: Any documents.

Pat Hanes: Any documents. So what I'm hearing you say is you're willing to share formerly confidential documents with the citizenry.

Male: No. I'm willing to share the documents we've given to Audubon with you.

Pat Hanes: Okay. We've heard from retirees and what not that they have to go to their grave not sharing anything that they found out about the EPA Super Fund stuff. And it's ridiculous. How can this be happening in 2016.

Male: Thank you.

Pat Hanes: I don't understand it. Thank you.

Male: Thank you very much.

Theresa Logan: Number 20.

Marshall Runcle: Good evening, sir, how are you? My name is Marshall Runcle and I'm [inaudible]. And whoever came up with the idea of having the meeting here tonight should get a raise. This is perfect for that. Talking about politics on a Thursday evening.

Male: I think the charter prohibits us from giving Commissioner Fisher a raise but he appreciates the suggestion.

Male: Thank you Marshall, I'll share half of it with you.

Marshall Runcle: [Laughs] All right. I didn't plan to testify so I just stole pieces of what other people said. As DEQ and representative elect Sanchez said it is an environmental justice issue and the most chilling thing that I've read in studying this is a story about an outreach worker talking to immigrant populations about the fish situation and the person who is talking to panicking because he knows dozens of people who have freezers full of fish in their house. It's a real thing. There's people really do eat the fish. And then as Travis and others pointed out, wildlife eat the fish, too. And they can't read.

As the Portland Business Alliance folks pointed out and the building trades pointed out, there is a tension between jobs and the environment and I think too often that gets pitted against each other where it's jobs versus the environment in these kind of situations. I think in this case you've got to be thinking about as jobs and the environment. There are tons of opportunities. If we think of this as economic opportunity and not as a how do we punish people I think that's the right and I think having a community workforce agreement and making sure that those jobs go to

the people who are struggling in the neighborhoods. And then last but not least a gentle and respectful push back about the notion of getting some certainty now. I would much rather demand a very aggressive plan and have PRPs sue us. Because I believe that the law and science is on our side. Is on the side of very aggressive cleanup. We should stick stake in the ground and make them respond.

Charles Hale: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: We have number 17. And then next we have number 25, 15, 21, number 9 number 7, number 1 and number 3. If you're any of those if you want to get up and get ready. Go for that.

Jack Isselman: Mr. Mayor, commissioners. My name is Jack Isselman. I am senior vice president of external affairs at the Greenware companies. I also serve as the volunteer president of the working waterfront coalition and we are roughly a dozen harbor businesses. We have a number of potentially responsible parties who participate both inside the Willamette group and who are not inside the lower Willamette group that identify by EPA as potentially responsible parties including the port of Portland, Schnitzer, Vegar, Gunderson, which is our subsidiary.

We think it's important to focus on the facts here and among the facts are the water in the river is currently safe for swimming and other recreational uses. It was also safe according to EPA and the Oregon Health authority to eat migratory fish out of the river. So the purpose of the harbor cleanup is to ensure the safety of consuming a certain level of resident fish in the harbor. And we're concerned about the lack of precision in the EPA's proposed plan around time and cost. Specifically on cost we saw the cost drop to a little under 800 million dollars in the course of two months from 1.4 billion dollars in earlier in the spring a way to that those costs should have dropped so significantly. In terms of scope, the plan right now is not divided into operational units that allow us to really go out and attack the hot spots on the river. We support a river cleanup. We want a river cleanup. But we need to have a river cleanup that's targeted and smart to get the pollutants out of the river. Our environmental health and safety director at Gunderson is here, Dave Carvey. He'll enjoy talking with you further, soon. Thank you.

Charles Hale: Thank you.

Female: Could you just clarify for me please. I don't understand that the cost dropped from 1.4 billion to 800 million.

Jack Isselman: Commissioner Fritz—in a plan that was presented to that was peer reviewed by the EPA's national remedy review board, an alternative proposed cleanup plan at the time called Alternative E, I believe that which very similar to the proposed plan in terms of the remediation that's going to occur. The dredging, the capping, the monitored natural recovery enhanced natural recovery. The activity level is the same, but the cost is about 6 to 700 million less than what was originally presented. There has been some attempt to explain that by EPA but it doesn't correlate to the roughly 7 to 800 million dollars of cost that fell out.

Female: Thank you.

Jack Isselman: Sure.

Theresa Logan: Okay. Next number 25.

Debbie Iona: I'm—does that seem right?

Male: Yes.

Debbie Iona: I'm Debbie Iona representing the League of Women Voters of Portland. The league is in the process of reviewing the cleanup plan and other supplementary information. Although we do not have specifics to share at this time, we have identified concerns about the adequacy of EPA's proposed plan. The league's advocacy work is at all times guided by positions our membership adopt at the national, state, and local levels. We arrive at our positions through a process of member agreement after reviewing league studies. In the case of the Portland Harbor, we will be relying on our natural resources position to evaluate the EPA's recommended plan. Following are the relevant sections from the position. The league believes that natural resources should be managed as interrelated parts of life supporting ecosystem. Resources should be conserved and protected and to preserve their future availability. Pollution of these resources should be controlled in order to reserve the physical, chemical and biological integrity of ecosystems and to protect public health and the environment.

The league also supports policies to achieve water quality, essential for maintaining species populations and diversity and including measures to protect lakes, estuaries, wetlands and in stream flows.

Once we have completed our review of the plan and received board approval, we will share a comments with the EPA, city council and other elected officials. Thank you for providing the public this opportunity to comment. Thank you.

Charles Hale: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: Okay number 15. Is 15 still here. Number 21. Number 9. Okay number 9.

Anne Gravit: Mayor Hales and members of the city council, thank you for the opportunity to be here. I'm Anne Gravit and I work for the Port of Portland. The Port is committed to a cleanup of the lower Willamette that protects the health of Portlanders and our environment. The city is right to be listening to residents and businesses and we appreciated your earlier survey work with the kitchen table—I always want to call the kitchen sink. We're here in the capacity tonight to talk about the city's education role.

Obviously the Port has a lot of comments that we will file on EPA's proposed plan, but we wanted to speak briefly on your role in educating Portlanders and we particularly wanted to talk about and understanding how this law works. The Super Fund law is not straightforward. Starting with the fact that there is no actual Super Fund that will be available to help cover the cost in Portland Harbor. We like to say then you have to drop the D and so that makes it Super Fun. So as part of this public education we think the city should explain, again, how this law works and how the liability is divided. We know that there are at least 150 entities who are potentially responsible and that includes private owners and businesses large and small. It also includes local state and federal government. I think I can say with confidence that no one would

be happier if Arcama, Bayer and Cargill were picking up the cost of this cleanup, but that's just not the way this law works. So Portlanders will be responsible for some of this cost not because industry won't be picking up the cost—paying their fair share but because public entities are among the responsible parties.

We share the vision that cleaning up the harbor is an economic opportunity for this region and we look forward to getting to that point. Thank you.

Charles Hale: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: Number 7.

Mike Omesco: Mayor Hales and Council, my name is Mike Omesco and I'm with—live in Northeast Portland my entire life and I work with Portland Audubon and today I brought a visual as part of my testimony and right here is an eight ounce fillet of carp and that's a resident fish that we find here in Portland Harbor. And this is the amount of fish the EPA currently deems safe for healthy adults to eat per month. A fillet of this. For the entire month. If you're pregnant or nursing, can't have any. If you're sick, can't have any. And this is a fairly small amount of fish, as you can see. If any of you guys need some more dinner, I can bring it up to you. But the current plan, EPA's current plan does very little to lower this fish advisory other than add more signs and do more outreach as they had previously done. And we've seen that those signs do not work.

People are still fishing. People are still eating those fish and it's a danger to them and we feel that instead of doing that and leaving 90% of the river contaminated, that we have to push EPA to do better to work towards reducing this risk and it's going to take a long time to do that, but it needs to take steps in the immediate future and currently we feel that the EPA has failed to protect our citizens, our Portland residents and the city needs to advocate to the EPA to greatly improve this plan that actually takes steps to reduce and that that proposal that could potentially come does not necessarily have to reach their approval of the PRP's and the polluters. This is a law that is in place to protect communities and can protect people and folks that are fishing on these rivers are some of the more marginalized and at risk communities that need to be protected and a sign just doesn't do that protection.

Charles Hale: Thanks.

Theresa Logan: Next up number 1. And can I see our number 3 and 13 here to be on deck. I see one hand. I see both. Great. Come on down and if anyone sees your number up here and perhaps you were in the bathroom when we called you and you didn't get a chance to go, please do come on down and we'll fit you back in if you weren't here when we called you. Otherwise we'll keep on going. Thank you.

Drew Gelpin: Mayor Hales and commissioners I'm going to try and talk quickly and cover all my points. My name is Drew Gelpin. I'm the manager of energy environment at Res Oregon Steel. At Res Oregon Steel employs over 400 folks in North Portland in good working class jobs. I have over thirty. I'm an engineer and a hydro geologist and I have over thirty years experience assessing and cleaning up contaminated sites. Everas has spent over 11 million dollars in the last several years addressing issues on our site and I bring that up because I want

to address there's a lot of talk about PRPs and holding PRPs accountable. And I wanted to let you know that a good amount of the work that we're doing is to address contamination on our site. By the way we're the most downstream site that was introduced by the Department of War during World War II in their shipbuilding operations. So we're definitely, as a company doing the right thing. Here's what I'd like you to consider.

As you all know there are eight alternatives in the Rivers [inaudible] and they all result in a much cleaner river than we have right now, but they cost very greatly based on the proportion of dredging, capping and natural attenuation. The most effective—the most cost effective alternative, B will cost about 640 million dollars. The one that EPA is proposing will cost about 1.2 billion. They've stated 750 million. We've looked at that number and we don't think it can be done for that amount. But here's the key point. The end result of both of these remedies is largely the same. As an example in the case of PCB, the driver for the river, alternative 1 results in an approximately 5% reduction of PCB levels versus alternative B and no change in the statistical ecological and human health risk. A 5% reduction for doubling the cost for PCB's. Remember the government is not going to pay for this cleanup. It's going to come from taxpayers, rate payers and the like. So we as a company feel that we can have the best of both worlds with a cost effective cleanup we can get a clean river, a much cleaner river and not lose jobs or hurt the economy.

Charles Hale: Thank you.

Drew Gelpin: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: Number 3. Number 13 come on deck for this mike.

Gary Plotsky: Mayor, commissioners, thank you so much for coming here this evening. My name is Gary Plotsky, and I am a northwest resident. Before reading my written speech here, I'd like to share with you a story about my EPA that I grew up with, my mom. I would make messes all the time at my house, at my friend's houses and before I left, I had to clean up whatever mess I made. And I think we all grew up living that way. And to pretend that we can go somewhere and make a mess and then just leave, it doesn't sit right with pretty much, I think anyone in this room. Regardless of your position here, you know that you should not make a mess and then leave, especially if you benefit financially from your experience as a business in this case. I also would like to share a super quick anecdote. Upon moving to Portland, I saw the Willamette and thought wow, this is great. This is a really great place to swim, and everyone I met said, don't swim in the Willamette. That's crazy. Don't do it. And I said why not. They said don't. There's a news report. Don't. It's awful. Just you don't want to go in the river. The people do not believe they can go in the river. They're not going to go in the river. When we make this change happen and get the EPA to clean up this Super Fund then we can get children and people into the river.

So like thousands of Portlanders I live within a five minute walk of a contaminated Super Fund site. It's a part of my community. And this community deserves clean water and clean air, the two basic building blocks essential for all life on earth to survive. I was disappointed and devastated when the EPA released its plan that seemed to help the bank accounts of the polluters more than it helps our river and surrounding communities. The Willamette cuts right through the

heart of our city and yet the EPA's plan barely scratches the surface, leaving 86% of the river contaminated.

Polluters like Chevron, Exxon Mobile, Northwest Natural and Schnitzel Steel are all made our river toxic. Now they should have to clean it up. I'm here to ask you. Are communities representatives to speak out against the EPA's ineffective plan and advocate for a plan that will clean up at least 1,000 acres of sediment. Bring toxic dredge sediment to off site landfills, and stop relying on monitored natural recovery. The contamination has been there for decades. It makes no sense to believe that the river will all of a sudden clean itself naturally. Help us advocate for a better plan by standing with us against the EPA's draft. Portland deserves better. Thank you.

Charles Hale: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: Thirteen and are numbers 22 around still? And number 10.

Dave Harvey: Hi. I'm Dave Harvey. I'm here to represent comments from Gunderson Manufacturing facility on Portland Harbor. We're home to 1,000 blue collar living wage jobs with a diverse workforce that looks basically exactly like Portland and lives and comes from all across the Portland Metropolitan area. And not to insult people in this room, but it's a lot more diverse than the people in this room at this point.

The EPA's proposed plan, let me say some things you may or may not expect me to say. The EPA's proposed plan to remove 2 million cubic yards is not the best solution for the people of PDX. And the reason it is not the best two reasons. It actually increases the risk for people it purports to protect, and the second one is EPA isn't even following their own EPA national Super Fund policy guidance document. How does it—why is it not the best solution? Because it dredges too much sediment. It would take a while to explain why that happens, but that's in fact the case. If you've ever played in a mud puddle, you can start to begin to realize the reasons why. I did when I was younger.

And I come at this from Gunderson. I feel like we're in a leadership position. The reason I say that is we actually volunteered to help participate in this process and move the process forward from day one. We actually were hoping to study it before EPA declared it a Super Fund. So we've helped work towards a solution and this is all based on the fact that our only connection to the contamination is that we bought a shut down factory in 1985. That's all we did. Just happen to have contamination from the 40s, 50s, 60s and 70s. So in the kind of the funny thing is, roughly half of our contamination, we're probably one of the top five or six contaminated sites in Portland Harbor. Roughly half the contamination comes from a city of Portland sewer outfall. So my recommendation is focus on the risk. Protect the people. Protect the environment. Once you do that then focus on the cost and if you do that, I think you'll come to the conclusion that you're going to use a different solution than what EPA proposed. And finally EPA really ought to follow its own national policy guidance document. Thanks.

Theresa Logan: 22 and 10 will be next. Are numbers 23 and 6 in the room still? Great.

Chris Edmunds: Mayor Hales and commissioners, thank you very much for hosting this tonight. My name is Chris Edmunds and I along with my wife who's eight months pregnant, who couldn't be here tonight, we live basically a stone throw away from the Super Fund site at

McCormick Fair condominiums. From my balcony I could actually toss a rock and I'd land right on the Super Fund site because we look up at the Broadway Bridge. And I've been a lifelong resident of the Portland Metro Area and I got to say that this is crazy. I want a clean river just as much as everybody else does. I can still remember. I'm old enough that I remember the signs that would advise against jumping into the Willamette River. Those are gone. The river has gotten cleaner. The river is already safe for swimming. It's already safe for boating. In fact, for seven years in a row now, we've had a big event called the big float where we encourage thousands of Portlanders to come and jump in that river. If it wasn't safe why would we do that.

I think that this is getting pitted as environment versus business. Environment versus jobs and that's false, because it's somebody else's health versus someone else's health and that's the balance you're going to have to walk. I'm really concerned as I'm living there with my baby and my eight—and my wife that there's going to be a massive dredging operation that's right near my home. How do dredges work? They suck sediment out. 11,000 truckloads of sediment coming out of the river. You have to put sediment back in when you dredge out so that's 11,000 truckloads of new fill coming back in. Those are diesel trucks. Those are diesel trains. It's diesel operated dredges. We know that diesel has cadmium. It has lead in it. It's going to negatively impact our air quality and I live right now in a cadmium hotspot, so we're talking about this trade off.

It's kind of a false choice. It's easy to say the polluters have to pay. We need to suck this stuff out of the river. Well you're going to hurt somebody else's environment and somebody else's health in doing that. So I don't think that a heavy dredge operation. When you talk about 11,000 truckloads, that's a lot of sediment that's coming out. So I think that trying to multiply that by ten. Imagine a construction zone that's lasting for twenty plus years tying up traffic, spewing emissions into the air, that we all have to breathe in. I was really dismayed out of this proposal that EPA didn't even study the impact on air quality in these various options. I think if you can do anything as a city council it would be to ask EPA to study what the impact to air quality is going to be from this remedy that they're proposing. Thank you very much.

Charles Hale: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: All right, number ten.

Jessica Hamilton: Mr. Mayor, commissioners, my name is Jessica Hamilton and I'm with the Port of Portland. Thank you for this opportunity to testify. The Port of Portland is committed to a cleanup of the lower Willamette that protects the health of Portlanders and our environment. I also want to thank you for hosting this forum and your continued leadership in this role. You've [inaudible] the poor in the city have worked alongside each other to try and move this to this phase and we are excited that we have reached this milestone to get to a proposed plan that the community can actually comment on. Mr. Mayor you asked a question earlier today about what types of incentives might be provided by EPA in order to facilitate cleanup and I want to frame my comments around that. We have been doing a lot of thinking. We're excited to get to the next phase where we actually get in the river and start cleaning things up. If EPA were to break this down into bite sized chunks, we think that would go to huge lengths to get this cleanup done faster. The reason for that is I don't know if any of you have tried to negotiate settlements with 150 parties, but if you can do it with just a few you're going to get there a lot quicker. The other thing that that does is it allows you to focus on the more pervasive risks first. You can prioritize

the cleanups that get to the risks that eliminate or mitigate the risks that need to be done quickly so that the river can start its process of recovery. As I said, the port wants to get to a cleanup and we would like to rely on your leadership role to help us get there quicker. Thank you.

Charles Hale: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: All right number 23 and do we have numbers 23—excuse me. 23 is up next and then we have number 6 and number 24 on deck. Okay then number 6.

Barbara Quinn: Hello. Thanks so much for coming out and asking for comments. I really appreciate that. I'd just like to say that the EPA favored option. I'm Barbara Quinn with the Portland Harbor Community Advisory. EPA favored option is not acceptable. I've been with the process for about ten years, first as a neighborhood association leader and now as a member of the CAG. It does not give us allow us safe access to either fish edible fish nor access to the river bank that's safe. Questionable whether swimming near the river bank, for instance swimming at Cathedral Park beach is safe. That's a very polluted area and not really that safe to be in contact with carcinogens.

So the river is commons like the air. It belongs to the community. The community is not a special interest. It is the owner of the river, technically and the question here is whether we are a democracy versus whether we are an oligarchy of a few some wealthy parties. And what we need here is advocates in the political sphere that are in favor of a democracy. We the community, some of us are the folks that are most vulnerable, that are fishing have a right to clean, safe fish in our commons. We also have a right to clean air and the air quality could be an issue here as well. So when companies and entities along the river who have externalized their cost with disposal practices that are not responsible what they're doing is they're externalizing their cost by giving us elevated risk and this is pretty much exactly what Bulls Eye glass did and pretty much exactly what Earl Burroughs glass did. It's not acceptable there. It's not acceptable here either. And they have built into their business practices irresponsible dumping.

Now if public entities have done that as well, the public hasn't really had much say in that. We are not in favor of that and I feel not so good about those costs being passed onto us if we didn't have a say in it. We would like those practices to stop. So the public should not be unfairly saddled with costs. That is a big concern here. If there are pollutants coming out of city pipes, the time and money that DES has spent tracing those chemicals is a good use of time and money as far as we're concerned, that's good. So if the company that are responsible here prefer to sue rather than work on an effective cleanup, then I think we should treat them just like we did the glass companies. We need to ask them to do right here and I think people are going to be just as upset with them at some point down the line if they do not do what they should be doing. Thank you.

Charles Hale: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: All right. 24. And do we have number 4? great.

Stuart Evans: Mayor. City commissioners, I'm Stuart Evans. Portland the green capital. Clean air. Clean water. From the BeCall era we had a cleanup of the Willamette river down river. Now we have the rest of the river to work on. And it's time. This is our only chance to get this

right. I think the EPA's plan is totally inadequate. We need to as a benchmark lift the fish advisory. We need to do at least double what the EPA is planning. There has also been a lot of talk about industrial land in this town. There is 230 acres of vacant industrial property along the Super Fund site that can be utilized if there is certainty. If we can get the river cleaned up and everybody knows where we are. It's too bad fish can't write checks to some people in power. Polluters can and this is our river. This is not the polluters river and I just ask you to please ask the EPA to strengthen this cleanup effort. Thank you.

Charles Hale: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: Number 24 is coming up. Are numbers 4 and 5 in the room? You're number 4. Are numbers 5? Is number 5 here? And 32. Great.

Pam Ali: Good evening. My name is Pam Ali. I live in North Portland and I try to breathe here no thanks to the DEQ. I want to acknowledge that if it were not for the citizens advisory group this meeting would not take place. None of these forums would ever take place, and I don't think if it weren't for them that the EPA would have anything to do with this either. We would just continue to live in a crummy river, along a crummy river. I also want you to know that I have nothing against any of you, even those of you who voted for Uber. But I do I think share a mistrust of the bureaus that you're supposed to head. We feel very deeply that a lot of us think that there's a lot of muddy buddy dealing that go on between moneyed interest. We used to say that money doesn't talk. It swears. We'd like it to talk. And sing even. Money is responsible for this and they've exploited us and exploited our river. Make them pay. Thank you.

Theresa Logan: Number 5. Number 32 is up next and do we have number 31.

Doris Wheeler: So my name is Doris Wheeler. I'm a Linton Resident. I'm a long term member of the Portland Harbor Community Advisory group. And I'm on the board of the Northwest Toxic Community Coalition for Region 10. I've been tasked—I was going to do just one thing I was going to talk about—I have lots of comments but I'll take comment cards. And the write about them [inaudible] so hopefully they'll get it done in two minutes. Don't let what happened in Silver Valley Idaho, Bunker Hill Super Fund site happen here in Portland. After thirty years of being declared a Super Fund site, residents at Silver Valley are still suffering serious side effects from an insufficient clean up. I refer to the Newsweek article on June 12, 2016 by Cena Christian titled, Bunker Hill is still a toxic mess.

The biggest health risk in the lower Willamette is not lead. But one of the more dangerous health risk chemicals, the PCBs. Banned from use in the 70s and still as pervasive in the Willamette River making resident fish nearly inedible. The amount of acceptable exposure for humans to PCBs is nearly 0. Recent studies by Dr. David O'Carpenter, show that the residents living along the river Super Fund sites such as New Bedford Massachusetts, show a higher risk for health issues from PCBs because of air exposure leaving 85% of the Willamette in monitored natural recovery and expecting sand to cover the pollutants doesn't work. The EPA has told us at our CAG meetings that the river only seasonally is depositional. Meaning it covers with sand. Because of currents, tidal action, flooding, [inaudible] and I will add earthquakes the sand later shifts and will uncover PCBs and other pollutants which will both expose them to the surface and spread downriver into the Columbia. Okay using NMR will further expose for many

more years residents to multiple serious health risks. We need to look at the long term risks and not the short term. By advocating this proposed plan, the EPA and the City of Portland do not as mandated by CERCLA, protected citizens and it's ecological health. We need to get it done right the first time. My second thing is about the—

Charles Hale: If you've got that written that would be great.

DW: I don't but it's just about the CDF and basically you have four resolutions passed by neighborhoods.

Theresa Logan: I think we're on track to get through most everyone tonight. If you want to get a second number we could get you in at the end.

DW: 2,000 signatures on a petition.

Charles Hale: Good. Thank you very much.

Male: Thanks. Thanks very much. Put that in the record.

Theresa Logan: Thank you. We have number 32. Number 31 is up next. And are numbers 12 and 34 in the room? 12 or 34?

Steven Maclure: Thank you. Hello Commissioners, My name is Steven Maclure. Dr. Steven Maclure. Retired. I'm with the Lewis and Clark organization in the state. Recently I located William Clark's campsite in the city and I've spoken to several, most of you, except for the Mayor about this in the not too distant past, when I presented to—when I presented to the port, that the campsite was on the ports property, I basically got the runaround. The organization is behind me, but what the Port did was hire a consultant who composed some very bizarre confabulations and it puzzles me why the port would want to cover up such a proud historical location. Be it as it may and the bizarre confabulations of the consultant has taught me one thing that the a number of the responsible parties are not interested in cleanup but more interested in cover up. If you'd like to see my research I'd be glad to get it to you and thank you.

Charles Hale: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: Number 31.

John Foxwell: Hi. Good evening. My name is John Foxwell. I'm giving you some comments tonight on behalf of the Columbia Corridor Association. Columbia Corridor Association is a business association working for the benefit of our commercial and industrial businesses along the Columbia Corridor on issues ranging from transportation, economic development, job creation and retention and the built in natural environment in the corridor. All things that are pertinent to the cleanup. I just want to hand out a couple of key points. As was mentioned earlier the cost estimate of 750 million dollars is subject to an incredible amount of uncertain. That cost estimate could easily double within the first year of the project. Mayor Hales, you're

an engineer. You can dig into that and see how that estimate was constructed and see the inherent uncertainty.

Another point that we wanted to hit on is permitting and how this is going to be done. The city has fairly comprehensive green way review requirements. This project would probably be conducted under a circular permit exception, however the city has substantive requirements that they hold everybody to. We've got 10,000 lineal feet of river bank and the alternative calls for armoring and reinforcement, things like that that just on first glance are really not consistent with the green-way program and having those projects, having them permitted, having a whole other layer of city involvement, cost associated with the restoration, cost associated with the potential for non-conforming upgrades that the various businesses will have to bear. Those are all costs that are not factored into this cleanup estimate that will be realized by the people that are paying for the cleanup.

I want to emphasize, you know, the use of the river. Everybody in the region is entitled to a clean and safe river for recreation. Most of the people that work in the terminals in the various facilities on the waterfront. They live in this region and so they're entitled to that too. The last point I wanted to hit on was federal entities. Lots of federal entities, department of War was mentioned are responsible for a significant amount of this of this cleanup. It's time to get these guys to the table. They've been held at arm's length or keep themselves at arm's length the whole time. That 750 million to 1.5 billion dollar pot has got to be split up and they should have a chunk of it. Thank you.

Charles Hale: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: Number 31. No 31. Number 12. And do we have number 34 and 33 in the room still?

Audience: Hello. Thank you for [inaudible] Portland. I'm a resident here as well. This is my community. I love my community and love the thank you. Thanks. Love the river as well, as polluted as it is. I still find appreciation in it.

I just wanted to say that I think we should keep in mind or I would like for you to keep in mind that future economic benefit of the river of a clean river is really important and we shouldn't think of you know jobs that are going to be at risk. I've heard several times about the possible job losses from a good cleanup happening. No one is going to come and create a viable future economic benefit on the river if the river is polluted. This is our chance to get a clean river now so that in the future, we can have maybe green jobs and people who are going to come here and create more jobs on our river. Right now they don't want to because it's a Super Fund site. Let's think about a better future and you know and think about economic benefit for a cleaner river and for them as well. Also, too, I'd like to be a good neighbor to my neighbors and my neighborhood and I think that industry should be good neighbors, too. You know I don't trash my neighbors yard up and impact them in negative ways and I think that that should be something that industry should keep in mind to. We don't want to lose jobs. We want you know we want good middle class jobs in North Portland, but we also need to have some good neighbors. So thank you for your time.

Theresa Logan: Number 34. is 34 here? 33?

Nancy Matson: Hello. My name is Nancy Matson.

Charles Hale: Get a little closer to the mike.

Nancy Matson: Thank you, Mayor. I appreciate the Mayor and the councilors for being here. Councilor Novak Fritz and Fish. Nancy Matson and I lived in Portland for almost fifty years. I'm part of the business community. I've owned my own small business for ten years and I've continued to be in the business world in a retail management position for another twenty. I don't want to repeat too much. Everybody has said that we want to have a clean and healthy river in our city. We pride ourselves—Portlanders pride ourselves as being nature oriented and environmentally aware and it's been such a stigma on us to have a Super Fund site here right in the center of our town.

The thing that has concerned— what I'd like to do is urge you to take action to demand a stronger cleanup plan from the EPA and having looked at the plan the thing that concerns me most is the storage of large amounts of contaminated sediment concentrated in a confined disposal facility located in the shipping terminal slip that's located right within the body of the river. We have a history of floods. I was living here in 96 and we have earthquakes from our location in the cascadia subduction zone. I took a look at the city of Portland hazard map on the city website and you can clearly see that the east bank fault runs right underneath terminal four and there's a potential landslide hazard area immediately behind that facility. I think these potential natural disasters coupled with the risk of leakage that is found in any natural containment facility make this an especially flawed choice for placement within the river we are attempting to clean up.

This is the time to move that toxic sediment out of and away from the Willamette river and I urge the city council to demand that the EPA return to their original plan of removing at least 1,000 acres of polluted sediment from the river. Now is the time for those with liability for the pollution to be held accountable and to pay for a best quality cleanup that would protect not only our citizens but our wildlife and our environment for future generations. We rely on the city council to speak for us citizens with the EPA to make sure that the work is done and the Willamette river is returned to a healthy state.

Charles Hale: Thank you very much.

Theresa Logan: Number 28. Number 35.

Audience: Good evening Mayor Hales and Commissioners. I wasn't planning to speak. I was just going to sit in and listen, but I thought I might say a few words. I wasn't sure if there was any pitch that had been made for small local businesses, yet, and also hiring local citizens in the cleanup effort. I think that's very important. This presents a tremendous opportunity an employment opportunity for folks. I live in Northeast Portland and I live a block from Commissioner Fish's house. I served on the River Renaissance Committee. I learned a lot about the industries along the river and I didn't hear a very big pitch from local businesses about the recruitment efforts to hire local folks. A very quick story.

A couple of years before I moved to Portland I did some work in Richmond California, which is on the east side of the bay on the Oakland side. City of Richmond partnered with the private industry council which is now a work systems because there was a freeway project that

was going to join the San Rafael Bridge and the East Bay, the Nimitz freeway. Richmond, predominantly people of color community. Richmond, partnered with the Private Industry Council to set up a miniature organization to for local people to come in and get screened for their job interests and then work with apprenticeships. I personally worked with community members who worked with these large companies that came into Richmond and introduced them after doing real work with people with resume's and getting them ready to go to the executives of these companies. And folks were hired. And these companies supported these local workers throughout the construction season.

I think that's important because not just employing local small businesses, but we're going to have companies from outside that have specialties that are going to come into Portland to do this work and so the city needs to have staff that can be a liaison between those companies and local community members to pitch our folks and provide jobs for them as well. I hope that you can develop a kind of a mini organization, some staff that can work on that so we can get more jobs for North and Northeast Portland and our Portland Community. Thank you.

Charles Hale: Thank you very much.

Theresa Logan: I just want to check back in and see if anyone was in the restroom when there number was called. These are the numbers who were not in the room when we called them. Number 30, number 15. number 21. number 23. number 31, 34. Then we'll have 36 and 37 to finish us off.

Audience: I was given an opportunity to speak. So the communities have spoken. We don't want a toxic waste dump, AKA CDF and T4. It's an experimental design, unlined and probably not earthquake proof and since it's a Portland facility the taxpayers will get to clean it up the next time it goes back into the river. It's also Sturgeon habitat which no other Sturgeon habitat has been identified along the lower Willamette to replace it. What I gave you was there are four neighborhoods that have resolutions. Passed against the CDF. And I also drew up a petition of about 2,000 signatures. So thank you. One is missing we'll have to give it to you later, for the neighborhoods.

Audience: Thank you. I decided to pick a number and step up here again because I wanted to touch on an issue that I think is very important and has been woven throughout a lot of the comments but has not been explicitly said. And that is really the difference between short term and long term impacts. We have a lot of discussion about the impact on jobs. Either there are jobs created by the cleanup or there are jobs that somehow would be impacted and lost by the cleanup although I'm not sure how those jobs would be lost by the cleanup. There's also the impact of jobs in the long run when we look at the effect of having a clean river that would encourage new development along the river along with recreational improvements and more use of the river for tourism and other activities that would bring people to the area and bring people to the river for the impact on jobs that that would create. Then there's the impact, the short term impact of cleanup itself when things are happening during the cleanup.

And as compared to the impact in the long run of having contaminate that is there in the river that would either be released again in the future or that gets released over time and gets into the systems, gets into the fish, gets into the food that people eat. Gets into the air that people breathe. We need to be certain that when we're looking at the cleanup, we're looking at a real

long term measure of the impact, not just for the next ten or twenty years or during the time of the cleanup, but what would be the long term impact for several future generations.

Theresa Logan: All right. We have worked our way through all of the members in the lottery that we had. Is there anyone who maybe wasn't planning on providing testimony but based on what you've heard here you do have something you'd like to say—oh. There's one more number. 38. Please come on down. If there's anyone else who didn't go get a number who at this point does want to provide testimony, please come on up here and we'll fit you in and we'll all be able to go home a bit early tonight.

Laura Feldman. My name is Laura Feldman. I'm a St. John's resident. I just came from a planning meeting 350.org. We're doing a tour de tank on August 7th where we're going to do a bike tour of all the toxic places in St. John's/North Portland. Not all of them, god knows, no one could ride back, could they. Not in an afternoon. So we're doing things in North Portland in St. John's area mainly that pertain to climate change and one of the things that I learned at the last forum with Peter Defer our consultant and maybe this came up. If it did, I'm going to say it again because I think it needs to be heard is that PCBs become airborne. PCBs are the most virulent carcinogen in that stew in that river. They become airborne and he gave us the research for this and restated it on cable the next morning. Whether you swim in that river. Whether you eat the fish in that river, doesn't matter. You are impacted by it. So anybody living within a five mile radius, that's most of us here in St. John's and those neighborhoods are impacted by this river and what's in it. I think we just and for the new development that's happening in St. John's, I'm kind of horrified. People with children moving into condo's you know a block away from the river, with all the pollutants that are in there. I just think this is something that has to be figured into the mix. Peter Defer said that it was a glaring, EPA's glaring omission. Thank you.

Charles Hale: Thank you.

Theresa Logan: All right. Thank you all for coming out tonight to provide your testimony. A couple of reminders that you can still submit your comments and I think the city really wants you to submit your comments directly to the EPA through their process. Electronically it's at Harborcomments@EPA.gov and at the back table there's more information about the schedule of information sessions and other formats for submitting comments. The city is going to post a summary of the testimony that they received here tonight on line as well as their comments to the EPA. If you have other written comments or copies of the testimony you provided that you'd like to submit, you can do that at the back table. We also would love for you to fill out one of our evaluations just about our facilitation of this event. Help us know what worked well, what could be better next time. And I'll turn it over to the Mayor and Commissioners for the final word.

Charles Hale: Let's first of all, thank our facilitators for a nice job. Thank you. Very well done.

[Applause]

Charles Hale: And I think we often remark to ourselves on the council to one another on the council that this job this office is a privileged because we get to hear from thoughtful people and

that's certainly been the case tonight. Thank you. Thoughtful, passionate, incisive testimony that will help us develop the city's position on this really important long term issue. So I just want to express my thanks. We've got a lot of work to do as a city to put a coherent and clear response before the EPA. You've helped us very much tonight and we appreciate you coming out to do that. Some of my colleagues, I know Commissioner Fish has some comments as well, but anyway if anyone else has any comments before we wrap up. Thank you so much for coming.

Commissioner Fish: Thank you, Mayor. Just some housekeeping things. Jim Robeson, you said that the gentleman who was going to testify by phone or in what way couldn't make it so we'll get his written statement and make that part of the record. You can furnish it to me or—well you can furnish it to our office and we'll put it in the record. The League of Women Voters and some neighborhood associations said that they hadn't quite finished working up their comments, we will keep the record open a week for those written comments and the mayor and I will confer with Commissioner Fritz just to work out the details of how the notice goes out to the neighborhood associations and how we will receive any additional comments, but if people are working on them and haven't been able to complete them, it seems like we should simply extend that clock, Mayor, particularly since the EPA has added an additional thirty days.

We want to hear from people so we don't want to set up any barriers. When we introduced the team earlier, we introduced almost everybody but Mike Jordan. So for those of you who haven't met Mike, would you stand so people can put name and face together. Mike is the director of the bureau of Environmental Services and he and Annie and a lot of the professionals you've met coming in are helping the city work up our comments so he's someone you may want to talk to.

I just want to personally thank everybody who took the time to come out and testify. And it was extremely thoughtful. People have raised a multitude of questions and issues which we will follow up on and address. This is a very challenging thing and there's a lot of moving pieces, but you've helped us fulfill our duty as a party which is to get our comments right, so I want to echo what the mayor said and thank people for taking the time to come share their views with us tonight.

Charles Hale: Thank you all very much, we'll see you soon.

[Applause]

Theresa Logan: You can applaud now. Good night.

[End of Recording]