



Metro St. Johns Landfill RI-FS Stakeholder Interview Outline DRAFT

OBJECTIVES

- Attain better understanding of potential questions, issues, opinions and opportunities from some of the most connected and interested individuals and groups
- Clarify areas of misunderstanding of the landfill status, project scope/goals and Metro's status as the owner, not the regulator
- Identify who is most likely to be interested in the project
- Identify what information and process will build trust in the results of the RI-FS and risk assessment
- Clarify understanding of what the community/groups ultimately want to happen to the landfill

POTENTIAL QUESTIONS

Background Knowledge Level –

- What areas in and around the landfill do you think are sensitive?
- What do you know about the St. Johns landfill's history?
- Who do you think is responsible for managing the landfill?
- What kind of waste are you aware of that may be in the landfill?

Evaluating Levels of understanding and concern -

- What are your concerns?
- Do you think the landfill contaminants are contained?
- What is your understanding of an environmental risk assessment? RI-FS regulatory process?
- What do you think DEQ's role is with maintaining the landfill? What is their role in the RI-FS Process?

Metro and the public process -

- What type of information will you need to understand the status of the landfill contents?
- How would you like to receive updates and information?
- What will make you comfortable with the assessment results and recommended remedies?

Smith and Bybee lakes and future use of the landfill -

- Do you think Smith and Bybee Lakes are well-managed? Healthy? Do you recreate there? What are your concerns?
- Once the landfill is ready for public access, what activities and features should be available to the public, or to wildlife?

POTENTIAL INTERVIEWEES

“Group” interviews should have no more than three participants due to limited time and ability to gain input equally, from each person.

Public agencies

- The City of Portland Parks Department
- City of Portland BES (Susan Barthell is with BES and also the Columbia Slough Watershed Council – interview her with the Council)

• The Port of Portland (properties and/or environmental representative)

Environmental groups

- Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes (Frank Opela may have suggestions for other members)
- Columbia Slough Watershed Council (Sarah Murphy, Chuck Harris, Susan Barthel)
- Oregon Center for Environmental Health (unknown if they are tracking this project – recommend no interview)

Neighborhoods and interested individuals

- St. Johns Neighborhood Association (Robin Plance and one to two others)
- North Portland Neighborhood Services Coalition (Tom Griffin-Valade, Jane Boggus, other?)

Business groups

- Columbia Corridor Association (Patty McCoy, other?)
- St. Johns Boosters (combine with N. Portland Bus. Association representatives (Gary Boehm, president)
- North Portland Business Association (Steve Weir, president; Evie Salvo, staff)
- Rivergate Tenants Association

Recreation groups

- 40-Mile Loop Land Trust (?)

Minority communities

- Latino, Asian, Russian, other (talk with IRCO or N Portland Press to determine whether there are representatives wanting to be involved?)

Jerry Coddington
Chuck Harrison
Laf Keaton

Teachers?
Env. educators?

Brown bag?

Nancy Hendrickson

Bill Bach, Tim von Wormer, Denise Reunts



Metro St. Johns Landfill RI-FS Stakeholder Interview Outline DRAFT

OBJECTIVES

- Identify who is most likely to be interested in the project
- Inform the development of public materials and presentations to be relevant and useful to the public and stakeholders
- Inform Metro Council on public/stakeholder feedback, concerns and insights regarding the project
- Attain better understanding of potential questions, issues, opinions and opportunities from some of the most connected and interested individuals and groups
- Gauge level of understanding by individuals/groups that are not already intimately familiar with the project (to represent the greater public)
- Identify what information and process will build trust in the results of the RI-FS and risk assessment
- Identify what people expect in the way of monitoring and maintenance of the landfill
- Clarify understanding of what the community/groups ultimately want to happen to the landfill

POTENTIAL QUESTIONS

Background Knowledge Level –

- What areas in and around the landfill do you think are sensitive?
- What do you know about the St. Johns landfill's history?
- ?, ● What contents of the landfill are you aware of? – *why ask this? what will we learn?*

Evaluating Levels of understanding and concern -

- What are your concerns?
- What do you think are the environmental issues that need to be addressed?
- What is your understanding of an environmental risk assessment? RI-FS regulatory process?
- What do you think DEQ's role is with maintaining the landfill? What is their role in the RI-FS Process?
- Do you know how the landfill is monitored?

Building Trust and the public outreach process -

- What type of information will you need to understand the status of the landfill contents?
- What will make you comfortable with the assessment results and recommended remedies?
- How would you like to receive updates and information?
- Do you trust info. from: (scale 1-10?) Metro, DEQ, paper, TV, neighbor or friend
- What would increase your trust in Metro?

Smith and Bybee lakes and future use of the landfill -

- Do you think Smith and Bybee Lakes are well managed? Healthy?
Purpose of this question?
- Do you recreate around Smith and Bybee lakes and the Rivergate area (if so, what activity)?
- What activities and safeguards do you think will be in place to monitor and maintain the landfill over time?
should?
- Once the landfill is ready for public access, what activities and features should be available to the public, or to wildlife/how should the landfill site be used?

POTENTIAL INTERVIEWEES

"Group" interviews should have no more than three participants due to limited time and ability to gain input equally, from each person.

Environmental groups

- Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes (Frank Opila may have suggestions for other members)
- Columbia Slough Watershed Council (Sarah Murphy, Chuck Harris, Susan Barthel)
- Oregon Center for Environmental Health and NW Environmental Advocates (unknown if they are tracking this project - may not be worth interviewing)
- An Environmental Justice Group (PACE - formed through a grant in Multnomah County? Other?)

Neighborhoods and interested individuals

- St. Johns Neighborhood Association (Robin Plance and one to two others - Robin will have a good idea of who else should attend - Jane Boggus?)
- North Portland Neighborhood Services Coalition (Tom Griffin-Valade)
- Friends of Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association (Rick Sandstrom, Chair)
- Jerry Cottingham, Columbia Sportswear
- Laf Keaton

Business groups

- Columbia Corridor Association (Patty McCoy, other?)
- St. Johns Boosters (combine with N. Portland Bus. Association representatives (Gary Boehm, president)
- North Portland Business Association (Steve Weir, president; Evie Salvo, staff)
- Rivergate Tenants Association

Recreation groups

- 40-Mile Loop Land Trust
- Alder Creek Kayak & Canoe (store owner and employees rent kayaks and canoes, and lead tours of many local areas (aldercreek.com))

Minority communities

- Latino, Asian, Russian, other (talk with IRCO or N Portland Press to determine whether there are representatives wanting to be involved?)
-

Metro-led one-on-one Meetings with Public Agencies

- The City of Portland Parks Department
- City of Portland BES Nancy Hendrickson and Susan Barthel (who is with BES and also the Columbia Slough Watershed Council – interview her with the Council)
- The Port of Portland (properties and/or environmental representative)



Draft for 5/25/04
outreach mtg.

Metro St. Johns Landfill RI-FS Stakeholder Summary

The St. Johns Landfill is a 240-acre site on the North Portland peninsula, near the confluence of the Columbia and Willamette rivers, and essentially surrounded by surface waters of the Columbia Slough and Smith Lake. It is within the boundaries of the Smith and Bybee Lakes Wildlife Area, which is managed by Metro, and is the largest protected wetland within an American city. The landfill served as the primary refuse disposal site for the region for over 50 years. In 1980, the City of Portland passed responsibility for the landfill's operations to Metro and in 1990, Metro assumed full ownership responsibilities. In 1991, Metro stopped accepting waste at the landfill, and is now in the process of closing the site in an environmentally sound manner.

In March and April 2004, The JD White Company, Inc. conducted a series of stakeholder interviews with the following community members and interested parties:

- Maria Elena Alvarado, Citizen
- Bill Bach, Port of Portland
- Jerry Coddington, Columbia Sportswear
- Tom Griffin-Valade, North Portland Neighborhood Services Coalition
- William Jones, Citizen
- Laf Keaton, Citizen
- Sarah Murphy, Columbia Slough Watershed Council
- Frank Opila, Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes
- Robin Plance, St. Johns Neighborhood Association
- Rick Sandstrom, Friends of Cathedral Park
- Jeri Sundval, Environmental Justice Action Group

A. Background

1. What do you know about monitoring and maintenance at the landfill?

Respondents were generally aware of the landfill and the monitoring that occurs, although many were less knowledgeable regarding the extent and methods used for monitoring. Respondents who have been heavily involved in issues surrounding the landfill were more knowledgeable regarding the technical details of monitoring. Overall, citizen knowledge of monitoring and maintenance was not extensive.

Recommendations: While a majority of the respondents are aware of monitoring, Metro should provide information regarding technical specifics as part of subsequent outreach efforts for the landfill, in order to better inform the public.

2. Have you seen the landfill since it's been closed? How often do you see it or think about it?

Respondents were evenly split between those who never, or rarely, visit or consider the site and those who think about and visit the landfill and its adjacent lands regularly. Generally, those who are more involved and have historical ties to the site think about and visit the landfill most often. This group of respondents also was more interested in receiving information about the landfill.

Recommendations: Community outreach for subsequent phases of the RI-FS process will raise awareness of the site and its importance. Field trips and site visits should be added to outreach efforts in order to get more people out to the area, giving Metro the opportunity for additional education and outreach.

3. How do you think garbage is contained in the landfill?

All of the respondents were aware of the landfill's cap. A portion of the respondents believed that the landfill was lined, and a significant number were aware of the perimeter containment berm. Several respondents expressed concern regarding leaks in the berm.

Recommendations: Most respondents were ^{most of them} aware of the landfill's cap. Some interviewees believed there was a liner underneath the landfill, however. In tandem with information regarding monitoring and maintenance at the landfill, Metro should emphasize how refuse was previously stored before today's environmental regulations.

4. Do you know what all of the pipes on top of the landfill are for?

All respondents, except for one, responded that the pipes were intended for methane gas collection. Respondents viewed the collection of methane gas as a positive aspect of the site and were generally receptive to its use at neighboring businesses.

Recommendations: Virtually all respondents were aware of the methane collection system at the landfill. Metro should continue to educate the public as to the purpose of the pipes.

B. Evaluating levels of understanding and concern

5. Do you have concerns about the landfill? What are they?

Those respondents expressing concern were troubled by the knowledge that the landfill previously was used to dispose of toxic materials. Respondents were concerned that heavy metal toxins currently or could potentially contaminate ground and surface water supplies in the area. The health impacts to the community were a primary concern amongst respondents. *Karen said it was really just Jeri & Mikey.*

Recommendations: Metro should work to ensure that the RI-FS process is transparent and that it directly addresses community health risks. The resulting data and conclusions from the study should be made readily available to the public.

6. Do you think that enough is being done to make the landfill safe? What more should be done?

Respondents varied in how they viewed current efforts to maintain the safety of the site. Those who believed more should be done were concerned with leachate and the structural integrity of the existing cap. Suggestions for improvement included a leachate collection system, a tide gate to flush the North Slough, and an independent ombudsman to address the concerns of the community.

Some respondents believed that the site is safer than it previously was, and that Metro was doing all it could to ensure the landfill's safety. Those responding in favor of Metro's current efforts, however, did not discount the hazard the site posed to the health of the community and were hopeful that future uses of the site were consistent with the former landfill's ability to accommodate such uses.

Recommendations: The RI-FS study will address potential impacts and necessary containment issues. If the study identifies and addresses impacts to community health, the interviewees responding both for and against the status quo likely will be satisfied.

7. Do you know how the landfill is monitored? *done*

Respondents generally were not aware of ^{how} monitoring ^{is} done at the landfill. One respondent, who was aware of monitoring at the site, expressed concern that the methods were inadequate.

Recommendations: Metro should include information regarding monitoring as part of subsequent outreach efforts for the landfill to better inform the public.

8. What is your understanding of an environmental risk assessment? RI-FS regulatory process?

Overall, respondents were aware of the RI-FS regulatory process and were enthusiastic about a study at the landfill.

Recommendations: It is important that Metro conduct an RI-FS that is as transparent as possible in order to better educate the public in subsequent outreach efforts, and inform those with historical ties to the landfill.

9. What do you think DEQ's role is in maintaining the landfill? What is its role in the RI-FS Process?

The common perception amongst respondents was that DEQ is responsible for overseeing Metro's analysis of the site and preserving community health. Some respondents have had some negative experiences with the agency and these were reflected in their responses. Typically, this sentiment concerned DEQ's close relationship with Metro and the business community, which the respondents stated often came at the expense of implementing what was suggested by the public. Generally, respondents believed decisions were not made as a result of the public's input.

Recommendations: It is unlikely that respondents' opinions of DEQ or Metro will be changed by this RI-FS study. However, by maintaining a transparent risk assessment and open dialogue with the community—including neighborhood associations, businesses, and non-profit organizations—these negative perceptions of DEQ and the agency's relationship with Metro may be abated somewhat.

C. Building Trust and Public Outreach Process

10. What do you need to know about the landfill?

Although respondents' replies varied, they generally requested additional technical information regarding the RI-FS study, and also asked that the public be educated on the history of the site and the current risk to community health. Additional information regarding contaminant plumes and perimeter leaching was requested as well.

Recommendations: Provide technical—but public-friendly—information in outreach materials, in addition to making the RI-FS findings available.

11. Where do you get your information about the landfill?

Respondents varied in the sources of their information; however, past involvement with Metro and/or community-based organizations involved with Metro was the reason that a majority received information.

Recommendations: Utilize existing Metro mailing databases of interested parties and neighborhood associations to disseminate print materials (see next question).

12. How would you like to receive updates and information?

Respondents varied in how they wished to be notified. Typically, they preferred standard US Mail to e-mail notifications due to the overwhelming amount of electronic correspondence they receive daily. Several respondents suggested broadening outreach materials to include community newspapers and other non-traditional means. Those suggested included laundromats, grocery stores, churches, and other community centers. In addition, Metro should provide information in multiple languages so that it is accessible to all in the community.

Recommendations: Use existing Metro databases to disseminate print materials to the public and neighborhood associations. Schedule regular briefings with interested neighborhood associations and community organizations to enlist their help in distributing information. They are the experts on how to reach their constituents. In addition, take advantage of opportunities for non-traditional outreach, such as neighborhood fairs, grocery stores, etc.

13. Do you trust information that you receive from Metro regarding the landfill?

Overall, interviewees responded that they were trusting of Metro; however, several respondents had less favorable views due to past experiences with the agency. Specifically, respondents were concerned about Metro's relationship with DEQ (which they believed was biased in favor of Metro) and a perceived bias in consultants' findings in Metro's favor. The general sentiment was that Metro needed to work harder in being more forthcoming with the public.

Recommendations: See question 9.

14. What should Metro do to increase its trust in the community?

As was seen in responses to the previous question, past experiences were a factor in the respondents' opinions. The general sentiment was that Metro should be more forthcoming in presenting information and increase its involvement in the community by presenting information at neighborhood association and community-based meetings. One respondent emphasized St. Johns Neighborhood Association be heavily involved in the decision making process for this project.

Recommendations: See question 9. It is important to note that much of Metro's credibility is based on outreach by Metro Councilors at neighborhood and organization meetings. Some of the interviewees made special note of Rex Burkholder and his "above and beyond the call of duty" presence at local, grassroots gatherings.

15. Is Metro a good steward of the landfill?

Responses to this question varied, with several respondents needing additional information. Those who responded negatively were concerned with Metro's perception that it is a good steward of the landfill, while continuing to perform minimum maintenance to preserve costs. Some interviewees' perceptions were based on previous negative experience with Metro, particularly in the area of land use.

Recommendations: The RI-FS should clearly state the risks (if any) associated with the landfill and emphasize Metro's commitment to following through with mitigation measures.

D. Smith and Bybee Lakes and Future Uses of the Landfill

16. Once the landfill is ready for public access, what activities and features should be available to the public or to wildlife? How should the landfill site be used?

A majority of the respondents believed that the site should be used as a community resource for all to enjoy. Ideas for future uses ranged from open space, an interpretive center focusing on wildlife and surrounding environment, sports and recreational activities, and a connection to the 40-mile loop trail. One respondent believed the site would not be open to public use in the near future, though Metro should make the site available and educate visitors as to the inherent risks involved in visiting the site.

Recommendations: While the results of the risk assessment will be the deciding factor in future use of the landfill, it is apparent that respondents overwhelmingly believed that the site should be a resource for the community. Metro should consider the site as a community resource (i.e. open space area) if the risk assessment deems the site suitable for such future uses.

17. How would you define success for Metro's management of the landfill? What do you see if you imagine it in 20 years?

Respondents believed the site should be made safe for the community's use. This can be achieved by an honest RI-FS process which involves the public and determines the best use for site based on its findings.

Recommendations: Ensure that future uses of the site are consistent with the findings of the RI-FS and that the public has the opportunity to influence the long-term use effectively. When the time is appropriate, Metro should consider a task force to develop and promote public access and use of the area.

SBMC

18. How do you think the landfill should fit into the Smith and Bybee Lakes Wildlife Area? Into the St. Johns community?

Respondents generally believed future uses of the site should be exclusively a community resource. Suggested uses consisted of an interpretive center focusing on wildlife and the surrounding environment, sports and recreational activities, and a connection to the 40-mile loop trail. Several respondents stated that any development outside of open space (i.e. business development) should be discouraged.

Recommendations: See question #16.



Metro St. Johns Landfill RI-FS Stakeholder Interviews—Appendix A Summary of Comments

In March and April 2004, The JD White Company, Inc. conducted a series of stakeholder interviews with the following community members and interested parties.

- Maria Elena Alvarado, Citizen
- Bill Bach, Port of Portland
- Jerry Coddington, Columbia Sportswear
- Tom Griffin-Valade, North Portland Neighborhood Services Coalition
- William Jones, Citizen
- Laf Keaton, Citizen
- Sarah Murphy, Columbia Slough Watershed Council
- Frank Opila, Friends of Smith And Bybee Lakes
- Robin Plance, St. Johns Neighborhood Association
- Rick Sandstrom, Friends of Cathedral Park
- Jeri Sundval, Environmental Justice Action Group

A. Background knowledge level

1. What do you know about monitoring and maintenance at the landfill?

- I know about the monitoring wells that are in place on the landfill and its perimeter. There are wells for monitoring methane gas as well. There has been chemical element sampling on the site, including air sampling for methane leaks. There has been maintenance on the site to repairs leaks and tears in the cover.
- I have been involved with issues at the landfill for some time. An RI-FS was completed a decade ago, though it was poor in quality. It is time a credible RI-FS was conducted at the landfill. Previous studies used tidal averaging in determining inflow and outflow, which was an incorrect means of viewing the data.
- I grew up in St. Johns and was present during the landfill's closure. Containing the landfill has involved a great deal of work and investment in structural elements such as a cap. The DEQ is involved to ensure that Metro monitors groundwater.
- Not much. My group, Environmental Justice Action Group (EJAG), mainly focuses on air quality issues such as car exhaust. EJAG is currently testing for air quality and have received complaints from the Columbia Villa area, which has a 14% asthma rate, two times higher than the standard
- Not much.
- Not a considerable amount.
- I am chair of my neighborhood association, which does not have a large membership. The DEQ visited our meetings and has presented information on its monitoring effort at the landfill. I do not have an extensive knowledge of the landfill.

- Fairly knowledgeable. Have been to management team meetings with Paul Vandenberg and Amanda Spencer. Visited the landfill to perform monitoring and became aware of sheep grazing and leaks in the methane pipes. Also, Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes gives four presentations a year out in the area.
- My organization has recently (within the last year) received a presentation from Metro regarding monitoring the landfill. Metro has worked hard to keep the Columbia Slough Watershed Council informed. I know about the landfill's methane being used at the neighboring businesses and the fact that there are methane leaks. I am aware that the landfill can affect vegetation—little vegetation is currently found on the site. The south side canoe launch is important and I would like to see improved public access.
- I know that the landfill is being monitored and that it is ongoing. I don't know what materials are being used to maintain the landfill. I also know that DEQ is engaged.

2. Have you seen the landfill since it's been closed? How often do you see it or think about it?

- Yes. I think about the site weekly.
- I am very familiar with the site. The Port of Portland has built a trail on the site and I have visited it approximately eight times in the past year. I recently toured the site with a media representative.
- I have thought about it a couple of times and have driven by it.
- No.
- Do not consciously look at landfill.
- I have not seen or thought about the landfill since its closure.
- No. Drive by it about once a year.
- Yes. A core group of members partakes in monthly paddle trips near the site. The landfill is discussed at meetings with the management area.
- Yes. I think about it a great deal. The action plan for the lower Slough mentions the landfill, so my organization is involved. Access for Smith and Bybee Lakes is involved as well.
- Yes. I am out in the area at least two times a year. I help Metro administer mitigation funds. The neighborhoods I work with are in close proximity to the landfill and the landfill has historically been a subject of interest to the neighborhoods.

3. How do you think garbage is contained in the landfill?

- The bulk of the landfill is contained by the sediment and membrane caps. The thickness of these caps varies throughout the site. I believe there is leaching occurring at the site.
- The refuse is not contained at the landfill. It was originally constructed without a liner and refuse was seen washing out of the landfill as recently as two years ago. The leachate containment wall has failed. The cap was shoddily constructed and allows for rainwater permeation.
- A robust barrier system and lining has been installed. The cap was a means of presenting leaching.
- Dig a large hole...throw garbage in...cover it up.

- The refuse is periodically leveled-off using bulldozers. The landfill is eventually covered and the resulting methane tells you garbage is contained within.
- I have not seen the landfill since its closure. It appeared that refuse was stored properly when the landfill was in operation.
- Do not know how it was set up, however, I assume it is lined. Most members of the neighborhood association know it has been covered. Not sure how the landfill was capped, though I postulate that the technique has been improved over time.
- Know because of information provided in the interview handout. I have concerns about the perimeter of the landfill—there is a 1,000 foot length of the perimeter that has been patched. How do you know if there is a leak?
- A portion of the landfill is lined, though a majority of the landfill was managed prior to understanding how refuse should be properly contained. The landfill is capped with a synthetic material.
- I know that the landfill is capped and I assume that there is a liner. I also assume that the liner is not as good as the liners that are being used today.

4. Do you know what all of the pipes on top of the landfill are for?

- The pipes are intended to capture methane, which is utilized at Ashgrove Cement.
- The pipes are intended for methane gas collection, which began approximately 5 years ago. I feel that it is better that the gas is being utilized than being released.
- The pipes are intended for gas release. Methane accumulates as refuse decomposes.
- Methane.
- I know because I received information in the mail. I heard of the pipes through Tyco/Mattel and Whittaker School (Adams High School) radon issues.
- I do not know.
- Yes, and it is a fascinating point. Excess gas and they are not piping it to a new Housing Authority of Portland project.
- Yes.
- The pipes are intended for methane containment and managing pressure.
- They pump off methane gas.

B. Evaluating levels of understanding and concern:

5. Do you have concerns about the landfill? What are they?

- Yes. There is garbage contained in the landfill that contains heavy metal toxins which are leaching into the Columbia Slough.
- Yes, absolutely. I am not too concerned with the landfill's poisoning of the aquifer, though I am concerned with the elevated levels of surface water pollutants measured by DEQ and Metro. The landfill is a dangerous place; a study found that the toxin levels in the landfill pose a risk of one death for 10,000 people exposed. This is unacceptable. Metro does not see how dangerous the

landfill can be—they are more concerned with solving the problem as inexpensively as possible. Metro's studies have averaged the risk of the multiple toxins found at the landfill, which is wrong. It is known that dioxin is found on the site.

- I do not have many concerns about the landfill. I followed the process of decommissioning the landfill and I am concerned about how it is contained and what will be done with the land.
- No concerns.
- Have not talked to the community about their concerns. Would be interested in having that discussion.
- I do not have any concerns about the landfill.
- I have concerns about the landfill and I hope that there is not another blowout. Leachates are not hazardous, though I have a mild concern about what is there and what is happening.
- There are potential impacts from leachate migrating into Smith and Bybee Lakes. This is due to the chemicals that were disposed of in the landfill before laws were in place governing the activity. I have additional concerns about the high gravel near the north Slough.
- I am concerned about what is leaching into the water, public access, and the landfill's proximity to the wetland area. I need additional information.
- No, but I don't live in the community. I work with the neighborhood associations who are concerned. (Tom asked that we interview Mikey Jones. He felt Mikey was someone it was very important to interview.)

6. Do you think that enough is being done to make the landfill safe? What more should be done?

- No, though the site is safer than it once was. We need to be creative in making the site safer, though I do not know exactly what that should consist of.
- No. Not filling the washout area would have been beneficial in flushing the surface water. An ombudsman is needed in order to independently address the concerns of the community. Metro should provide the funding for this position. A leachate collection system to collect surface water should be implemented. A tide gate is needed to flush the north Slough. A better cap is needed as the current one has failed. A perimeter leachate collection system is needed for surface water. A good, honest risk assessment is needed to assess the risks at the landfill.
- Not to my knowledge.
- As long as methane is being drawn off and the landfill is not developed on or in proximity to, it should remain reasonably safe. Two companies are currently profiting from the use of the methane.
- Do not know enough about the landfill. My concerns involve potential health issues—asthma in particular. Interested in how the landfill could exacerbate that condition.
- Need to pay close attention to safety while making the site more accessible for the community.
- There are extremes (i.e. containment seen at Hanford); however, Metro should do the best it can within its budget.
- A great deal is being done, though more could be accomplished if more funding was available. One of my board members believes that methane is a problem.

- I have concerns about what is leaching into the water and pollutants for fish, wildlife, and humans.
- Yes. As soon as the testing is complete, we will know if more is needed. If the tests show that corrective measures are needed, I believe that Metro will do the right thing.

7. Do you know how the landfill is monitored?

- The landfill is monitored through wells.
- Monitoring wells are located on the site; however, they have not drilled to the bottom of the plume. Scientists need to drill from the site and locate the plume in the aquifer. Metro has tested for dioxin and it is known that the fish in the area have elevated dioxin levels.
- I know that the DEQ is involved in water sampling, perhaps electronically.
- No.
- No.
- No.
- I know there are wells being monitored and head space analysis for methane.
- Not well known what is being done, though it would be beneficial to conduct tours.
- The landfill is being monitored naturally. I trust that Metro and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) know what they are doing.
- I know that it is monitored. I don't know exactly how.

8. What is your understanding of an environmental risk assessment? RI-FS regulatory process?

- The study first looks at what the problem is and how it can be solved. The second phase develops a work plan.
- I am very familiar with the RI-FS process. I will be viewing the upcoming study's report upon its release.
- I have heard of the term, though there is a great deal of legal terminology out there. I first heard of the term as a result of the mailing for this interview; it suggests a study when someone believes they have located a potential source of pollution.
- Providing knowledge so the community can make informed decisions. Work is finally being conducted connecting testing with health issues. There seems to be more modeling than monitoring and there is a disconnect from what the people need and what the government is doing. Real data is needed, including more monitoring.
- I do not know much about the process. It is important that the public is educated on the procedure.
- It is an assessment to view past, present, and future impacts to water, air, and vegetation.
- I have a Master of Science degree and have performed RI-FS work. The science behind risk assessments is not well known amongst the general population, nor does the public know what triggers the process. It is also unlikely that they know whether there was a closure permit.

- People have seen newspaper articles regarding the landfill and they know pollutants are there and that it is in the industrial area. Most people consider it an industrial site.
- My knowledge of the RI-FS regulatory process is limited. The process is what it claims to be and will result in recommendations for best management practices. Water pollution should be a large part of the process.
- It is where you look for the need for remediation.

9. What do you think DEQ's role is in maintaining the landfill? What is their role in the RI-FS Process?

- The DEQ's role is that of an enforcing regulatory entity that maintains safety levels for the community. The agency should work with Metro in developing a feasible solution for the site.
- The DEQ's role is protecting community health, not Metro. There is a culture of protecting Metro and DEQ employee, Joe Gingrich, sacrificed his career by standing up to the regional government. The next RI-FS process needs to be honest from the beginning.
- The DEQ is the watchdog that oversees Metro's actions and approves the RI-FS process. They ensure that the plan adequately addresses existing and long-term risks.
- DEQ should be monitoring the landfill.
- My group struggles with DEQ, though we are committed to working with them. There is a level of dissatisfaction. It is perceived that DEQ responds more favorably to the business community than the public.
- The DEQ is concerned with pollution and are doing their best.
- DEQ provides the expertise to monitor, maintain, and manage the site. Need to keep it safe.
- DEQ is the regulator and they need to keep a record of their decisions. Metro will do the work and DEQ comments and make decisions.
- The DEQ should work in partnership with Metro and the EPA in regulation and monitoring. The DEQ should be involved in protecting the public interest, health, safety, and water quality.
- It is Metro's facility. DEQ is the regulatory agency. DEQ would require or trigger an RI/Fs process.

C. Building trust and the public outreach process:

10. What do you need to know about the landfill?

- I need as much information as Metro and DEQ can provide. The community needs to be more involved in the process and understand the issues and the decisions that are being made.
- I need know how quickly the plume is traveling east. I hope that Metro will assess dioxins and other contaminants in the sediment at the site. Need to assess leachate levels on the borders of the Slough and whether plumes are located offsite. Pizometer readings need to be recorded at least twice daily, not once a day. This will not be any additional cost to Metro since they are recorded electronically.

- The public needs to know that the landfill has been located there for 50 years, before today's environmental concerns existed. Nobody knows what is located there and it is important to build confidence that those in charge know what they are doing. Politics should not be involved.
- I need to know what health issues may result from its emissions. What would be the impact of breathing the landfill's air on a daily basis. The community would like to know they are safe and not being poisoned.
- People need to know that methane is flammable.
- The public needs to know more about the RI-FS process and its specifics. Publish information in different languages.
- Paul Vandenberg and Amanda Spencer attending a meeting to discuss hydrology, the RI/FS process, ecological receptors. I need to know detailed information and the project schedule.
- People need to know why it is important. Most consider the site out of sight, out of mind; need to be reminded why they should care.
- I need to know the context of what the RI-FS consists of: who is requiring it and what the process involves. I am interested in water-related issues and whether there have been leachates. Would also like to know about how and where the landfill is lined and any potential problem areas.
- I am already on information overload. I am more interested in what the citizens think.

11. Where do you get your information about the landfill?

- I receive my information from Metro, DEQ, and historical data.
- I get my information from Metro's solid waste library and have paid Metro for reports. I can also glean current issues from the Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes meeting agendas.
 - Internet
 - Newspaper
 - Radio
 - Television
 - More of those (above) than any other agency
- Citizen board, Columbia Slough Watershed Council, Port of Portland.
- I am on the DEQ hot list.
- I attended past Metro events and was subsequently included in their mailing list. I receive informational flyers periodically.
 - Metro presentations
 - Metro flyers
 - DEQ presentations
 - Newspaper
 - Neighborhood associations
- Representation on Smith and Bybee Lakes Committee.
- I receive my information from Watershed Council meetings, correspondence with Metro, National Public Radio, and the newspaper.

- I get my information from a variety of sources. Most recently, I got information from a DEQ hearing.

12. How would you like to receive updates and information?

- I would like to receive information on the data that's being collected. Would also like to have monthly discussions with Metro and DEQ as to the status of the project. Information should be included in neighborhood newspapers. There needs to be more Metro and DEQ dialogue with the St. Johns neighborhood.
- I would like to be included in a list of individuals notified when a report is available to the public.
- Normal sources consisting of newsletters via US Mail, and e-mail notifications. I prefer to see the facts.
- Use standard mail.
- E-mail, though I prefer a phone call if you want me show up somewhere. Mail from government sources goes into a circular file. Best way to get people involved is cultivate multi-lingual neighbor-to-neighbor communication in places such as laundromats, grocery stores, and churches. Go door to door. Community forums with a small group, town hall style format would be another means of involving the community. Use existing communication channels—best results can be found by using the SKANNER's community calendar. Space is provided for a brief description of the event.
- I would prefer to receive information via US Mail, e-mail, and phone calls.
- Printed mail would be best, not e-mail. E-mail can be distributed to the Council if sent to me. I would be interested Metro presenting information at one of our monthly meetings. We organize field trips in July and I would like a tour of the landfill.
 - Information from Metro
 - Tours
 - Monthly meetings
 - Web site (would like link to site)
 - E-mail list
 - Events
 - St. Johns Review, Women on Water, Audubon Warbler, Pacific Northwest EcoForum, In and About St. Johns
- Electronically—but I am most interested in what the citizens need. We have a 2,800-piece mailing going out on April 24. If there were information available, we could include it in the mailing.
- The best way to get information to this community is word of mouth—usually from monthly meetings of the coalition.

13. Do you trust information that you receive from Metro regarding the landfill?

- I question the information I receive because it is biased. I do not think Metro has adequate information on the landfill to make any claims.
- No, though the data included in the reports does not lie. Consultants compiling the reports say what Metro would like them to say.

- I do not know if I trust the information or not. I want to know, with confidence, that PM is not Metro's puppet.
- I believe everything and believe nothing.
- For the most part. I do not take them as seriously as City of Portland or DEQ. Metro is fluff government—gets to do the pretty things.
- Yes.
- Yes, and most people do. I know Rex Burkholder—he often attends public meetings and rides his bike to work. Anti-government people are likely less trusting of Metro.
- I would give Metro a 90% rating. Sometimes individuals withhold information, though employees are forthcoming and trustworthy most of the time. An example of Metro not being forthcoming can be found in the issue of model airplanes: Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes were against them, though Metro had made the decision six months before they announced it.
- I trust the information I receive from Metro. The Watershed Council is interested in reviewing and providing input. The Council has a range of interests.
- Yes.

14. What should Metro do to increase its trust in the community?

- Metro needs to expand its public involvement beyond special interest groups. More involvement needs to occur at the neighborhood level, especially with the St. Johns Neighborhood Association.
- An independent ombudsman is needed.
- Metro should be disbanded. I have very little faith in Metro as a government entity. Metro has its own view and agenda and disregards those with other opinions. They do not represent the community or its interests.
- Go where the people are and ensure that childcare is available and that you provide food if the meeting is held during meal hours. People need to know that their input is valuable. Be honest, if you do not know the answer to a question, admit it and find out the answer and get back to them. Rex Burkholder is well known and trusted. It means a great deal when someone from the organization puts forth a volunteer effort (has a presence when not getting paid for it).
- Metro has been active in providing information with newsletters and Spanish language television commercials. Television commercials in other languages would also be helpful.
- Metro should be seen at meetings and answer the difficult questions. Paul Vandenberg is a good representative of the organization.
- Need to separate Metro government from the landfill. Management of landfills is not what people think of when they envision Metro. The urban growth boundary is what they are typically concerned with. The landfill will get mired in other land use issues. Metro has larger public relations issues other than the landfill.
- Metro should give presentations periodically and regularly to the Watershed Council. Present information as early in the process as possible. Metro should also present information regularly to the community.

- Metro should continue the universal, direct approach. The people that Metro has working on this are credible and trustworthy. The current Metro councilor is very visible.

15. Is Metro a good steward of the landfill?

- History will tell.
- Metro is not a good steward of the landfill. They have the perception that they are good stewards because they do the job as cheaply as possible. The elected officials within the organization rely too much on staff for the day-to-day work.
- No.
- Need to get rid of invasive plants. Not currently seeing stewardship in that regard.
- Landfill at 82nd and Siskyou has not sunk, it is too high.
- I don't know.
- Yes.
- I do not know enough about the issue to make a clear judgment. Who would replace them?
- I would give Metro a good grade, though I would like to look at a cost/benefit option. We have laws governing the disposal of waste, though there is a question as to how well the laws are followed.
- Yes.
- Yes, Metro is a good steward. Most folks think that the Port of Portland is terrible, so Metro can only shine in comparison.

D. Smith and Bybee Lakes and future use of the landfill:

16. Once the landfill is ready for public access, what activities and features should be available to the public, or to wildlife/how should the landfill site be used?

- The site should be open the public and be a resource to the St. Johns community. The feasibility study will determine whether the site can be used. The site could be used as open space, wildlife habitat, or entered into the public land trust. I would not like to see the site used for special interest groups. A kiosk could be included on the site showing the history of the landfill and its present use.
- The community needs to know the extent of how the landfill may be harmful to their health prior to any efforts at making the site safer. Public access to the site is not a good idea; however, if Metro can educate the public as to the risks involved, access to the site may raise awareness.
- Whatever use is decided will be that of the environmental groups. I do not believe the decision will be open to the public. I believe Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes want to close to the land to the public. The site could be used as a park that is incorporated into the Smith and Bybee Lakes Project.
- The site could be used for a sportsfield—baseball diamonds. If you have the right trees and native plants, wildlife will be attracted to the site.
- Wildlife and vegetation if area can sustain it. No housing!

- The landfill should be a resource for the community, north Portland in particular. An open area for family recreation and/or an interpretive center would be preferable.
- This depends on the condition of the landfill—if it is 100% safe for human contact. Gas Works Park in Seattle is a good example and it depends on what people are willing to tolerate. What would be the criteria for opening the site?
- Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes would like to see wildlife habitat within the management area. The top layer is too shallow for trees; however, it could serve as quality habitat for birds such as the Western Meadowlark. A trail connected to the 40-Mile Loop could be implemented, though there are different opinions as to where it should be located. Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes believe it should be located along the perimeter of the site, rather than encroaching on other habitat. May, at some point, transition from solid waste to greenways.
- Extremely important that fish and wildlife are protected in order to respect Smith and Bybee Lakes. Do not allow model planes. An improved canoe launch is needed in addition to public access.
- There needs to be an extensive public process. There needs to be long term outreach. The process needs to tie the environmental and recreational opportunities of Smith and Bybee Lakes—but also make a connection with the neighborhood. There are opposing views in the area and all should be heard and considered.

17. How would you define success for Metro's management of the landfill? What do you see if you imagine it in 20 years?

- Success would consist of:
 - Public involvement in the landfill's remediation
 - Protected wildlife habitat
 - A use for the site that includes the public
 - A site that is a resource for the community
- Future technology could remove contamination and it is important that we use our creative vision to achieve that.
- Success would be defined by compiling an honest assessment that accounts for the numerous contaminants found at the site and the risks they pose to the community. I do not believe the landfill will become safer with time; rather, it will become more of a risk to the community.
- I envision the site as part of the Smith and Bybee Lakes refuge, with viewing platforms. This could expose people to wildlife and the complexities of the refuge.
- An area free of blackberries, ivy, thistles, stinging nettles, and dead birds. Plant native trees and grasses.
- Not creating a health hazard after being ugly for so long. It should be beautiful.
- Metro's current management of the landfill is successful. I envision the site being clean, safe, and pleasant to visit without pollution.
- Think about what happens sooner rather than later. Need:
 - Perimeter trail
 - Testing made public on an annual basis
 - Successful native habitat with native wildlife
 - Remediation efforts out of RI/FS successful

- Gravel bed at north slough needs to be addressed.
- Site could be managed for wildlife. Need to decreased toxicity of land to reduce potential impact to surrounding area.
- Important that water quality is not negatively impacted. Continue to use methane, bearing safety in mind. Would be beneficial to add to the habitat valley in lower Slough in conjunction with Smith and Bybee Lakes. A park would be nice community resource. Continue to involve the community in the decision-making process.
- This is a huge property. If Metro uses it to tie its mission back to the community—that will be success. It would be less of a success if it ends up being “just” open space.

18. How do you think the landfill should fit into the Smith and Bybee Lakes Wildlife Area? Into the St. Johns community?

- It is important that the site be used as a resource for the St. Johns community and not for special interests.
- I support the 40-Mile Loop trail around the perimeter of the site. I do not want to see people in the water nor see the site open to Smith and Bybee Lakes. The project team should solicit Ray Piltz’s input as well.
- Smith and Bybee Lakes are part of the area and the landfill should be kept in as natural of a state as possible with an access trail network. The landfill has always been part of the St. Johns community, though it is more a part of Smith and Bybee Lakes.
- It would fit if there were native plants. Wildlife will be attracted to such a setting. No development such as Wal-Mart or Starbucks.
- A nice introductory zone before you get into the wildlife area. A place for observers—ambience without the hassle.
- Include an interpretive center and make the site a place for family recreation.
- Most people would say the land should be managed as a park, whatever that means to them.
- The landfill should complement what is currently in place and should be an extension of the wildlife area. Include trails and keep a protective eye on what is happening. Could extend resources by creating a park with a soccer field and a mix of uses.
- The communities need to make that determination. The process needs to include those nearest the landfill, but also include all those who should/could use it. One reason the process should be long term is that the longer the period, the more the most active will be worn down. Others, who may not be as passionate, will have the opportunity to participate.

From: Paul Vandenberg
To: Dennis O'Neil; Elaine Stewart; inet:"amanda.spencer@hartcrowser.com";
inet:"kciocia@jdwhite.com"; Jan O'Dell; Karen Blauer; Sharon Kelly
Date: 5/11/04 8:48AM
Subject: Stakeholder Interviews Summary

To the RI-FS Public Outreach Group:

Attached for your review and for discussion in our next meeting is a report of the stakeholder interviews completed in March and April by Karen Ciocia and Kyle Brown of the JD White Co.

* *Stakeholder Summary.doc* includes a description of themes and key points relevant to each question posed to the participants, and a corresponding recommendation to Metro.

* *Stakeholder Summary Appendix.doc* is a list of all comments made in response to each question.

Note that *Stakeholder Summary.doc* will be sent to each participant to ensure that it adequately reflects their comments. Any feedback received by the time of our next meeting will be included in our discussion.

This report is intended to provide direction to our public outreach efforts. So our meeting should include any clarification needed to improve understanding of it, its implications, and how it can be utilized to make our outreach efforts more effective.

I would like to schedule a meeting of the group for Tue., May 25, 10:00 a.m.
Please let me know if that date/time works for you (direct e-mail to me is preferred).

Thanks
Paul V.