



Oregon's Kitchen Table – City of Portland – Portland Harbor Superfund Cleanup Community Engagement

Background

The City of Portland's Bureau of Environmental Services (the City), in partnership with Oregon's Kitchen Table (OKT), conducted an online consultation with Portland residents in March 2016 to better understand their opinions and values regarding cleanup of the Portland Harbor Superfund site in the Willamette River north of downtown Portland. Once the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announces its preferred cleanup plan, there will be a 60 day comment period where any member of the public has the opportunity to provide comments to EPA about the proposed plan. The City of Portland sought feedback from Portlanders to help inform the City's preparation of comments to the EPA. The OKT consultation provided some background and asked a series of questions about Portlanders' values and priorities regarding the river and the cleanup.

A total of 2,704 residents (including 67 via paper) responded to the survey. All questions were optional; participants were allowed to skip any question.



In addition, the International Refugee Center of Oregon (IRCO) provided OKT with summaries from three culturally specific community discussions with members of the Slavic community, the Asian / Pacific Islander community, and the community of African immigrants and refugees. A summary of these discussions is included as an appendix to this report.

Outreach was conducted through OKT as well as a number of partners, including the Portland Mayor's office, additional City channels, and local community-based organizations. Surveys were made available in six languages: English, Spanish, Vietnamese, Somali, Russian, and Chinese. Data-entry was conducted by OKT and started in March of 2016 for paper copies and continued through early April of 2016.

The raw data for both the paper and online versions was provided by OKT to DHM Research for processing and analysis. The following analysis by DHM Research includes a summary of results as well as findings and examples of responses to open-ended questions.¹ An annotated survey is attached as an appendix. Results in the annotated questionnaire may add up to 99% or 101% due to rounding.

DHM Research: DHM Research has been providing opinion research and consultation throughout the Pacific Northwest and other regions of the United States for over three decades. The firm is non-partisan and independent and specializes in research projects to support planning, policy-making, and communications. www.dhmresearch.com

Statement of Limitations: Any sampling of opinions or attitudes is subject to a margin of error, which represents the difference between a sample of a given population and the total population. The margin of error is a statistic expressing the amount of random sampling error in a survey's results and differs by sample size. In the case of community engagement surveys like this one, we do not have random sampling. Thus, we cannot confidently calculate the margin of error and differences found between demographic groups should be interpreted cautiously as *possible* differences.

¹ Open-ended questions will not be full included in this report; all responses to open-ended questions are available upon request from Oregon's Kitchen Table.

Overview of Results

Respondents show high concern for the environment in the Superfund cleanup process. They consistently agree with priorities like ensuring the river is *safe for fish and wildlife* and that the *river be as clean as possible*. Recreation was also a top concern for the vast majority of respondents. Regarding these priority issues, there were no notable demographic differences.

- 98% of respondents agree that the river should be *safe for fish and wildlife*
- 95% of respondents agree that the river should be *as clean as possible*
- 93% of respondents agree that the cleanup plan should *allow Portlanders to swim, boat, and play in the river*

Respondents are conscious of cost—some more than others. When asked about costs, they say it's important to minimize the impact on households. But when asked if they would support a higher cost for greater benefits, respondents say they would support such a cost.

- 81% of respondents say it is important the *cleanup minimizes cost to households in Portland*.
 - 91% of Hispanics/Latinos agreed.
 - 76% of Native Americans and young residents agreed. These groups exhibited the highest cost tolerance throughout.
- 69% of residents agree that *the river should be cleaned to as safe as possible for people, fish, and wildlife, even if some of the costs are passed on to Portland households*.
 - 75% of residents under 35 agree.
- 39% of respondents say it is important to them that cleanup occur *more quickly, even if it means that the cost increases*.

Respondents do care about the impact cleanup may have on jobs on the economy, but they still think the industries that polluted the river should bear the responsibility to pay for the cleanup.

- 72% of residents agree it is important that *the plan considers potential positive and/or negative impacts on jobs*.
 - African Americans (85%) and Hispanics/Latinos (88%) were more likely to agree.
 - Native Americans placed less importance on jobs (68%).

- 68% of respondents agree that *industries that rely on the river are important to the region's economy and jobs, and we should consider their needs in the cleanup plan*, but only 22% say they *strongly agree*.
- 94% of respondents agree that *industries contaminated the river and it is their responsibility to clean it up*.

Respondents do say that the ability to eat more fish from the river is important, but not as important as other environmental concerns.

- 60% of residents agree that *Portlanders should be able to eat an increased amount of resident fish, even if it means spending more for cleanup*.
- 69% of Native Americans and 70% Hispanics/Latinos agree.

Key Findings

PRIORITIES FOR CLEANUP

Above all, Portlanders prioritize river cleanliness to support healthy habitat for fish and wildlife and a safe place to recreate.

Respondents were asked whether they agreed with a series of priorities that community leaders may consider during cleanup (Q1).

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Nearly all Portlanders surveyed were in strong agreement that the river should be *safe for fish and wildlife* (Q1E). Overall, 98% of respondents said they agreed this factor was important, and eight in ten said they *strongly agreed* (80%).

"I lived above the Superfund site for a number of years and came to realize how important the river is for our migratory birds and resident birds. The river supports all manners of life, and making it safe for humans and wildlife is what I believe we should do."

– Female nature hiker, white, 55-64

This broad agreement spanned demographic groups. More than nine in ten respondents from all demographic groups—gender, age, race or ethnicity, and neighborhood—agreed that the river should be safe for fish and wildlife. As such, there weren't significant differences by demographic groups.

Respondents were also asked which priorities they agreed with the most, second most, and third most (Q2). When combining most, second most, and third most important scores, the *safety of fish and wildlife* was the top priority (Q2E). Nearly three in ten respondents (27%) said they most agreed with this statement, along with 29% who put it in second place, and 16% who put it in third place.

Degree of River Cleanup

Respondents were also in broad agreement that the *river be as clean as possible* (Q1A). Again, more than nine in ten respondents (95%) agreed with this statement. Only a few demographic groups showed diminished agreement, and the difference was slight. African American residents were a little less likely to agree that the *river be as clean as possible* (87%), and residents who work at the harbor were also less likely to agree (84%). Throughout the survey, these two demographic groups shared attitudes that differ slightly from the general

population. These groups tend to be more cost conscious, slightly less concerned with environmental aspects of cleanup, and more concerned about impacts on jobs at the harbor.²

When asked where degree of cleanup fell in relation to other priorities, 35% of respondents said it was most important to them that the *river be as clean as possible* (Q2A). Looking only at the single most important issue, it ranked first, but when combining second and third most important priorities, it fell behind *fish and wildlife*.

Recreation

Another priority that garnered the agreement of more than nine in ten respondents was that *cleanup allow Portlanders to swim, boat, and play in the river* (93%). Throughout the survey, recreation played a significant role in cleanup priorities, but always fell after the cleanliness of the river and the safety of fish and wildlife.

When respondents were asked how much they agreed with this cleanup priority in relation to others, 12% said *recreation* was the issue they agreed with most, along with 17% who said they agreed with *recreation* second most, and 20% who put it in third.

There were no significant differences by demographic groups regarding the importance of recreation.

Portlanders also care considerably about the impacts cleanup will have on local households.

Cost

When asked if it was important that the *cleanup minimize costs to individual households in Portland*, eight in ten residents agreed that it was (81%) (Q1C). Agreement was highest among Hispanics/Latinos, 91% of whom said they agreed.

"We just can't afford higher living costs to have a clean river. I regret saying that, but we already carry too much cost for services."

² Of the 71 residents who identified as Black/African American, just seven reported working at the harbor. The majority of respondents who said they work at the harbor identified as white (78%).

– Female, values Portland Harbor’s cultural significance, white, 65 and older

“The City needs to reduce costs by capping the costs on planning, design, and litigation phases of work.”

– Male nature hiker, Korean, 35-44

“Portland Harbor is a shared waterway, and it is right that costs of cleanup should be shared, to some degree, broadly across the community. But certainly entities directly responsible for the contamination should pay the largest share of cleanup costs.”

– Male beachgoer, Native American, 55-64

Not all groups felt the same. Among residents under the age of 35, 76% agreed, along with 76% of Native Americans. Throughout the survey, both groups exhibited stronger preferences for environmental cleanup than for issues like cost.

Cost fell behind recreation when respondents were asked which priorities they agreed with most (12%), second most (12%), and third most (15%) (Q2C).

Impact on Jobs

Respondents were less concerned with the *potential positive and/or negative impacts on jobs* than with *cost*, but still, seven in ten residents said they agreed this was an important factor (72%) (Q2F).

In keeping with some of the demographic differences described above, some groups were more focused on *jobs*. African Americans (85%), Hispanics/Latinos (88%), and those who work at the harbor (82%) were all more likely to agree *impacts on jobs* are important to consider. On the other hand, Native Americans were the least likely to show agreement with this priority (68%).

However, few residents said that *impacts on jobs* were their top concern when asked about the priorities in relation to one another (Q2F). Just 6% said it was the most important, along with 7% who said it second most, and 9% who put it in third. Although most groups prioritized *jobs* at about the same rate, 23% of Portland harbor workers said it was the most important priority (Q2F).

“I ranked ‘job creation’ as low but I’d like to clarify: Job creation would be great if it came with river cleanup. Job creation as

maintaining industry at the expense of the river's health is not as important to me. Those jobs won't last."

– Female, Japanese, 25-34

"The cleanup should create jobs in the cleanup process for locals, as well as when they are restoring the river. We need to re-create a fishing economy."

– Female fisher, American Indian, 45-54

Impact on Neighborhoods

Seven in ten residents said it was important that the strategy *consider cleanup construction impacts* on surrounding neighborhoods (71%) (Q1G). Notably, both residents who live in nearby neighborhoods (69%) and those who live in other parts of the city (72%) agreed with this priority at about the same rate.

Although a large majority of residents agree that this is an important issue to consider during cleanup, only a handful of residents said *neighborhood impact* was the priority they agreed with most (1%) (Q2G). A few more residents said it was the priority they agreed with second most (4%), and some (8%) said it was a third priority. There was almost no difference in priority between those who lived near the cleanup site and those who lived in other parts of the city.

Portlanders are concerned about the health of resident fish, but it doesn't rise to the top of the priority list.

The vast majority of respondents said it was important to them that *Portlanders can eat more resident fish from the river with fewer health concerns* (78%) (Q1D). Of course, those respondents who said they eat fish from the Portland harbor agreed the most (96%). But this issue was also especially important to residents 65 and older (84%), Native Americans (83%), and Hispanics/Latinos (84%).

Residents who value Portland harbor for its cultural significance also agreed in high numbers (83%). There are a number of times throughout the survey where those who value this cultural significance of the harbor exhibit a stronger preference for certain outdoor activities, showing that cultural significance is closely linked to historical and community activities like fishing and swimming.

Throughout the survey, those who work at Portland Harbor industries were more likely to hold more conservative views on resident fish. Here, 68% agreed that this issue was important, the least of any group.

Seven in ten respondents also agreed that the cleanup plan should *protect those who rely on eating resident fish* (71%) (Q1I). Again, Native Americans (82%) and Hispanics/Latinos (83%) were in stronger agreement than other groups, about the same as those who eat fish from the river (84%). And, again, those who work at Portland harbor were the least likely to agree (52%).

But when respondents were asked if they agreed most with the statements that Portlanders be able to *eat more resident fish* or that cleanup should *protect those who rely on eating fish*, few said it was their top concern (2% and 3%) (Q2D, Q2I). A few more said they were the priorities they agreed with second most (6%) and some (8% and 9%) said these priorities came third on their list.

"Decision-makers should not spend astronomical amounts of money for a small increment of benefit. It may very well be that resident fish cannot be safely eaten more than rarely for a long time. If it costs billions to allow regular consumption, I would favor letting that go."

– Male, white, 45-54

The timeline for the cleanup is of minimal concern to Portlanders.

Just four in ten respondents said it was important to them that cleanup occur *more quickly, even if it means that the cost increases* (39%) (Q1H). Some demographic groups were more likely to agree: 47% of African Americans agreed, along with 49% of Native Americans, 48% of Asians, 41% of Hispanics/Latinos, and 53% of those who identified as another race or ethnicity. Although several of these groups exhibit sensitivity to cost in other questions, some groups, like Native Americans, consistently support fast and effective cleanup.

"I don't care about the speed, as long as it is steady progress, because doing it right is an investment in the future health of the area."

– Female beachgoer, white, 35-44

Those who fish recreationally (45%) or eat resident fish from the river (48%) were also more likely to prefer a faster cleanup with additional cost.

In total, just one in ten residents said a faster cleanup was one of their top three priorities (10%) (Q2H).

DEGREE OF CLEANUP

Portlanders are willing to pay slightly more to ensure the river is safe for humans and wildlife.

As the first section of the survey showed, residents placed a lot of importance on a healthy river that is safe for fish, wildlife, and human recreation. When asked if *the river should be cleaned to as safe as possible for people, fish, and wildlife, even if some of the costs are passed on to Portland households*, the vast majority said they agreed (69%) (Q3A).

"I would like the river ecosystem to be as safe, clean, and useable as possible for all living creatures. I would like the responsible companies that created the majority of the problem to pay the lion's share of the cleanup, but I would be willing to take on some of the cost of cleanup as long as it's fairly allocated."

– Male boater, white, 55-64

Contrast these results with the second statement in this pairing: *The river can never be entirely clean, and increases in the degree of safety for people, fish, and wildlife are not worth additional expenses passed onto Portland households* (Q3B). Fewer than three in ten residents agreed with this statement (29%).

The residents with the highest tolerance for household costs that result in a higher degree of cleanup were residents under age 35 and those who eat fish from the harbor (75% agree with Statement A). Those who eat fish from the harbor feel especially passionate about this issue, and about half (49%) say they *strongly agree* with Statement A.

Several demographic groups were less likely to agree with Statement A than were white residents. While seven in ten white residents agreed that additional cost was acceptable for greater cleanup (71%), fewer Native Americans (64%), Hispanics/Latinos (60%), and African Americans (54%) agreed.

Portland Harbor workers had the lowest tolerance for increased cost, and just over half agreed that the additional cost would be justified (51%). Nonetheless, these workers preferred Statement A to Statement B (47%).

Although several demographic groups weren't particularly enthused about additional costs for a higher degree of cleanup being passed on to Portland households, they split on the issue when it came Statement B. While more than

four in ten African Americans agreed that additional cleanup wasn't worth the additional expense (44%), just 26% of Native Americans agreed. Hispanics/Latinos fell in the middle (39%).

Even when respondents were given a chance to prioritize *degree of cleanup*, *cost*, the *time* it would take to finish the cleanup, or a *balance* of all three, respondents said *degree of cleanup* was their top concern (Q4). Four in five residents agreed that *the river should be cleaned up as much as possible for people, fish, and wildlife* (80%). This was far and away the statement with the highest agreement, and half of the respondents even said they *strongly agreed* (51%).

A majority of residents also agreed that the cost, time, and degree of cleanup are all important and should be *balanced*, even if it means compromising in each area (56%) (Q4D). Fewer than four in ten residents agreed that cleanup costs should be kept as low as possible, even if it means the process takes longer and leaves some contamination (35%) (Q4B), and even fewer agreed that the cleanup should occur as quickly as possible, even if it increases the cost and leaves some contamination (19%) (Q4C).

Only Portland Harbor workers held different views from the rest of the demographic groups. Workers were more likely to agree that *balance* was the most important thing (70%), while *cost* (56%) and *degree of cleanup* (55%) were viewed about equally.

African American respondents were, like all respondents, more likely to agree that *degree of cleanup* (69%) was most important. However, their agreement was much less intense when compared to Native Americans (86%), Hispanics/Latinos (84%), white residents (80%), or Asians (80%).

CLEANUP AND JOBS

Portlanders value industries' contributions to the local economy but feel strongly that industries should be largely responsible for the cost of cleanup.

More than two-thirds of respondents agreed that *industries that rely on the river are important to the region's economy and jobs, and we should consider their needs in the cleanup plan* (68%) (Q5B). While this is certainly a wide margin, just 22% of respondents said they *strongly agreed*. This soft support indicates residents do care about jobs and the economy, but that they might prioritize other interests first.

When asked if they agreed that *industries contaminated the river and it is their responsibility to clean it up*, nearly all residents agreed (94%) (Q5A). More than two-thirds (69%) said they *strongly agreed* that industries should be held responsible—more than agreed that industries’ needs should be considered in the cleanup plan (68%).

"Costs of the river cleanup should be paid for by the industries that caused the contamination. No cleanup costs should be passed onto Portland households, individual taxpayers, or residents."

– Female nature hiker, white, 45-54

Portland Harbor workers were more likely to prioritize these industries’ impact on *the region’s economy and jobs* (80%) than to agree it is the industries’ *responsibility to clean it up* (78%), although the two were nearly equal.

"The Superfund area was polluted by the people that live in the Willamette River Basin, whether directly or indirectly. All persons that live in the area have benefitted from the industry that is adjacent to the river whether they believe it or not."

– Male harbor worker, white, 35-44

African American residents were slightly less in agreement that industries bear the *responsibility to clean it up* (87%) than were Hispanics/Latinos (97%) Native Americans (92%), Asians (95%) or white residents (95%). On the other hand, African Americans were among the most concerned about the *region’s economy and jobs* (72%), along with Hispanics/Latinos (73%). Native Americans, meanwhile, were the least likely to agree that industry’s needs should be considered in the cleanup plan (57%).

RESIDENT FISH

Portlanders care about the ability to eat resident fish, but it’s less important than other environmental concerns.

As mentioned previously, residents do care about the viability of resident fish as food, but their support for additional cleanup for this reason is softer. When asked if they agreed that *Portlanders should be able to eat an increased amount of resident fish, even if it means spending more for cleanup*, three in five residents agreed (60%) (Q6A). Respondents may see the viability of resident fish as an indicator of other environmental impacts.

"The river should be cleaned up enough for people to eat resident fish from it, because then it is clean enough for people and wildlife."

– Female boater, white, 45-54

But the issue was more important to Native Americans (69%) and Hispanics/Latinos (70%). However, even for these groups support was much higher when it came to other priorities, like cleaning up the river *as much as possible for people, fish, and wildlife*, where 86% of Native Americans agreed, along with 84% of Hispanics/Latinos (Q4A).

The ability to eat resident fish is, unsurprisingly, very important to people who fish in the harbor or already eat resident fish. The highest agreement that *Portlanders should be able to eat an increased amount of resident fish* came from those who eat fish from harbor (86%). Those who swim in the harbor were also likely to agree (72%), while less than a majority of Portland Harbor workers agreed (47%).

Even though support was softer on this issue, it was still a strong majority among the general population and most demographic groups. Overall, fewer than half of residents agreed with the converse statement, that *it's not worth large expenditures of money to allow for an increase in the amount of fish* (47%) (Q6B).

The only group that was more likely to agree that *it's not worth large expenditures to allow for an increase in the amount of fish* were Portland Harbor workers (61%). Among African American residents, the two statements garnered the same amount of support (54% Statement A, 53% Statement B).

PRIORITIES

Residents were asked to rate the importance of a series of priorities on a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 was the most important and 7 was the least important. A mean score was calculated for each priority, where a lower mean scale indicates higher agreement.

Portlanders prioritize wildlife health and habitat over recreation, although having beach access is important.

Wildlife Health and Habitat

Respondents agreed that *wildlife health and habitat* was the most important issue, with an overall mean score of 1.8 (Q7G). Each demographic group was in agreement that this issue was most important, although it was especially important

to women, Native Americans, and those interested in Portland Harbor for its cultural significance (1.6).

Portland Harbor workers did agree that *wildlife health and habitat* were more important than the other priorities, but didn't see it as quite as important (2.5). African Americans were also less likely to characterize it as very important (2.1). Nonetheless, it remained the most important priority for African Americans.

Beach Access and Other Recreation

Respondents were largely in agreement that *beach access and recreation other than swimming or fishing* was the next most important priority, with a mean score of 3.1 (Q7D). Naturally, the residents who placed the highest importance on *beach access* were those who access the beach for recreation (3.3).

Most demographic groups agreed, although Portland Harbor workers said *job creation* was more important (3.3 to 3.4).

Swimming

Respondents said the ability to swim in Portland Harbor was somewhat important, with a mean score of 3.9, in the middle of the scale (Q7A). The residents who were most likely to say swimming is important were residents under the age of 35 (3.6), those who swim in the harbor (2.9), and those eat fish from the harbor (3.6).

Asian residents (4.3), residents over 65 (4.1), and Portland Harbor workers (4.1) were less likely to say swimming was important.

Job Creation

Job creation was somewhat important to residents (4.2) (Q7F). As mentioned throughout the report, Portland Harbor workers (3.3) and African Americans (3.7) were the most concerned with job creation.

On the other hand, those who swim in the harbor (4.7) and Native Americans (4.4) were the least likely to say job creation was important.

Recreational Fishing

Overall, recreational fishing was considered less important than wildlife habitat, beach access, swimming, or job creation (4.6) (Q7B). The groups most likely to say recreational fishing was important were those who already fish (3.2), those who eat fish from the harbor (3.7) and Native Americans (4.1). Nonetheless, all these groups gave it a middling score.

Eating Resident Fish

Residents said *eating resident fish* was only somewhat important (4.6), but for a few groups, it was more important (Q7C). Native Americans (3.5), Asians (3.6), and those who eat fish from the harbor (3.2) put it between somewhat and very important.

Industry

Residents said the needs of industry were the least important, with a score of 4.9, or not too important (Q7E). Portland Harbor workers said it was more important to them (3.6), and so did African Americans (4.1).

The least sympathetic to industry were young residents under age 35 (5.2), Native Americans (5.2), and those who swim in the harbor (5.4).

Appendix A.

Summary of IRCO Culturally Specific Community Gatherings

In order to reach out to a broad range of communities, Oregon's Kitchen Table contracted with community-based organizations to conduct outreach and engagement and, in some cases, culturally specific community discussions. The International Refugee Center of Oregon (IRCO) conducted three culturally specific community discussions with members of the Slavic community, the Asian / Pacific Islander community, and African immigrants and refugees. Community discussion topics included how community members use or interact with the river as well as a discussion of questions used in the online / paper survey. IRCO staff provided translation and interpretation during the community meetings. They then reported back to OKT a summary of the discussion and any results of any of the survey questions that were directly asked. Below is a compilation of those summaries.

ASIAN / PACIFIC ISLANDER (API) COMMUNITY GATHERING

IRCO reported that the main questions that arose in the API discussion revolved around wanting a clearer sense of the cost and length of time to clean up the Superfund site. Participants interact with the lower Willamette in the following ways:

- Walk along the river downtown.
- Selfie with the river
- Camping on the 4th of July, @ Sauvie Island
- Jet ski or picnic with family
- Sightseeing
- Place to pray

Many participants report that either they themselves or their friends or family members fish or boat. A few report that while they don't swim in the Willamette, they know others who do.

As a group in reviewing the survey questions, IRCO reported back how participants rated the importance of the following possible viewpoints (Q1):

A. It is important to me to have the river be as clean as possible.

- All agreed that this was very important.

B. It is important to me that any cleanup plan allows Portlanders to swim, boat, and play in the river.

- All agreed that this was very important.

C. It is important to me that the cleanup minimizes costs to individual households in Portland.

- All agreed that this was very important.

D. It is important to me that Portlanders can eat more resident fish from the river with fewer health concerns.

- Most felt this was very important while a couple felt this was somewhat important.

E. It is important to me that the river is safe for fish and wildlife.

- A slight majority felt this was very important while slightly less than half felt this was somewhat important.

F. It is important to me that the cleanup plan considers potential positive and/or negative impacts on jobs.

- All agreed that this was very important.

G. It is important to me that the plan considers cleanup construction impacts (such as lights, noise, and air pollution) on the neighborhoods surrounding the Harbor during the cleanup.

- Most felt this was either very important while one felt this was not important.

H. It is important to me that the cleanup is finished more quickly, even if it means that the cost increases.

- Most felt this was either very or somewhat important while one felt this was not important.

I. It is important to me that the cleanup plan protects those who rely on eating resident fish from the river for food.

- Most felt this was either very or somewhat important while a couple felt this was not important.

In regards to the factors of cost, cleanliness, and time, IRCO reported that all participants agreed that *the cost, time and degree of cleanup are all important and should be balanced even if it means compromising in each area.* All also agreed with the statement *industries contaminated the river and it is their responsibility to clean it up.* None agreed with the statement *industries that rely on the river are important to the region's economy and jobs, and we should consider their needs in the cleanup plan.*

Participants also all agreed that *it's not worth large expenditures of money to allow for an increase in the amount of fish it would be safe to eat in a month.* IRCO reported that one participant explained that when they "consider about the river's cleanliness, it's not about the edible try of the fish, it's about the environment. I want to let the fish live, not to let them live to eat. I don't eat the fish."

IRCO reported that after the cleanup, the following uses of the river would be most important this group of community members:

- Wildlife & Habitat
- Recreation
- Job Creation
- Recreational fishing

IRCO reported the following opinions were voiced during the discussion:

- Anyone who polluted the river, has to pay for it. The industry needs to pay for the river, not the tax payers. I didn't do anything to the river. Leave me alone. Tax the industries to pay for the cleanup.

- The water should be safe for the fish and wildlife. People should be allowed to fish safely. The river needs to be cleaned for the environment and wildlife.
- Either way, there will be the creation of jobs.
- Not worth the money to clean the fish for it to be safe for eating.

Lastly, IRCO reported they heard a desire for more education and awareness about the cleanup and any plan for how to treat the river.

AFRICAN COMMUNITY GATHERING

IRCO reported that there were a lot of uncertainties during this group's discussion of the issue and the survey. Many participants in the African community gathering did not know or didn't understand that these issues were happening around them; however, there was an agreement that it's imperative for the river to be clean for health purposes. Most believe that cleanliness ensures healthy surroundings and adds value to the environment.

The bulk of the group's discussion focused on the set of questions in the survey around the three main factors to consider in the cleanup plan - time, cost, and degree of cleanup - as well as the responsibility of paying for the cleanup. IRCO reported that participants felt that Portlanders are not the ones responsible for the contamination and therefore they should not be paying for clean-ups directly or indirectly. People felt like the choices in this section do not accurately depict their thoughts and feelings, therefore a lot of people disagreed on the question and felt that it should be rephrased or they should have the option to not choose either one.

IRCO also reported they heard the following during this community gathering:

- Many agree that it does not matter how long it takes as long as the clean-up takes place. However, as important as it is, there should be a balance in how the funds are used.
- The industries that contaminated the river should be responsible for the clean-up, and should be fined even if the jobs depend on the economy. The community will also like to see that these jobs are diversified, but even so, they will like to be in a healthy environment.
- The river should be used for eating residential fish, job creations, but most importantly our health, and the wildlife health and habitat.

Lastly, IRCO reported that participants will like some inclusion and more awareness, improvement and workshops next time. They also voiced a desire for direct questions and room for disagreements.

SLAVIC COMMUNITY GATHERING

IRCO reported that the participants in the Slavic community gathering felt it is very important for the river to be clean and that costs be at a minimum for taxpayers with costs paid by the industries that caused this issue. Others mentioned that everything should be balanced, and that they don't want the cost of living to go up in our area. There was concern that the cost of the cleanup could mean the cost of living continues to increase for Portlanders, making it more

difficult to live in areas like downtown. Participants strongly agreed that the industrial companies are responsible for the cost of the cleanup.

IRCO reported that it was also very important for all the group members to make sure the river is safe for wildlife.

Some participants preferred that the cleanup happens more quickly while others felt it was more important to have a lower cost plan, whether it is fast or slow.

Some participants shared the importance to their community to be able to eat fish without any health concerns and that many men within the community like fishing and bringing fish they've caught home for the whole family to eat. During the cleanup, participants felt there should be other fishing areas available nearby for all the fishermen who rely on the fish from the river. Other participants felt that the people of Portland shouldn't eat the fish from Willamette at all and that it's not worth picking up the costs of the cleanup just to eat more fish.

In terms of jobs, it was important for each member that the plan considers the positive and negative impacts on jobs on any surrounding businesses around the area that might be closed at the time of cleaning. And overall, it was important for this group that the cleanup plan consider the neighborhoods around the surrounding area. Members shared that industry job creation was not very important to their community.

Some people mentioned that if Portlanders have been living with a dirty river, then we can keep living like this without a cleanup project, especially since it's such a small part of the river. The majority of the group, however, said that they want a clean river that is safe for the environment and that they are concerned that cleanup costs could cause Portland's cost of living to increase.

In terms of future uses of the river, wildlife, clean beaches, swimming, and fishing were all very important to the group as they stated that the Slavic community relies on rivers to cool down in the summer and on fish from local rivers.

Appendix B.

OKT – City of Portland – Portland Harbor Superfund Cleanup Annotated Survey - DHM Research

Introduction

The City of Portland is looking for your feedback about some important decisions coming up for our community. Later this spring, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will release a proposed plan to clean up the Portland Harbor Superfund site in the Willamette River north of downtown Portland. EPA will accept official comments after the release of that plan. Now, it's important to the City that it has feedback about Portlanders' values about the cleanup as the City prepares its comments to EPA. Your voluntary feedback here will help the City develop its comments. We will provide you with some background, followed by questions asking about your values and priorities regarding the river and the cleanup. This should take you about 10 minutes. Your feedback is extremely important. Your responses will be aggregated with other participants' and provided anonymously to the City of Portland. We thank you for your time.

Later this spring, EPA will have its official process for you to give comments about the cleanup plan. We encourage you to participate. We will send an email reminder to you when the EPA plan is available for your comments.

Background

Below is some information intended to give you background on the issues surrounding the cleanup. The Portland Harbor Superfund site is a part of the lower Willamette River between the Broadway Bridge (just north of downtown Portland) and Sauvie Island. People live, work, and fish along the river. Some parts of the river are used for recreational activities such as boating and swimming. The lower Willamette River is also an important habitat for fish and wildlife and is culturally significant for several Native American tribes.

In 2000, Portland Harbor was named a Superfund site. Superfund sites are areas where toxic materials have been released into the environment at unacceptable levels. Over the past century, toxic materials (contaminants) were released into the water and onto the shoreline surrounding Portland Harbor. These chemicals stay in the river sediment (river mud) and don't break down for many years. The contaminants have been found in the sediment in many areas in the river and along the shoreline. The primary way people may be affected by the contamination is by eating fish that live in the river year-round such as bass, catfish and carp. These fish in Portland Harbor, called resident fish, carry levels of contaminants that may have significant health consequences. Health authorities have determined that it is unsafe for people to eat more than one meal of fish from the Portland Harbor (one meal is about the size of a deck of cards or half a pound) per month over a significant amount of time. Health authorities recommend that pregnant or nursing women and children should not eat any resident fish from Portland Harbor. The contaminants may also have an impact on the health of wildlife and their habitats. The cleanup is intended to make the river safer for people, fish, and wildlife. After many years of investigation, EPA will release a proposed cleanup plan in Spring 2016 and the public will have a chance to comment. The cleanup options in the EPA's proposed plan may include a combination of the following:

- removing contaminated sediments
- treating contaminated sediments in place
- covering or capping the contaminated sediments
- allowing new sediment to naturally cover the contaminated sediment over time

These cleanup options have a range of costs associated, ranging anywhere from \$800 million to \$2.5 billion. Superfund law is based on the idea that those responsible for the pollution pay for the cleanup. In this case, EPA has identified over 150 different companies and public entities that are potentially responsible for paying to clean up Portland Harbor. Some potentially responsible parties have stated that some of those costs may be passed on indirectly to consumers, ratepayers and taxpayers through higher prices, higher government costs or other means. After the cleanup plan is finalized, those potentially responsible parties negotiate with EPA to determine who will fund the site's cleanup. The City of Portland is one of those potentially responsible for paying for the cleanup.

The City also has a responsibility to represent the values of Portlanders regarding the cleanup. Once EPA has announced its preferred cleanup plan, there will be a 60 day comment period where any member of the public, including you, will have a chance to provide comments to EPA about the proposed plan.

Oregon's Kitchen Table is a program of the College of Urban and Public Affairs at Portland State University and was created by a group of non-partisan, non-profit community organizations dedicated to helping Oregonians have a voice. Oregon's Kitchen Table is a place for Oregonians to share their ideas, opinions, beliefs, and resources to improve Oregon and our communities.

Thank you for taking the time to answer the questions below. You may skip any questions you choose not to answer.³

Importance Ratings

1. There are a number of points of view on the cleanup. Below are some statements that reflect those different viewpoints. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Please only select one for each statement.

Response Category	Strongly Agree	Smwt Agree	Smwt Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
A. It is important to me to have the river be as clean as possible.	73%	22%	4%	1%	0%
B. It is important to me that any cleanup plan allows Portlanders to swim, boat, and play in the river.	67%	26%	5%	1%	1%
C. It is important to me that the cleanup minimizes costs to individual households in Portland.	47%	34%	13%	4%	2%
D. It is important to me that Portlanders can eat more resident fish from the river with fewer health concerns.	44%	34%	13%	7%	3%
E. It is important to me that the river is safe for fish and wildlife.	80%	18%	2%	0%	0%
F. It is important to me that the cleanup plan considers potential positive and/or negative impacts on jobs.	33%	39%	17%	8%	3%
G. It is important to me that the plan considers cleanup construction impacts (such as lights, noise, and air pollution) on the neighborhoods surrounding the Harbor during the cleanup.	27%	44%	20%	7%	2%
H. It is important to me to have the cleanup finished more quickly, even if it means that the cost increases.	12%	26%	38%	20%	4%

³ Because questions were optional, not all responses added up to the total number of survey participants (2,704).

Response Category	Strongly Agree	Smwt Agree	Smwt Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
I. It is important to me that the cleanup plan protects those who rely on eating resident fish from the river for food.	39%	32%	16%	9%	4%

2. Now you have the chance to share which of the points of view are most like yours. Which of the following statements do you agree with most? Please rank and pick your top 3 with 1 being the one you agree with most, 2 the second most, and 3 the next most.

Response Category	Agree Most	Second Most	Third Most
A. It is important to me to have the river be as clean as possible.	35%	15%	11%
B. It is important to me that any cleanup plan allows Portlanders to swim, boat, and play in the river.	12%	17%	20%
C. It is important to me that the cleanup minimizes costs to individual households in Portland.	12%	12%	15%
D. It is important to me that Portlanders can eat more resident fish from the river with fewer health concerns.	2%	6%	8%
E. It is important to me that the river is safe for fish and wildlife.	27%	29%	16%
F. It is important to me that the cleanup plan considers potential positive and/or negative impacts on jobs.	6%	7%	9%
G. It is important to me that the plan considers cleanup construction impacts (such as lights, noise, and air pollution) on the neighborhoods surrounding the Harbor during the cleanup.	1%	4%	8%
H. It is important to me to have the cleanup finished more quickly, even if it means that the cost increases.	2%	3%	5%
I. It is important to me that the cleanup plan protects those who rely on eating resident fish from the river for food.	3%	6%	9%

3. Some of the debate around the river cleanup is about cost versus degree of cleanup. The cleanup of the river will be costly and some potentially responsible parties have stated that some of those costs may be passed on indirectly to Portland households as consumers, ratepayers, and taxpayers through higher prices, higher government costs or other means. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements. Please only select one for each statement.

Response Category	Strongly Agree	Smwt Agree	Smwt Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
A. The river should be cleaned to as safe as possible for people, fish, and wildlife, even if some of the costs are passed on to Portland households.	32%	37%	17%	12%	2%
B. The river can never be entirely clean, and increases in the degree of safety for people, fish, and wildlife are not worth additional expenses passed onto Portland households.	10%	18%	27%	42%	3%

4. There are three main factors to consider in the cleanup plan: time, cost, and degree of cleanup. For each of the statements below, consider those three factors. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Please only select one for each statement.

Response Category	Strongly Agree	Smwt Agree	Smwt Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
A. The river should be cleaned up as much as possible for people, fish, and wildlife. This is the most important factor if it increases the cost or takes longer. (Degree of cleanup)	51%	29%	12%	8%	1%
B. The cleanup costs should be kept as low as possible, even if it means that the process takes longer and leaves some contamination. (Cost)	12%	22%	29%	35%	1%
C. The cleanup should occur as quickly as possible, even if it increases the cost and leaves some contamination. (Time)	5%	14%	39%	41%	2%
D. The cost, time and degree of cleanup are all important and should be balanced even if it means compromising in each area. (Balance of 3 factors)	20%	36%	25%	16%	3%

5. Portland Harbor has long been a site for industry and related jobs. Some of the 150 potentially responsible parties that EPA has identified to pay for the cleanup continue to operate in the Portland Harbor today. Please select which statement you agree with most, even if you don't agree with either statement entirely.

Response Category	Strongly Agree	Smwt Agree	Smwt Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
A. Industries contaminated the river and it is their responsibility to clean it up.	69%	25%	4%	2%	0%
B. Industries that rely on the river are important to the region's economy and jobs, and we should consider their needs in the cleanup plan.	22%	46%	20%	11%	1%

6. Right now, it is recommended that most adults eat only one meal a month of resident fish from the lower Willamette (and pregnant/nursing women and children should not eat any). A meal is about the size of a deck of cards (about half a pound for the average adult). Please select which statement you agree with the most, even if you don't agree with either one entirely.

Response Category	Strongly Agree	Smwt Agree	Smwt Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
A. Portlanders should be able to eat an increased amount of resident fish, even if it means spending more for cleanup.	27%	33%	22%	13%	5%
B. It's not worth large expenditures of money to allow for an increase in the amount of fish it would be safe to eat in a month.	18%	25%	26%	26%	5%

7. People live and work along the river and also use it for recreational activities such as fishing, boating, and swimming. People also rely on fish they've caught from this part of the river as a regular food source. After the cleanup, what uses of the river would be most important to you? Please rank the following 1-7, with 1 being the most important and 7 the least important.

Response Category	Top Box (1+2+3)	Mean	Don't know
A. Swimming	47%	3.9	0%

Response Category	Top Box (1+2+3)	Mean	Don't know
B. Recreational fishing	27%	4.6	0%
C. Eating resident fish	32%	4.6	0%
D. Beach access and recreation other than swimming or fishing	66%	3.1	0%
E. Industry	26%	4.9	0%
F. Job creation	37%	4.2	0%
G. Wildlife health and habitat	88%	1.8	0%

8. Please use this space to share anything else you'd like the City to know regarding the Portland Harbor cleanup. (Open)

Demographics

Now we want to ask you some questions about yourself so that we make sure we hear from the whole community. These questions are optional.

9. Do you live in any of the following communities?

Response Category	N=2,313	Raw Numbers
Linton	1%	15
St Johns	5%	111
Cathedral Park	1%	21
University Park	2%	45
Overlook	2%	57
Arbor Lodge	1%	33
Elliot	1%	20
Lloyd District	3%	78
Old Town/Chinatown	1%	13
Pearl	2%	49
Northwest District	5%	114
Northwest District/Industrial	1%	20
Northwest Industrial	1%	13
None of the above	75%	1,724

10. Age

Response Category	N=2,603	Raw Numbers
Under 18	0%	0
18-24	2%	57
25-34	10%	255
35-44	19%	507
45-54	21%	550
55-64	24%	632
65 and older	23%	602

11. What races/ethnicities do you consider yourself to be?⁴

Response Category	N=2,458	Raw Numbers
White/Caucasian	92%	2,265
White/Caucasian only and not any other race	87%	2,133
Black/African American/African/Caribbean	3%	71
Native American/American Indian/Native to Canada	4%	87
Asian/Pacific Islander	4%	88
Hispanic/Latino	5%	116
Middle Eastern/North African	1%	18

12. How do you identify your gender?

Response Category	N=2,571	Raw Numbers
Female	51%	1,319
Male	48%	1,240
Other	<1%	12

13. Which of the following do you do in/on Portland Harbor, or describe your relationship to Portland Harbor?

Response Category	N=2,598	Raw Numbers
Value Portland Harbor for its cultural significance	56%	1,466
Access the beach or recreate other than swimming or fishing	50%	1,288
Boating in Portland Harbor	33%	854
Live within a half mile of Portland Harbor	17%	443
Swim in Portland Harbor	17%	436
Recreational fishing	12%	317
Work on Portland Harbor	6%	167
Eating resident fish from Portland Harbor	5%	136
Other	10%	247
None of the above	12%	305

⁴ Respondents were able to select any that applied, including providing a description in their own words (open ended). Percentages will not then add up to 100%.