From:	Schuster, Cindy
To:	Oken-Berg, Jake (Merkley)
Cc:	Deveny, Adrian (Merkley); Ward, Rebecca (Merkley); Brown, Timothy (Merkley); Schuster, Cindy
Subject:	PH Feasibility Study
Date:	Tuesday, October 27, 2015 8:28:25 AM

Hi Jake,

I'm glad that you got the links to the Feasibility Study. Our remedial program manager says that we have no later public documents, so no additional materials that she would suggest.

--Cindy

From: Oken-Berg, Jake (Merkley) [mailto:Jake_Oken-Berg@merkley.senate.gov]

Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 4:22 PM

To: Schuster, Cindy

Cc: Deveny, Adrian (Merkley); Ward, Rebecca (Merkley); Brown, Timothy (Merkley)

Subject: RE: EPA Update and Reminder: Call today on Portland Harbor

Hi Cindy,

Alanna Conley sent us this link:

Non-Responsive

If there are any additional materials we should have, please let us know.

Thanks!

-Jake

From: Schuster, Cindy [mailto:Schuster.Cindy@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 4:19 PM
To: Oken-Berg, Jake (Merkley)
Cc: Deveny, Adrian (Merkley); Ward, Rebecca (Merkley)
Subject: RE: EPA Update and Reminder: Call today on Portland Harbor

Jake, I was unexpectedly away from the office until today and will check on this tomorrow.

--Cindy Schuster

From: Oken-Berg, Jake (Merkley) [mailto:Jake_Oken-Berg@merkley.senate.gov]

Sent: Monday, October 19, 2015 2:04 PM

To: Schuster, Cindy

Cc: Deveny, Adrian (Merkley); Ward, Rebecca (Merkley)

Subject: RE: EPA Update and Reminder: Call today on Portland Harbor

Hi Cindy,

Can you email me the EPA's Feasibility Study for the Portland Harbor?

Best,

Jake

From: Schuster, Cindy [mailto:Schuster.Cindy@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, August 05, 2015 7:29 AM
To: (Merkley) Adrian Deveny; Oken-Berg, Jake (Merkley); Bittleman, Sarah (Wyden); Fauerbach, Erin (Wyden); Egler, Jacob (Wyden); (Blumenauer) Liv Brumfield; (Bonamici) Sarah Round; (Schrader) Chris Huckleberry; (Blumenauer) Julia Pomeroy; (Blumenauer) Stephanie Phillips; (Blumenauer) Willie Smith; (Bonamici) Kristin Rasmussen; (Bonamici) Russ Kelley; Baumann, Jeremiah (Merkley); Stevens, Jessica (Merkley); Neal, Grace (Wyden); Gautreaux, Mary (Wyden); (Bonamici) Elvia Gaona; (Schrader) Suzanne Kunse
Cc: Levine, Carolyn; Barber, Anthony; Schuster, Cindy
Subject: EPA Update and Reminder: Call today on Portland Harbor

Good morning. This is a reminder of the EPA conference call today with congressional staff to discuss

the Portland Harbor feasibility study and the process leading to the proposed cleanup plan:

Wednesday, August 5, 12:30 pm PT/3:30 pm ET

Call-in number: Non-Responsive

Code: Non-Responsive

Region 10 Remedial Program Manager Cami Grandinetti will provide the update, and we plan on 30 minutes, with additional time if there are many questions. For EPA, Congressional Team Leader Carolyn Levine, Remedial Project Manager Kristine Koch, Oregon Operations Director Anthony Barber, and Public Affairs Director Marianne Holsman also plan to be on the line. I understand that these participants plan to be on the line for the congressional offices:

Senator Merkley's office--

Adrian Deveny

Jake Oken-Berg

Senator Wyden's office--

Sarah Bittleman

Erin Fauerbach

Jacob Egler

Congressman Blumenauer's office--

Liv Brumfield

Congresswoman Bonamici's office--

Sarah Round

Elvia Gaona

Congressman Schrader's office--

Chris Huckleberry

Below is a Portland Harbor update that was sent to stakeholders last night and may be helpful background for the call today. We look forward to talking to you soon.

With my regards,

Cindy

Cindy Colgate Schuster
Congressional Coordinator
International Coordinator
U.S. EPA Region 10
Seattle, WA
206-553-1815

****

Portland Harbor Update

EPA will soon share the final two sections of its draft Portland Harbor Feasibility Study (FS) with the groups that have been working closely with the EPA on the development of the cleanup plan for Portland Harbor: the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, six tribes, the Natural Resource Trustees, the Community Advisory Group and the Lower Willamette Group.

Sections 3 and 4 of the FS detail the toxins that need to be addressed, the sites where those toxins pose the greatest risks, the five alternatives for addressing the risks at each site, and the costs of the alternatives.

EPA expects to release a proposed cleanup plan for public review and comment in the spring of 2016, but there are several internal review steps to complete before releasing the Proposed Plan.

First, EPA will present a *Conceptual Remedy* to the **National Remedy Review Board** and the

Contaminated Sediment Technical Advisory Group for internal review prior to issuing the Proposed Plan. This step is required for sites like Portland Harbor where cleanup will cost more than $50 million. The NRRB and CSTAG reviews ensure national consistency with the law, EPA policies and guidance, and take into consideration past practice at sites of similar magnitude.

The LWG, ODEQ, the tribes, trustees and the CAG can provide input to the NRRB and CSTAG on the *Conceptual Remedy*, which the EPA will share on **September 18**.

The NRRB and CSTAG are then scheduled to review the *Conceptual Remedy* and comments from the parties on **November 18 and 19** in Portland, Oregon.

At that point, the EPA site team will use the recommendations from the NRRB and CSTAG in developing the *Proposed Plan*. The *Proposed Plan* will go through the full Superfund public comment process once it is released in the **spring of 2016**.

What do Sections 3 and 4 of the Feasibility Study cover?

Section 3 of the FS focuses on the pollution that must be addressed, where that pollution is and the alternatives for cleaning it up.

Specifically Section 3

- Addresses reducing the risks from sediments contaminated with more than 40 toxic chemicals and compounds including: polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), total polycylic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), dioxins/furans, and the pesticide DDT and its by-products, DDE and DDD.
- Identifies and addresses Principal Threat Waste (PTW), including pure chemical product seeping from the sediments within the site, as well as highly contaminated sediments;
- Addresses contaminated groundwater seeping into the river; and
- Presents five different cleanup alternatives the EPA is evaluating.

EPA's evaluation of cleanup alternatives is focused on reducing the risk to people over the long term through achievable cleanup goals. When developing the final alternatives, EPA will consider the environmental conditions of the river, and the current and potential future uses (industrial, recreational, etc.) of a particular site. To the degree possible, EPA will also seek to limit restrictions on sites. For example:

- Appropriate beach material will be placed in sediment cleanup locations that serve as public access points for recreation or wildlife habitat.
- EPA will consider limiting the use of caps in locations where commercial and shipping activities occur.
- EPA will also consider future navigation and maintenance dredging when determining the appropriate cleanup technology.

Section 4 of the FS will include cost estimates of the cleanup alternatives, as well as an evaluation against seven of the nine criteria required under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, also known as the Superfund law. Two of the criteria – state and tribal acceptance and community acceptance will be evaluated during EPA's review of the public comments.

This long process isn't over yet, but the end is in sight! All the parties are working toward the same goal, which is a cleaner, healthier Willamette River.

Thank you!