

PortlandTribune

Tuesday, January 23, 2018 • portlandtribune.com





Terminal 4's long-delayed toxic remediation gets rolling

By STEVE LAW The Tribune

The Port of Portland has reached a preliminary agreement with the **U.S. Environmental Protection** Agency to resume Superfund cleanup work at Terminal 4, its busiest marine terminal, contaminated decades ago.

It's one of three major cleanups at Superfund sites that appear to be finally moving forward after several years of studies and delays. The Terminal 4 agreement, announced Jan. 11, comes a year after the EPA released its final \$1 billion cleanup plan for a polluted 10-mile stretch of the Willamette River known as the Portland Harbor Super-

The Trump administration has tilted the EPA in an industry-friendly direction, and is promising to be more flexible in how it works with companies on the hook to pay for cleanup costs. The federal agency also appears anxious to get cleanup moving in the Portland Harbor, which was named a Superfund site in 2000. News of the three cleanup projects advancing came shortly after Albert "Kell" Kelly, EPA Director Scott Pruitt's point man for the Superfund, came to Portland to meet with local business, government, environmental and tribal leaders.

The EPA's efforts to get the cleanup going suits the Port of Portland which. like many other Superfund property owners, is anxious to finish the work and get on with regular business.

"Cleanups don't usually get any cheaper over time," said Jessica Hamil-ton, the port harbor environmental di-

Terminal 4 seemed a good place to move forward, Hamilton said, because it's clearly a Port of Portland responsibility, and the polluted parts of the terminal are off the main river current, so there are fewer concerns about polluted sediments gravitating into the area after it's done with cleanup.

The port already has spent \$22 million cleaning up Terminal 4, but stopped work in 2012 so EPA could finalize its cleanup plan, known as its

Record of Decision. The port, a key player elsewhere in the Portland Harbor, also wanted to show some leadership for the 140 or so "potentially responsible parties" on the hook to pay for the Superfund cleanup,



COURTESY PHOTO: PORT OF PORTLAND Diagram shows past work at the two slips at Terminal 4 and at Wheeler Bay. Dredging the river bottom is much more expensive than capping contaminants in place.



An aerial view shows part of Terminal 4, the Port of Portland's most active marine terminal. The Port is negotiating with the EPA on a cleanup plan to remove contamination introduced decades ago into the water.

"We can show that you can actually move forward with a cleanup and get some finality around that," she said. This feels like the right first step for

Other cleanups moving ahead

EPA talks also have moved forward with NW Natural on the Gasco site, which is perhaps the most contaminated site in the Portland Harbor, as well as a group working to clean up River Mile 11 East that includes the city of Portland, Cargill Inc., CBS Corp., DIL

'I think all of these are welcome news," said Travis Williams, executive director of Willamette Riverkeeper, a nonprofit environmental advocacy

However, Williams and other environmentalists, as well as Native American tribes, were critical of the sampling plan approved last month by the EPA, which will serve as a guidepost from which to measure the effectiveness of cleanups. Among other limitations, the

See CI FAMID / Dade 9

PPS staff may have violated elections law

Public workers taken to task urging yes vote on Measure

By SHASTA KEARNS MOORE The Tribune

A Portland Public Schools decision to cize the result of a Jan. 9 vote of the boar education may have run afoul of election

A newsletter sent Jan. 17 to about 58,0 ents, students and community members no school board's unanimous decision to urge to pass Ballot Measure 101. It links to a page PPS website with quotes from board me about why they feel the measure is important to pass.

A Jan. 9 tweet by Harry Esteve, director of strategic communications and outreach at PPS, also noted the decision.

The Secretary of State's handbook on restrictions on political campaigning by public employ-ees states that if there is a decision by a political body on a ballot item, no public employee time may be used to prepare or promote that decision.

The d'Amico was

docked at Slip 3 in the Port of

Terminal 4 last

Thursday. The

about 300 days

a year, largely

to export soda

ash hauled here

Saskatchewan,

TRIBUNE PHOTO:

from

Canada.

slip is used

Portland's

A public employee may not, according 16 of the handbook, "include the vote or posithe governing body in a jurisdiction newsle other publication.'

One exception would be if the public emp as part of their regular job duties, regularly cized neutral lists of the outcomes of all of risdiction's votes

Neither the PPS Pulse newsletter nor Es Twitter account noted any other decisions that night, which included a corrective action for botched financial statements, a compla peal and various items on the business a according to the board materials.

Debra Royal, chief of staff for Secretary of Dennis Richardson, declined comment other to say that the Elections Division would i gate if it receives a complaint.

Chief Petitioner for Ballot Measure 101 Parrish, said she believes the school distri lated elections law, but that it's not the mos gious she's heard of in her campaign to ge the health insurance tax.

Parrish said school staffers at Beaverton District forwarded her a Dec. 18 all-staff

See PPS

Oregon joins lawsuit over ne neutrality repe

21 states sue FCC over cha that disrupts internet traffic

By PARIS ACHEN Capital Bureau

Oregon has joined 20 other states and the trict of Columbia in launching a legal challe the Federal Communications Commission sion Dec. 14 to repeal a rule barring intern viders from blocking or charging more for to one website over another.

The complaint, filed Tuesday, Jan. 16, in t Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C., as court to overturn the decision to repeal "n trality" and to find it unlawful. The suit that the decision by the FCC was an abuse cretion and that it violated the U.S. Const and the Communications Act of 1934.

Furthermore, attorneys general of the argue that the action conflicted with notic

comment rule-making requirements. Other plaintiffs in the case are the att