

Oregon Solutions-Columbia Levee Improvement Project  
**Technical Advisory Sub-Committee (TASC)**

**August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2015**  
**2:00-2:30 pm**

**Revised Draft Meeting Notes**

**Meeting Participants:**

*Steering Committee:* Mike Stuhr

*TASC Members:* Christine Shirley, Jason McBane, Mandy O'Hara (phone), Mike Moran, Kimberly Tallant, Nancy Hendrickson, Tom Braibish (phone)

*Facilitation Team:* Rick Mogren, Nicole Savara-Brown

*Other Attendees:* Bob Salinger, Kaitlin Lovell

**Meeting Objectives:**

- To review and discuss the draft statement of work for the environmental assessment as presented by the Environmental Assessment Subcommittee.

**Next Steps:**

- Reconvene the Environmental Assessment Subcommittee to review comments made during the meeting and develop a final draft scope of work.
- Convene the Economic Subcommittee to review and finalize the draft cope of work for the economic assessment.

**Meeting Summary:**

*Old Business:*

- Meeting notes from the July 20<sup>th</sup> TASC meeting were approved with no edits.
- Sara Morrissey, who was unable to attend this meeting, provided a written outline of updates on activities discussed at the last meeting that were shared with meeting participants.
  - Funding: The IFA approved 3.5 million dollars in loans. Sara is working on finalizing the IGAs.

- The economic subcommittee has not met yet. An earlier draft statement of work has been circulated to TASC members with individuals responding and commenting. NERC has taken those comments into consideration and revised the draft statement of work accordingly. The economic subcommittee will need to meet to review the statement of work and present it to the full TASC for approval.
- At the last TASC meeting, the TASC agreed to the “Option 2040.” This option was presented at the last Administrative Subcommittee meeting. It was also forwarded via email by Steve Greenwood for review and comment by OST members. Once Steve returns, the comments will be compiled and distributed.
- Encroachment evaluations: Of 35 structures identified for review, 20 have been completed.
- A copy of Sara’s status report is attached.

**New Business:**

- Kaitlin and Nancy presented the draft environmental assessment SOW as developed at the environmental assessment subcommittee meeting:
  - The subcommittee decided that the assessment should be prepared as an environmental baseline as opposed to merely inventorying existing conditions. This will make the results more usable in the event regulatory consultations prove necessary and would avoid rework.
  - The intent is to draw needed information from existing documents.
  - The subcommittee recommends that that inventory’s boundaries be bounded by the Oregon border to the north (center of Columbia River), the Sandy River delta to the east, the southern edge of the Columbia Slough to the south, and the west bank of the Willamette River to the west.
- The TASC participants agreed to the boundaries as proposed, to focus on existing documents, and to orient the report on the environmental baseline.
- Mandy recommended the southern boundary be the southern edge of the Columbia Slough watershed, as opposed to just the slough itself.
- Christine Shirley recommended that the authors or organizations of any documents used in developing the environmental assessment report be invited to review the draft report to ensure their findings and conclusions are properly represented.
- It was also suggested to develop a list of potential reviewing agencies for the final product.
- 3<sup>rd</sup> party consultant would be best for the research due to multiple parties being involved and in the interest of objectivity.

- OST or the Administrative Subcommittee needs to decide who would pick up contract officer responsibilities.
- Bob Salinger suggested that the environmental inventory SOW be further developed with better focus, background, and statement of goals, similar to the structure and format of the economic inventory statement of work. Bob suggested these documents be parallel in structure.
- The Environmental Assessment subcommittee will reconvene to take these comments into account and revise the draft SOW accordingly.

**Next TASC Meeting:** September 21, 2015

**Attachment:** Sara's Status Report

## ATTACHMENT

### Oregon Solutions – Levee Ready Columbia Technical Advisory Sub-Committee (TASC)

Sara Morrissey, Program Manager, project update for Monday August 17, 2015 TASC meeting:

#### **Funding**

Friday morning (August 14) the Business Oregon Infrastructure Finance Authority board approved the project proposal from Multnomah County for a \$3.5 M loan to begin the levee engineering assessments (and other associated work) in MCDD and SDIC. This loan is being proposed to be backed by multiple project partners. I am now working with the project legal subcommittee to finish the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) paperwork. The IGA and project proposal will be presented to multiple jurisdictions / agencies over the next month to sign on as loan backers. This includes: the Multnomah County Commission (August 18), City of Troutdale (August 25), City of Fairview (Sept. 2), Portland City Council (Sept. 9) and others. This means that we are one step closer to finalizing the funding for this next round of work.

#### **Economic SOW**

NERC has adjusted their scope of work to move away from ‘case studies’ as a way to capture accreditation impacts to doing a financial impact analysis if the area is remapped as a special flood hazard area and what the impacts to property owners are through mandatory flood insurance requirements. I have attached the revised scope to this email – can you please distribute it to the TASC. Additionally, NERC received comments from multiple TASC members and have responded – see below.

□ ***Andy Cotugno, Metro Comments:*** The main measures of economic activity in this analysis are jobs, wages, business revenues, tax revenues and financial impact of flood insurance in the event of non-accreditation. However, the airport alone is probably one of the single biggest economic drivers in the study area. Raw data of air cargo and passenger volumes should be included with the economic magnitude measured in some fashion (like dollar value of air cargo and share of passengers that are business travelers). Similarly, is there any way of quantifying the economic value of the truck activity at Jubitz?

□ ***NERC Response to Andy Cotugno:*** Economic activities at the airport and at Jubitz are captured as part of the jobs, wages, business revenues, etc. in the area. They are captured and coded according to their NAICS (industry), and then the overall impact to the region's economy is estimated accordingly. For example, air cargo and passenger volumes support the employment in the airport, so we would not want to double count the economic contributions. We are planning to examine other studies that have looked specifically at the airport's economic impact and will include any useful information in our analysis as well.

□ ***Hossein Parandvash, Portland Water Bureau Comments:*** The Columbia South Shore Well Fields and the Wellhead Protection Area have to be considered in two ways in the economic analysis. The wells are used as an emergency source during high demand in summer as well as high turbidity events in the Bull Run source that can coincide with Columbia River flood event. First, the impact on the assets, which include wells, equipment, pipes, and properties, as a result of failure of the levee should be estimated. Second, the impact on PWB customers as a result of the PWB not being able to deliver water and meet the demand and the loss of revenue to the PWB. The extent of the impacts obviously depends on how long it would take for the PWB to recover the well fields.

□ ***NERC Response to Hossein Parandvash:*** This would be beyond the scope of our study. If the Water Bureau would be able to provide some quantification of potential losses if the levee is not accredited, we may be able to utilize their numbers in our analysis.

□ ***Steve Kounz, Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Comments:***

1. Export/traded sector activity. Distribution and manufacturing are the predominant business sectors in the Columbia Corridor, relative to other business districts, and their output is predominantly sold outside of the region. I think that the IMPLAN data being analyzed includes measures of output sold outside of the region. State, regional, and local economic development strategies prioritize this traded sector activity as a key driver of regional prosperity. The airport also has a specific role in supporting exporters throughout the region.

2. Impacts on income distribution and economic equity. Jobs and forecast job growth in the Columbia Corridor and other industrial areas in the region are predominantly middle-wage jobs, which are declining in the overall economy. Continuing job growth in this geography has important distributive and equity roles that support an economically diverse community and reduce neighborhood and racial income disparities. Using the QCEW data being reviewed, payroll could potentially be analyzed by quartiles or similar measure of wage distribution to recognize these distributive impacts. US Census LEHD data also reveal that Columbia Corridor workers tend to live in the more racially diverse and moderate-income neighborhoods east of I- 205. Census data also reveal that the share of Multnomah County workers in blue collar occupations is much higher for workers of color than white workers. Here's a link to some recent research we've done at BPS on this topic. The Columbia Corridor and adjacent Portland Harbor also have a unique economic role as Oregon's multimodal freight infrastructure hub linked to associated freight terminals and rail/runway-access facilities in the district. The infrastructure analysis in the draft scope appears to be already getting at these attributes.

□ ***NERC Response to Steve Kounz:*** I think that most of this is already covered in the SOW, particularly highlighting the distribution/manufacturing sector which is

prominent in the Corridor. Although the income distribution/economic equity is very important and interesting, it does appear to be outside the objectives of this SOW. It could be a very interesting study to be done separately.

□ ***Port of Portland Comments:***

1. Rest of state impacts – Oregon (and southwestern Washington) depend on PDX and the freight facilities located within the districts. Any additional costs or any business disruptions would be felt not only within the metro area, but throughout the state.

2. As Andy points out with Jubitz, there is more than just DCs/logistics operations in the districts. Most of region's freight handling facilities, including forwarders/brokers, etc., are located in the Columbia Corridor. We should look at broadening NAICS codes to closely align with all the freight activities in this geography.

3. Industrial land access – In a constrained industrial land market if some/all existing firms were to try to relocate, given the supply of available industrial land, could we accommodate that? TRIP (Troutdale-Reynolds Industrial Park), the Port's business park adjacent to Troutdale Airport is a critical source of industrial land, particularly large lot. How/where can we accommodate this if that land was not able to develop for industrial purposes? What happens if we cannot accommodate these relocations and greenfield sites while also accommodating the expected demand for industrial land from other sources? Can that be addressed in this scope?

□ ***NERC Response to Port Comments:*** Rest of state impacts are captured as part of the IMPLAN economic impact modeling already. All of the NAICS codes that exist within the region will be captured accordingly, the scope highlights distribution as requested by MCDD, but if there are any other major economic contributors when we conduct the study, we will highlight them as well. Finally, industrial land access and the ability to accommodate expected demand is probably more appropriately studied in a separate industrial land supply and demand analysis.

**Climate Change – 2040 or 2080?**

Steve Greenwood sent an email to the full Oregon Solutions team on August 6th requesting that they review the TASC recommendation regarding which climate change model to use. The email read the following:

***Decision Needed.*** *Since we have a few weeks between now and the next meeting there is a time-sensitive recommendation for your consideration from the Technical Advisory Subcommittee (TASC) around the approach to the climate change model.*

*At the July 20th TASC Meeting USGS and USACE staff presented their proposal for modeling climate change with two options for the TASC to consider. The TASC recommends starting with a model that projects climate impacts to 2059, and then determining whether to model further out. This recommendation appeared to recognize the following benefits of the 2030-2059 approach:*

- Developing alternatives for levee improvements is time-sensitive and modeling which goes out to the year 2100 could more than double the project's timeline (12 months+ to a 12-month timeline).*
- Climate change models tend to increase in uncertainty the farther they are modeled out. A model that goes beyond 2059 may have too much uncertainty to base significant infrastructure decisions.*

*Attached find draft notes from our July 20, 2015 TASC meeting as well as the written proposal from USGS and USACE for further details.*

*After reviewing the recommendation and accompanying attachments, please indicate by email to me by **Friday August 13, either:***

- Yes--I am OK moving forward with the TASC's recommendation to utilize the 2030-2059 data model.*
- No--after reviewing the USGS/USACE proposal I have some questions or concerns that require further discussion.*

*This is a time sensitive issue as the modeling may take up to 1 year or more. Additionally, USACE technical staff have set aside resources to start the project this fiscal year (which begins in Sept. 2015), and if there are delays in the acceptance of the proposal, it could impact the project timeline.*

I have not yet heard from Steve about whether or not he has received emails on a decision on whether to move forward with the TASC recommendation of the 2040 model or that it requires additional discussion. As soon as I hear from Steve I'll update the group.

### **Encroachment Evaluations**

- Of the 35 structures being surveyed, 20 have been completed (5 of 8 in PEN 1; 15 of 27 in PEN 2).
- We are awaiting on one more property owner for 4 total buildings to be surveyed. Otherwise all permission has been granted and survey work should be complete by next week.
- The project manager from the District will pull records from the City of Portland to supplement survey information if necessary.
- Once all of the survey information has been collected it will be sent to Mackenzie, who are putting together cross-sections for each structure. The cross-

sections will capture the structure location and where it sits relative to the levee design section and overbuild.

The work has also created an updated contact list for property owners in the area. This will allow for the District to share information with property owners in a more efficient manner. This will also be helpful for future emergency operations and management work.