



Health Department
MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

Office of the Director

426 SW Stark Street, 8th Floor
Portland, Oregon 97204
(503) 988-3674 phone
(503) 988-4117 fax

DATE: July 20, 2012

TO: Susan Anderson, Director, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

FROM: Lillian Shirley, Director, Multnomah County Health Department

Lillian Shirley

CC: Joe Zehnder, Chief Planner, Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
Eric Engstrom, Principal Planner, Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
Jonna Papaefthimiou, Policy Advisor, Portland Mayor's Office
Jeff Cogen, Chair, Multnomah County
Elizabeth Clapp, Research Analyst, Multnomah County Health Department
Moriah M. McGrath, Research Analyst, Multnomah County Health Department

RE: "West Hayden Island Planning Project, Health Summary" (June 18th memo)

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input about the potential health impacts of annexation and development of West Hayden Island (WHI). The changes proposed for Hayden Island are likely to have significant impacts on the community's physical, environmental, and economic health. Providing expertise to help decision-makers who are weighing these impacts is a core function of the Multnomah County Health Department.

On June 18, the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability requested guidance from Multnomah County regarding the health impacts of annexing and zoning West Hayden Island. After an extensive nationwide review of best practices in planning and health assessment; and after reviewing public input and consulting with island residents and City staff, we recommend the following:

- 1. In conjunction with the City of Portland annexation of the property, the Economic, Social, Environmental, and Energy (ESEE) analysis should be revised to include further assessment of health impacts.**



The Oregon Land Use System has established the ESEE as a standard protocol for assessing the potential consequences of proposed development. We recommend revision of the June 15th draft ESEE to address key health issues detailed in section 2 below. Expanding the health assessment within the ESEE will integrate health considerations into the decision-making framework and build on the assessment and community engagement work that has been completed to date. For this reason, we do not recommend a separate Health Impact Assessment be conducted prior to the annexation hearing. The ESEE framework allows for an analysis that achieves the key components of the HIA framework: identification of health impacts (including social determinants of health) and their distribution among populations, recommendations for mitigation, and public input about the assessment.

We suggest the City enters into the Intergovernmental Agreement with the Port after the ESEE revision is completed and appropriate mitigations are included based on the assessment findings, and that special attention is given to community input about the agreement.

2. The revised ESEE should address the following information gaps.

While a wide variety of information has already been collected in preparation for the annexation hearing, additional information will be necessary to more comprehensively assess health impacts. We recommend that the ESEE be revised to incorporate the issues outlined below; completing this assessment within six months should be feasible.

2.1. Gaps in assessment of existing conditions

- 2.1.1. Redevelopment projects: include the anticipated impacts of the Columbia River Crossing and Jantzen Beach shopping center redevelopment projects.
- 2.1.2. Background noise/vibration and air quality: incorporate current baseline conditions when determining the likely impacts of port development.
- 2.1.3. Demographics: information from Attachment A of “West Hayden Island Health Impacts Update” (Eric Engstrom memo, June 14th) along with educational attainment and employment status of current residents

2.2. Other assessment gaps

- 2.2.1. Geographic scope: Hayden Island should be the primary scope. However, nearby North Portland and Clark County, Washington populations should be included in the assessment because of the possibility that they may experience noise/vibration, air quality, and vehicle congestion as a result of development on West Hayden Island.
- 2.2.2. Projected demographics: socioeconomic composition of the population at the expected time of port development, using the Metroscope model or other data
 - 2.2.2.1. age
 - 2.2.2.2. ethnicity
 - 2.2.2.3. race
 - 2.2.2.4. housing status

- 2.2.2.5. educational attainment
- 2.2.2.6. employment status
- 2.2.2.7. income
- 2.2.3. Air quality data: use information provided in “West Hayden Island Conceptual Development Air Quality Analysis” (Port of Portland paper, June 26th)
- 2.2.4. Transportation
 - 2.2.4.1. modeling of multi-modal level of service (i.e., congestion for all travel modes)
 - 2.2.4.2. projection of potential collisions between cars, trucks, pedestrians, and bicycles
 - 2.2.4.3. availability of active transportation resources
- 2.2.5. Distinctive housing types: manufactured homes and floating homes
 - 2.2.5.1. literature review and/or field research about housing-related health conditions
 - 2.2.5.2. literature review and/or field research about economic vulnerability (including fluctuating values and resale/relocation issues)
- 2.2.6. Synergistic impacts: literature review about the effects of simultaneous exposure to noise/vibration, light, and air pollution
 - 2.2.6.1. Include cumulative impacts of both port operations and the transportation of goods via rail, truck, and barge to and from the port.
- 2.2.7. Community dynamics: literature review about community cohesion in contexts with limited public facilities (like Hayden Island)

Because most of this assessment entails synthesis of existing information rather than the collection of new data, we believe that BPS would be able to complete this analysis in 2012. Multnomah County Health Department staff will be available to assist BPS with the above scope of work for a total of 208 hours through the end of 2012.

3. Health Impact Assessment (HIA) tools should be employed to inform future decisions about development on West Hayden Island.

The ESEE is the best assessment tool for the annexation decision.

A Health Impact Assessment is similar to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) assessment process, however, the scope of human health issues addressed in an EIS is generally limited. For future decisions about development, HIA tools allow additional flexibility for evaluating health impacts in greater depth, engaging stakeholders, and evaluating a proposed decision’s impacts on social determinants of health and health equity.

Because of the substantial health impacts likely to result from any future industrial development of West Hayden Island, we recommend that HIA tools be used within the EIS process to help assure that the review of any port

development plan effectively considers community health impacts. The Multnomah County Health Department should be designated a Participating Agency in the EIS for proposed port development.¹

Please do not hesitate to contact me, Moriah McSharry McGrath (503.988.3663 x24021), or Elizabeth Clapp (x25844) with questions or comments. We look forward to our continued collaboration on assuring the public's health through effective community planning.

¹ A useful discussion about how to coordinate HIA with an EIS is presented in Human Impact Partners' "Frequently Asked Questions about Integrating Health Impact Assessment into Environmental Impact Assessment," available at <http://www.humanimpact.org/component/jdownloads/finish/11/42>.



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

MEMO

DATE: July 25, 2012

TO: Lillian Shirley, Director, Multnomah County Health Department

FROM: Susan Anderson, Director, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

CC: Eric Engstrom, BPS Principal Planner; Joe Zehnder, Chief Planner; Jonna Papaefthimiou, Policy Advisor, Mayor's Office

RE: West Hayden Island Planning Project, Health Assessment

Thank you for your response to our request to review the health information we collected for the West Hayden Island Project. We agree with your suggested approach of integrating health information into established decision-making tools, such as the ESEE. Staff will be working over the next few weeks to outline an approach. Our goal is to have a draft scope of work with defined staff roles and a project timeline by August 1.

Our thinking is to complete an initial literature review and additional fact-finding in August. We will then host a technical work session with our Project Advisory Committee in September to review the work and respond to questions. We would use this review opportunity to invite technical experts such as colleagues from Oregon Public Health Institute and Upstream Public Health to offer their feedback. Work sessions like this for other technical documents throughout the WHI planning process have been well-received as a way to vet staff and consultant reports with our Advisory Committee and the general public. After that, we would make recommended refinements, and present the work to the Planning and Sustainability Commission in October.

Thank you for the time you and MCHD staff have spent on this project thus far. I appreciate the partnership on this health report and look forward to collaborating on future efforts.



City of Portland, Oregon | Bureau of Planning and Sustainability | www.portlandonline.com/bps

1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100, Portland, OR 97201 | phone: 503-823-7700 | fax: 503-823-7800 | tty: 503-823-6868

Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.

West Hayden Island Proposed Draft Health Report Schedule and Assigned Tasks

On July 20, 2012, the Multnomah County Health Department (MCHD) provided a memo to BPS with their recommendation moving forward to complete a health impact report. BPS and MCHD staff met on July 24, 2012 to discuss the memo and next steps. The summary below details tasks, assigned roles, and timeline.

Step 1: Complete Scoping of Report and Work Plan (Timeline: 7/23- 8/5)

- a) Confirm agreement on scope and staff hours - MCHD and BPS
- b) Send Scope to AC – BPS
- c) Discuss potential roles with Oregon Public Health Institute (OPHI) and Upstream Public Health – BPS
- d) Identify and contact AC subcommittee members – BPS

Step 2: Complete Basic Data Collection and Outline/Framework (Timeline: 8/6 – 8/17)

- a) Edit existing health packet to eliminate duplication of materials – BPS (Rachael)
- b) Meet with DEQ to confirm air shed geography and discuss interpretation of available Air Quality information. This is based on information provided in “West Hayden Island Conceptual Development Air Quality Analysis” (Port of Portland paper, June 26th) and Port of Vancouver air quality analysis. BPS will get feedback from DEQ on August 1st on current baseline conditions and DEQ’s capacity to assist with this task and describe cumulative impacts.– BPS and MCHD
- c) Meet with PBOT to discuss/confirm interpretation of traffic analysis, Q&A. Agree on best summary material to include with health analysis. Note: current traffic report assumes CRC, mall redevelopment, Port development. – BPS and MCHD
- d) Confirm Geography: Hayden Island should be the primary scope. However, nearby North Portland and Clark County, Washington populations should be included in the assessment because of the possibility that they may experience noise/vibration, air quality, and vehicle congestion as a result of development on West Hayden Island. – BPS (Uma)
- e) Demographics: expand current demographics to new geography, and to include educational attainment and employment data – BPS (Uma)
- f) Estimate population and socioeconomic conditions in 2035 for the study geography, from Metroscope model and City scenario models being used for the Comprehensive plan. If possible, include what we know about age, ethnicity, race, housing status, educational attainment, employment status, income – BPS (Tom, Kevin, Uma)
- g) Receive report from Noise Consultant, with baseline noise data. (Expected by 8/6) – BPS (Rachael)
- h) Produce timeline and narrative explaining the sequencing of CRC, mall development, and Port development to establish context for cumulative impacts. Include summary information about the vision for potential Hayden Island redevelopment from recent plan. – BPS (Rachael)

- i) Produce maps of existing and expected (2035) sidewalk and bike lane networks in study area – assuming CRC, expected Mall redevelopment, and NHID reconstruction. – BPS and PBOT (Rachael, Kevin)
- j) Attend Planning and Sustainability Commission briefing. (August 14) – BPS and MCHD

Step 3: Literature Review and Analysis (Timeline: 8/6 – 9/7/2012)

- a) Identify the determinants of health that may be impacted by mall redevelopment, CRC, and other non-Port changes expected by 2035 to establish context for cumulative analysis - MCHD
- b) Based on demographic information provided above and relevant literature, summarize the likely health issues faced by the existing population and identify vulnerabilities related to expected Port impacts – MCHD
- c) Can MCHD assist with this research on vibration as we do not have background information on vibration?
- d) Literature review on noise, vibration, and air quality with an emphasis on data related to rail operations, ship emissions, and track traffic. Summarize key literature and relate to baseline data and WHI projections. – MCHD
- e) Based on traffic studies and PBOT data, develop assumptions for the number of additional collisions that could occur from the additional Port traffic. – BPS, PBOT
- f) Literature review on the impact that active transportation availability may have on health. Summarize key literature and relate to assumed transportation network changes on Hayden island. (CRC, LRT, new street network with mall redevelopment, sidewalks with reconstruction of NHID). – BPS
- g) Impact of manufactured homes and floating homes on health context: 1) conduct a literature review and/or field research about housing related health conditions likely to impact this community, 2) conduct a literature review and/or field research about economic vulnerability (including fluctuating values and resale/relocation issues. – MCHD
- h) Synergistic impacts: 1) Literature review about the effects of simultaneous exposure to noise/vibration, light, and air pollution, 2) Include cumulative impacts of both port operations and the transportation of goods via rail, truck, and barge to and from the port. – MCHD
- i) Community dynamics: literature review about community cohesion in contexts with limited public facilities, like Hayden Island. – MCHD
- j) Employment impacts: Literature review and prepare brief summary of how employment impacts health outcomes –BPS

Step 4: Internal Review/Editing of Draft Document – BPS/MCHD (Timeline: 9/7-9/14/2012)

- a) Assemble written results from Step 3 – BPS
- b) Develop Draft Recommendations – MCHD
- c) Communications Review – BPS and MCHD

Step 5: Release Draft Report to AC, PSC, and Technical Reviewers (OPHI and Upstream, etc.) in Preparation for a Work Session – BPS (Timeline: 9/14/2012)

Step 6: Hold Technical Work Session – BPS/MCHD (Timeline: TBD)

- a) Work session and prep – BPS and MCHD

Step 7: Updates to the Report and Recommendations Based on Work Session Discussion – BPS/MCHD (Timeline: TBD)

- a) Editing – BPS and MCHD

Step 8: Release Updated Document (Timeline: TBD)

- a) Document release – BPS

Step 9: Update ESEE with Additional Relevant Health Information and/or Include Addendum to ESEE Report (Timeline: TBD)

- a) MCHD Review

The specific implementation steps and timing of the above are still being discussed and refined. A revised scope will be issued after the Advisory Committee review period.