

# Stakeholder Interview Summary

Bradford Island Community Involvement Program ■ U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ■ May 2006



# Stakeholder Interview Summary

## Bradford Island Community Involvement Program

Prepared for:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
P.O Box 2946  
Portland, OR 97208-2946  
Contact: Mike McAleer

Prepared by:



**Jones & Stokes**

101 N. Capitol Way, Suite 103  
Olympia, WA 98501  
Contact: Melinda Posner  
360/357-4400

May 2006

This document should be cited as:

Jones & Stokes. 2006. Stakeholder Interview Summary. Bradford Island Community Involvement Program. May. (J&S 06061.06.) Olympia, WA. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Stakeholder Interview Format .....	1
Report Organization .....	1
<b>Findings</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Members .....	3
General Stakeholders .....	4
<b>Recommendations</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Summary of Responses</b> .....	<b>8</b>
Technical Advisory Group (TAG) .....	8
General Stakeholders .....	12
<b>Appendix</b> .....	<b>A-1</b>
List of Stakeholder Interviews .....	A-1
Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Questionnaire.....	A-3
General Stakeholder Questionnaire.....	A-5



# Introduction

The purpose of the stakeholder interview process was to identify issues and concerns related to the Bradford Island clean-up, to assess stakeholders' level of understanding of the project and their desired level of participation, and to inform development of the Bradford Island Community Involvement Program.

Interviews of stakeholders were conducted between March 27 and May 1, 2006. Based on an agreed-upon list, Jones & Stokes contacted individuals from federal and state agencies, local governments, tribes, environmental organizations, sport fishing and river user groups, as well as general citizens. A number of interviewees were members of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) for the Bradford Island clean-up project. Of the original list of 50 recommended stakeholders, 43 were interviewed.

## Stakeholder Interview Format

With input from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (hereafter referred to as “the Corps”), Jones & Stokes developed a standard questionnaire (see Appendix) to be used in conducting interviews over the month-long interview process. Two different versions of the questionnaire were developed; one for Technical Advisory Group (TAG) members and one for other stakeholders. Although most of the questions on the two surveys were identical, the TAG questionnaire asked specific questions about the interviewee's involvement in TAG meetings, their level of understanding of the in-water contamination, and their agency's interest or role in the project.

The list of 50 names was divided into in-person interviews and phone interviews, with 15 individuals agreeing to be interviewed in-person and the remaining individuals who could be reached were interviewed by phone (see Stakeholder List in Appendix). Interviews were conducted after the first or second phone call, but in several cases three messages were left and no return call was received (these are noted on the Stakeholder List in the Appendix). Although the majority of stakeholders contacted were agreeable to being interviewed, several were initially reluctant, either due to time constraints or their lack of knowledge of the project. However, after explaining the purpose of the interview and the ability to conduct it in a timely manner, they agreed to take part in the process.

## Report Organization

This summary is organized into three sections:

- General Findings



- Recommendations
- Detailed Responses

The stakeholder interview responses are organized by topic, generally based on the interview questionnaire. Comments have been organized to identify key themes and responses of those interviewed. No comments are directly attributed to specific individuals.



# Findings

## Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Members

### 1. Communication with the tribes is a key component of the clean-up process.

Many interviewees recommended that the Corps should be more proactive in communicating with the tribes, such as reaching out and talking to tribal councils directly and listening to tribal perspectives. There is a belief that there is a lack of communication with tribal staff regarding clean-up decisions. *“Communication with the tribes seems to occur after the fact. In other words, decisions are made and then the tribes are informed; this puts the tribes in a reactive or adversarial mode. Be more aggressive in contacting the right people representing the tribes.”* The tribes want to know what documents are out for review, when and what decisions will be made, and how their representatives can give input prior to decisions being made. One interviewee commented that the process should be more transparent.

### 2. There is some concern over the levels of toxins in fish and if adequate fish tissue sampling has and/or will occur.

Fish tissue sampling is a critical part of understanding the levels of toxins and contamination of fish in the area around Bradford Island/Bonneville Dam. There is a concern about how the levels of toxins are set. *“Be sure the data is accurate.”* Some feel there is not enough fish sampling (sturgeon) taking place, in addition to concerns about the timing of the sampling. *“It should have been done years ago.”* It was suggested that the Corps needs a monitoring plan that is tissue-based (i.e., samples taken before the removal action, the first year after the clean-up, and then five years after the removal of the sediments in order to adequately determine the impacts of the contamination on fish).

### 3. Safety during the clean-up process and disposal of the contaminated sediments are important concerns.

Concern was expressed for the safety of the divers who will be performing the clean-up work. In addition to human safety, concerns were raised about the protective measures for aquatic species at the dredging site. An issue was raised about the PCB dredging activity proceeding without more information relative to the potentially harmful aspects of dredging and diving disturbing the contaminated sediments.

The question of where the dredging material will go was raised. The assumption by an interviewee is that the hazardous material will go to the hazardous waste landfill in Arlington, Oregon and other material will go to the Wasco Landfill.

## General Stakeholders

### 1. There is general support for the clean-up at Bradford Island.

The fact that the Corps is developing a plan to remove the contaminants is seen as a positive and responsible measure. However, there are differences among interviewees regarding the timing of the clean-up. Some expressed concern that it has taken too long for the Corps and ODEQ to act on the problem, while others feel the Corps may be moving too quickly. Some feel there has not been sufficient fish tissue data collected or a determination on how widespread the contamination really is.

### 2. The Corps needs to be more effective in communicating with all the relevant stakeholders.

A common thread running through the interviews is that the Corps needs to keep stakeholders better informed throughout the entire clean-up process. Most expressed an interest in knowing the timeline for the clean-up, the results of ongoing data collection activities, the risks associated with PCBs, and the impact of the contaminants on salmon, sturgeon, and other fish and shellfish. Interviewees expressed a desire for general updates on a regular basis, as well as prior to important decision points. Interviewees also expressed a concern about having sufficient time to review documents that are being generated throughout this process.

Tribal representatives are particularly concerned that they are unable to participate due to a lack of funding from the Corps. *“There seems to be minimal outreach to the tribes and when there is it seems it’s because they have to do it, not because they really want meaningful participation and input.”*

### 3. Risk Assessment is needed for a clearer understanding of the risks.

Many interviewees expressed a lack of knowledge about how serious or widespread the problem of PCB contamination is at Bradford Island. They understand that PCBs can cause cancer, but they don’t know how to translate that into what the risks are in eating the fish caught in the river near Bradford Island. Columbia River fish is a substantial part of the diet for tribal members, yet the level of toxins is unclear. The suggestion was made that the Corps should do sampling in the middle of the basin by

divers, if it has not already done so. Interviewees expressed a need to have an understanding of all the facts.

#### **4. Based on past interaction with the Corps, some stakeholders are skeptical of the Corps' ability to successfully get the job done.**

Although there is agreement that the clean-up needs to occur and that “no action” is not an option, some interviewees are concerned about the Corps' ability to “do the job and do it right.” One respondent wondered whether this is due to a lack of accurate and complete data, insufficient funds, or the technical ability to remove these contaminants. Some interviewees remain skeptical about the ultimate success of the clean-up effort.

#### **5. Questions about plans for monitoring the site post-clean-up.**

Several comments were made regarding how the Corps and ODEQ will monitor the site after the dredging is completed. How will the Corps ensure that all the contaminated sediments have been removed? In addition, once the clean-up is completed, will the Corps and/or ODEQ monitor the site to ensure that leaking does not occur and the site remains clean?

#### **6. There is support for the formation of a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC).**

When asked if they would be interested in participating in a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to review and provide input to the clean-up efforts, many respondents said yes. Even those who declined because of time commitments thought it was a good idea for the Corps to form such a group to give non-technical stakeholders the opportunity to participate in the process. It was emphasized by several interviewees that the scope and responsibilities of the CAC should be clearly defined (i.e., that it is an advisory body and not a decision-making body).

# Recommendations

## 1. Demonstrate that the Corps is committed to involving community stakeholders in the clean-up process.

- Continue to work closely with tribal representatives, environmental groups, local governments, river users, and the general public to gather comments and suggestions.
- Provide opportunities to meet face-to-face to answer questions and listen to concerns about the presence of contaminants and other health concerns.
- Seek out speaking engagements to share project updates.
  - Hold informal meetings of stakeholder groups.
  - Consider tours or educational opportunities.

## 2. Develop a proactive Community Involvement Plan.

- Identify all interested stakeholder groups.
- Provide opportunities for community stakeholders to communicate their concerns and offer input throughout the entire clean-up process.
- Communicate with tribal representatives on a regular basis.
- Provide regular updates and consistent information about data collection, clean-up timeline, and decision-making points.
- Inform stakeholders through multiple avenues (i.e., e-mail, Web sites, direct mail, newspaper notices, fact sheets, news releases, and other media relations).
- Schedule and host public meetings/open houses.

## 3. Form a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC).

- Based on responses from both TAG and general interviews, there is support for forming a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC).
- Important considerations for a CAC include:
  - Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the committee.
  - Disseminate updated information to committee members on a regular basis.
  - Committee members will provide input on the clean-up process.



#### 4. Conduct a Risk Assessment Analysis.

- Continue to do fish tissue sampling and provide data to the public in a timely manner.
- Clearly describe the nature and extent of all hazardous substances associated with Bradford Island.
- Clearly articulate to the public the risks associated with the contaminants to fish and humans.

#### 5. Develop a Monitoring Plan for the site post-clean-up.

- In partnership with ODEQ, identify a strategy for monitoring the site after the dredging has been completed.
- Provide the public with a post-clean-up status report.

# Summary of Responses

Following is a summary of the more detailed responses to the stakeholder interview questions, including responses from both TAG members and more general stakeholder interviewees.

## Technical Advisory Group (TAG)

### TAG Involvement and Level of Understanding

The level of involvement from TAG members ranged from attending one meeting to attending all of the meetings. Most TAG members interviewed have a thorough understanding of the issues at Bradford Island. Two individuals indicated a limited knowledge of the specific technical aspects, but all were able to articulate any concerns.

### Agency's Role

TAG members interviewed included representatives from the Corps, NOAA Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fisheries Commission, Yakama Nation, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Health Services, and Washington Department of Health. Their interests include:

- Minimizing impacts on endangered species and migrating birds;
- Fish tissue data;
- Assessing the potential risks to human health; and
- Tribal concerns.

### Concerns Heard from Stakeholders

When TAG members were asked what concerns and issues they have heard from stakeholders about the project, answers included:

- The clean-up is not moving along fast enough; it needs to be done ASAP.
- There is not enough fish sampling (sturgeon) taking place.
- There are concerns about dredging activity proceeding without more information about the harmful aspects of dredging and diving and how these activities may disturb the contaminated sediments.



- Some want to know more about the degree of fish contamination.
- There is concern about the inability of the tribes to participate due to the lack of funding from the Corps.

## Most Effective Public Involvement Tools

Most suggested that multiple avenues of communication are necessary to reach various stakeholders. This means using the large metropolitan newspapers, such as the Oregonian and the Columbian, and also placing ads in smaller local papers. Examples given were the Skamania County Pioneer, Hood River News, and the Yakama Nation newspaper, as well as the Yakama Nation radio station. Other suggestions included e-mail, direct mail, and talking directly to the tribes, agencies, environmental groups, fishing groups, and other groups that use the river.

## Using Existing Public Information Tools Within Agencies

When asked about utilizing existing public information mechanisms within their agency or group to get the word out about Bradford Island, most interviewees did not have any specific suggestions. However, one respondent suggested using tribal staff and tribal councils to spread the word. This individual believed that project fact sheets are not very effective and also generate waste. A suggestion was made to use the Yakama Nation radio station and the Yakama Nation newspaper to run a series of interviews and articles about the project. An offer was made to introduce the Corps to the radio station manager to discuss ways that this format could be utilized.

## Past Experiences/Lessons Learned from other Projects

From a public involvement standpoint, one respondent suggested that keeping one or two specific stakeholders informed by phone or e-mail usually helps to spread the word about a project. Also, keeping TAG members informed and updated is a way to keep stakeholders informed. Another suggested “*schedule public meetings and allow time for citizens to participate in the meetings. Give the public a schedule and timeline on what’s going to be done and when, and let them know in a timely manner if there are any changes to the timeline.*”

Past experience suggested to one interviewee that getting the tribes involved was a primary concern, not only because they have “*usual and accustomed fishing rights in the area, but because the fisheries are a cultural resource to the tribes.*”

Another comment recommended ensuring that any advisory committee be representative and not weighted toward one group or interest. This individual served on a committee in the past that was heavily weighted with economic interests.

## Interest in Participating in a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

Although the majority interviewed thought forming a CAC was a good idea to help keep the public and stakeholders involved, most did not think it was necessary or appropriate for them to be on a CAC since they were already TAG members. However, one interviewee said they would be willing to serve on a CAC if asked to do so. Another interviewee made the suggestion that perhaps a CAC member could be assigned to cover TAG meetings as an observer and report back to the CAC.

## Best Way to Be Kept Informed

Most agreed that e-mail was the preferred way to be kept informed about the project. One agency person said that occasional phone calls from John Wakeman, Corps Seattle District, have been an effective way to keep him informed and he would like that to continue.

## What is Most Important to Be Kept Informed About Regarding the Clean-up Program?

The following represent TAG member comments in response to this question:

- Keeping informed every step of the way throughout the duration of the project.
- Collecting preliminary fish data, the timely release of health data, more clarity on the TAG agendas, and more time between receiving various documents and when comments are due.
- The general timeline for the clean-up and updates on the progress of fish sampling and results.
- Any type of monitoring plan and proposed restoration at the site.
- Fish tissue data and the impacts of human health exposure.
- Keep the Yakama Nation informed about the clean-up process.
- Keep up to date on any in-water work regarding sampling, how the clean-up is progressing (when and where).
- The general implementation and progress of the clean-up plan.
- What documents are out for review, when decisions will be made, what the decisions will be and how the tribes and their representatives can give input prior to decisions being made.

## What Other Individuals or Groups Should Be Contacted?

The following were suggested. Several were already on the stakeholder list and have been interviewed.

- Columbia Gorge Commission
- Oregon Department of Health Services
- The usual agencies, environmental groups, and the tribes
- The Mid-Columbia River Toxic Reduction Committee
- Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership
- EPA
- Umatilla Tribe
- Nez Perce Tribe
- Warm Springs Tribe
- Indian Health Services
- Oregon Health & Science University

## Other Comments

Most interviewees did not have any further comments, but one said “*thanks for making the effort to get feedback.*” Other suggestions included:

- Keep a CAC well-balanced, including citizens, not just agencies.
- Be mindful of the Yakama Nation and tribal fisherman.
- The Corps process should be more transparent.
- Be creative in the clean-up decision; don’t just clean it up and go away.
- Think about the impacts on aquatic life and wildlife, as well as the human impacts to culture and tradition.

## General Stakeholders

### Knowledge of In-Water and Environmental Contamination

The majority of interviewees had at least some knowledge about in-water contamination at Bradford Island, but a few had no knowledge about it. Several individuals said the first time they heard about it was when they were contacted by Jones & Stokes. There were different levels of understanding about exactly what the issues were surrounding the clean-up. Many said they knew that electrical equipment and transformers were dumped in the river, but did not know when it actually occurred. Most heard that there were high levels of PCBs, but did not know what that meant. They knew PCBs were cancer-causing toxins, but they did not have actual data to gauge their risk.

An interviewee who works for an agency, but who is not a TAG member, had a good deal of knowledge about the contamination. Similarly, individuals with environmental groups had a better understanding of the issues than some river users.

### How and When They Became Informed

Those that had some knowledge of the contamination and/or the clean-up had mostly heard about it from seeing articles in *The Oregonian*. One interviewee had received a scoping letter from the Corps several months ago. A couple of interviewees attended the public meeting held on February 21, 2006. One interviewee said that “*all kinds of things have been dumped into the river, as far back as the 1960’s.*” Another had personal knowledge of dumping occurring in the river from when he worked at the hatchery in the ‘60s. He said everything used to be thrown into the river.

The length of time that people knew about the contamination ranged from just finding out about it to several months to several years.

### Concerns About the Contamination

One interviewee was more concerned about the Umatilla weapons site and the Hanford Nuclear site than the contamination at Bradford Island. Another had no particular concerns (“*the fish don’t seem to be dying*”), and as someone who worked for the Fish & Wildlife Service many years ago, he knows something about fish habitat and is not concerned about this site.

The majority of those interviewed had specific concerns such as:

- The large consumption of fish by the tribes and the associated health risks.
- Making sure all the contaminants are removed when the clean-up is being performed.



- Concern for deep water contamination (e.g., 120 feet deep); the Corps has not done deep water sampling.
- Preventing future pollution in the vicinity.
- Potential impacts of the contamination on endangered and threatened species.
- Will the clean-up cause a bigger problem?
- The impact on both recreational and commercial fishing.
- The potential negative impact on tourism in the Columbia River Gorge from safety concerns in the vicinity.
- Concern for sturgeon, which feed on crustaceans.
- PCBs are the main concern, but what about other contaminants such as heavy metals?
- Concern about how thorough the clean-up will be.
- Concern about toxins in sturgeon and bottom feeders.
- Negative press (i.e., the market will not buy fish from the Bonneville pool if it's known as having high levels of PCBs).
- Concern about how Proposed Alternative #6 was chosen for the proposed clean-up action (this interviewee preferred #5). Was #6 selected for cost only?

## Types of Recreational Uses and Consumption of Fish

Respondents were asked if they recreated around Bonneville Dam/Bradford Island. Boating and fishing were the most common forms of recreating. A few interviewees said swimming; one said jet skiing; and one said kayaking and canoeing.

Of those who fished, most said they ate the fish that they caught. Some respondents only fished and ate their catch a couple times a year. Several fished as often as possible. One interviewee estimated that he and his family of five might eat about 20 fish during a two-week period. The fish most consumed were salmon and sturgeon, but some ate shad and smallmouth bass. No one interviewed ate shellfish or crayfish.

## Interest in Participating in a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

About half of those interviewed said they would be willing to serve on a CAC. Those who were not interested, mostly due to time constraints, agreed that forming such a committee was a good idea and an effective means to receive input, as well as a means to keep people informed about the project and the longer-term clean-up process.

Preference for meeting times and days varied, with some preferring the day (working hours) and others the evening. Suggested times for evening meetings were 4:00 –

6:00 PM (traveling from Portland to the Gorge area) or 6:30 to 8:30 PM (those who live locally).

## Best Way to Be Kept Informed

The majority of stakeholders preferred being kept informed by email, while a few prefer newspaper articles. Several interviewees recommended that the Corps take out paid advertisements in the local papers, including the Skamania County Pioneer, Camas Post-Record, and the White Salmon Enterprise.

Several interviewees said they would attend a public meeting if held in the Gorge area, while one suggested the Bonneville Power Administration Building in the Lloyd District of Portland. One interviewee commented that the Corps should not plan public meetings during the summer or around major holidays.

Several interviewees said they use the internet to get information, although limited bandwidth is sometimes a technical issue for accessing Web sites with large graphics or downloading large attachments.

## Most Important Issue to be Kept Informed About

To many interviewees, the most important issue is being kept informed about the clean-up activities. Other important issues and questions included:

- How will the Corps protect natural resources and connect with the tribes (especially relative to protecting any potential cultural or historic resources in the area)?
- Most interested in the mortality rate of birds and other wildlife that can be traced to the PCB contamination in the river and on the island.
- How will the dredging and clean-up impact the operations, if any, at the Port of Cascade Locks?
- Knowing if the tribes and the State (ODEQ) are satisfied by the clean-up
- What are the ODEQ requirements for mitigation and follow-up once the site has been cleaned? Will ODEQ work with the Corps to prevent future contamination?
- Being notified if anything unusual or unexpected comes up during the project.
- A progress report and timeline on the clean-up process.
- Accurate reporting by the Corps on the levels of PCBs and other contaminants.
- Where will the Corps be disposing of the PCBs and other toxins?
- Concern about anything that might have consequences to fish below the dam or adversely impacts the fish population.



- Concern about the scheduling and timing of the clean-up. It should be done quickly, but thoroughly, and when sturgeon are least present in the river.
- What is the extent of the contamination and what are the risks at this point on critical habitat and the environment?
- After the clean-up, how will the Corps and ODEQ monitor the site?
- Are studies and sampling delaying the clean-up effort?
- The method of clean-up, as well as the risks and residual effects of the clean-up activities.
- More details about the extent of PCB contamination and other pollution in the river.
- Make sure contamination doesn't happen again.

## Other Comments

The following are additional comments made by the interviewees:

- Take into account safety issues during the clean-up work; do not further contaminate the river. Also consider the safety of the workers doing the clean-up work.
- It's not just fish that are impacted by these contaminants; osprey populations downstream from the Bonneville Dam have the highest concentrations of PCBs in the basin.
- What are the ODEQ requirements for mitigation and follow-up once the site has been cleaned? Will ODEQ work with the Corps to prevent further contamination?
- Continue to touch base and talk to the State (ODEQ) and the tribes.
- What is the level of risk for Cascade Locks?
- Get the legislators involved that represent the Bradford Island area and outline the dangers of PCBs that are in the Columbia River.
- Concern about the Hanford Nuclear site and toxins and contamination at that site. Also, concerned about the warm water temperatures around the John Day Dam and its effect on the fish there. The Corps needs to do a better job of keeping the Columbia River safe and healthy.
- Keep ODFW updated and informed on the clean-up project.
- Will the clean-up use suction dredging or crane removal?
- The Corps should consider compensation for the tribes and others to participate in the process.

- Who will be educating the public about the health risks?
- If a CAC is formed, be sure to define the purpose and role in the clean-up process. The fewer meetings, the better.
- Talk to others in Cascade Locks other than the Mayor and City Administrator (the city's level of sophistication is evolving).
- Appreciation for the community outreach effort that is taking place; hopeful that this will lead to better communication from the Corps and other agencies.



# Appendix

## List of Stakeholder Interviews

### In-person Interviews

- City of Cascade Locks
- City of North Bonneville
- City of Stevenson
- Skamania County Commission
- Skamania County Planning and Community Development
- Skamania County Economic Development Council
- Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC)
- Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership
- Columbia River Gorge Commission
- Citizens

### Phone Interviews

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Portland District
- Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ)
- USACE, Seattle District
- URS Corporation
- Oregon Department of Human Services (ODHS)
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)
- Washington Department of Health (WDOH)
- Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE)
- Multnomah County
- Hood River County
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)



- Port of Cascade Locks
- Yakima Tribe
- Columbia Riverkeeper
- Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area
- Oregon Natural Resources Council
- Audubon Society of Portland
- Friends of the Columbia River Gorge
- NW Sportfishing Industry Association
- Association of Northwest Steelheaders
- Warm Springs Tribe
- Umatilla Tribe
- Nez Perce Tribe
- Wind River Watershed Council
- Gifford Pinchot Task Force
- Oregon Bass and Panfish Club
- Lower Columbia Recovery Board
- Oregon Native Fish Society



## Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Questionnaire

1. What has been your involvement as a TAG member (or agency) related to the Bradford Island cleanup process? How many TAG meetings have you been able to attend?
2. From your involvement as a TAG member (or agency), how would you characterize your level of understanding of the in-water contamination at Bradford Island/Bonneville Dam?
3. What is your agency's interest or role in this issue?
4. Given the knowledge that you have about the situation, do you have any concerns related to the cleanup process?
5. What are the concerns and issues you've heard most from stakeholders about this project?
6. What do you think are the most effective public involvement tools that should be used to reach residents, businesses and stakeholders?
7. Are there existing public information avenues within your agency/organization that we might "leverage" to get the word out about this project? If so, what are they and who should we contact about them? (Newsletters, Web sites, Advisories, etc.)
8. Are there past experiences/lessons learned from other projects that you think might be helpful to point out to us? In general, and from a public involvement perspective.
9. Are you interested in participating in a working group that would review and provide input to the clean-up efforts? (Describe that this group might meet every couple of months.) If interested, ask the following:
  - a. What are the most convenient days/times for you to meet?
  - b. Could you be committed to two hours every two months?
10. What is the best way for us to keep you informed about this project?
  - a. Newspaper (If so, which newspapers?)
  - b. Email (Obtain email address)
  - c. Direct mail (Obtain mailing address)
  - d. Project Web site (Provide Web site address)
  - e. Public meetings (What locations are most convenient?)
  - f. Presentation at other stakeholder or community meetings. (Identify which ones)
  - g. Other



11. What is most important to you to be kept informed about with regard to the clean-up program?
12. Are there other individuals or groups that we should be in contact with?
13. Is there anything that you would like to add?



## General Stakeholder Questionnaire

1. What do you know about in water contamination at Bradford Island near the Bonneville Dam?
2. Did you know that that there has been evidence of environmental contamination found on the island and in the Columbia River near Bradford Island?
3. If so, how and when did you become informed about this?  
  
If no, describe generally and briefly the levels and types of contamination that have been found.
4. What are your concerns about this?
5. Do you or your neighbors/friends/family or others that you know use the area around Bonneville Dam/Bradford Island for recreation? What types? What about fishing? If so, continue with the following questions:
  - a. If for fishing, where do you or they fish specifically?
  - b. How often do you fish? Times per week/month/year
  - c. Do you or other people you know eat the fish, shell fish or crayfish?
  - d. Were you aware of the fishing advisory that has been placed on shellfish and crayfish caught upstream from Bonneville Dam?
  - e. How often do you or others eat fish from the area around the Bonneville Dam?
  - f. What types of fish do you or others catch to eat?
6. Are you interested in participating in a working group that would review and provide input to the clean-up efforts? (Describe that this group might meet every couple of months.) If interested, ask the following:
  - a. What are the most convenient days/times for you to meet?
  - b. Could you be committed to two hours every two months?
7. What is the best way for us to keep you informed about this project?
  - a. Newspaper (If so, which newspapers?)
  - b. Email (Obtain email address)
  - c. Direct mail (Obtain mailing address)
  - d. Project Web site (Provide Web site address)
  - e. Public meetings (What locations are most convenient?)
  - f. Presentation at other stakeholder or community meetings. (Identify which ones)



g. Other

8. What is most important to you to be kept informed about with regard to the clean-up program?
9. Are there other individuals or groups that we should be in contact with?
10. Is there anything that you would like to add?

