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SASG Charter

SASG Purpose

• Input on Feasibility Study
• Identify Agency Interests
• Provide Informed Feedback

Role and Expectations

• Attend Four SASG Meetings
• Act as Liaison to Policy Group and Agency
Project Overview

- **Purpose**: To create a resilient lifeline crossing
- **Goal**: To recommend rehabilitation and/or replacement alternatives for further NEPA-phase analysis
- **Timing**: Study to be completed in Fall, 2018
- **Funding**: Needed for future phases
Project Overview

Regional Earthquake Risk

- 1 in 3 chance of Magnitude 8+ earthquake within 50 years
- Thousands of fatalities and injuries
- Billions in economic loss

Source: Oregon Resilience Plan (2013)
Earthquake Vulnerabilities

- Downtown bridges vulnerable to major earthquakes
- Board of County Commissioners adopted the Bridge CIP in 2015
- CIP identified the Burnside Bridge as its number one priority for seismic resiliency
Project Overview

Burnside Bridge, over 90 years of Service

• 40,000 vehicles, 2,000 bicycles and pedestrians daily
• Three bus lines
• 300 openings a year
• Crosses Blue/Red Max Lines, 78k weekday riders
• Crosses Union Pacific Railroad mainline
Burnside Street: Regional Lifeline Route

Over 17 miles long, Burnside Street connects Gresham to Washington County through downtown Portland

- Metro designated Burnside a Priority 1 route in the late 1990s
- City of Portland designated Burnside Street an evacuation route
- Only non-state owned Priority 1 route across the Willamette River
- ODOT is prioritizing investing in the I-205 corridor

Sources: Metro Regional Emergency Transportation Routes Report, 1996
         Portland City-wide Evacuation Plan 2014; portlandoregon.gov/pbem/65295)
PROJECT PHASING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEASIBILITY STUDY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURE NEPA FUNDING $17M*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA STUDY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURE DESIGN / ROW FUNDING $80M*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN / ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURE CONSTRUCTION FUNDING $415M*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Multnomah County Willamette River Bridges Capital Improvement Plan (2015-2034)
FEASIBILITY STUDY TIMELINE

- **Fall 2016**: Project Initiation
- **Winter 2016/17**: Project Initiation
- **Spring 2017**: Preliminary Alternatives Development
- **Summer 2017**: Alternatives Evaluation
- **Fall 2017**: Alternatives Evaluation
- **Winter 2017/18**: Alternatives Evaluation
- **Spring 2018**: Alternatives Evaluation
- **Summer 2018**: Alternatives Evaluation
- **Fall 2018**: Feasibility Report

Stakeholder Engagement & Community Outreach
Project Overview

Policy Group Members

- Multnomah County
- Metro
- TriMet
- Portland Development Commission
- Oregon Department of Transportation (Region 1)
- City of Portland
- City of Gresham
- City of Beaverton
- Clackamas County
- Washington County
- Federal Highway Administration (Oregon)
- U.S. Senator Merkley’s office
- U.S. Senator Wyden’s office
- U.S. Representative Blumenauer’s office
- U.S. Representative Bonamici’s office
- Oregon State Senator Taylor (District 21)
- Oregon State Representative Smith Warner (District 45)
Stakeholder Representative Group Members

- American Automobile Association (AAA)
- Buckman Community Association
- Burnside Skatepark
- Central City Concern
- Central Eastside Industrial Council (CEIC)
- Multnomah County Bike / Ped Advisory Committee member
- Neighborhood Emergency Teams (NETs)
- Old Town/ Chinatown Association
- Oregon Trucking Association (OTA)
- Portland Spirit
- Portland Saturday Market
- Sharon Wood-Wortman (Historic Resources)
- The Street Trust (formerly BTA)
- University of Oregon School of Architecture student
- Willamette Riverkeeper
Seismic Resiliency Committee Members

- Multnomah County Bridge
- ODOT Bridge
- FHWA Bridge
- WSDOT Bridge
- City of Portland – PBOT Bridge
- Portland State University
- HDR Engineering
- Parametrix
- Shannon and Wilson
- Hart Crowser
- Hardesty and Hanover

*Tentative*
Agency Interests

Project Setting
• Urban Environment
• Public Use Areas
• Multi-agency Involvement
• Bridge and River Users
• Natural Environment
• Economic Development

Agency Interest
• What are your interests in the project?
What are your agency interests in the project?
Multi-Step Process
Background, Problem Statement, and Intent

• Intent
  – Achieve seismic resiliency
  – Burnside lifeline river crossing is fully operational following a major earthquake
  – Enable emergency medical, fire, and life safety response
  – Post disaster restoration of services
  – Regional recovery
  – Implement related emergency plans
  – Long term multi-modal functions (independent of seismic resiliency)
What Alternative Groupings create an earthquake-ready crossing?
What alternatives are being considered within each grouping?
Low, Movable Bridge Replacement; Existing Alignment; Single Bridge

(This is one of 100+ Design Options under consideration)
Alternatives Development

Key Questions:
Q1. What are the bridge replacement options?
Key Questions:
Q1. Bridge
Q2. How high is the bridge?
Key Questions:
Q1. Bridge
Q2. Low, movable bridge
Q3. Where does the bridge cross the river?
Key Questions:
Q1. Bridge
Q2. Low, movable bridge
Q3. North of Burnside Street
Q4. How many bridges are there?
Key Questions:
Q1. Bridge
Q2. Low, movable bridge
Q3. North of Burnside Street
Q4. Single bridge
Q5. What is the roadway alignment shape?
Low, Movable Bridge Replacement; North Alignment; Single Bridge; West Angled + East Couplet Alignment

(This is one of 100+ Design Options under consideration)
(These are six of 100+ Design Options under consideration)
Alternatives Development

[Diagram showing different alternatives and their subcategories, e.g., 1. PRESERVE: Bridge Only (No Build), + Aerial Tram, + Floating Bridge]

Are we missing any alternatives?
Problem Statement

Background, Problem Statement, and Intent

• Intent
  – Achieve seismic resiliency
  – Burnside lifeline river crossing is fully operational following a major earthquake
  – Enable emergency medical, fire, and life safety response
  – Post disaster restoration of services
  – Regional recovery
  – Implement related emergency plans
  – Long term multi-modal functions (independent of seismic resiliency)
Screening Criteria

• Reflects the Project Intent

• Organized into Five Topics

1. Seismic Resiliency
2. Emergency Response
3. Multi-modal Needs
4. Consistency with Emergency Plans
5. Long-term Functionality

Criteria Rating

Step 1: Good/Fair/Fails to meet
Step 2: Good/Fair/Poor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Criteria</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Rating (good, fair, fail/poor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEP 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Seismic Resiliency</td>
<td>Crossing withstands earthquake</td>
<td>Seismic Design Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emergency Response</td>
<td>Emergency response based on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Distance (time)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity/Congestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEP 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Multi-Modal (post-earthquake)</td>
<td>Modal access on &amp; around the crossing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bike/Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vehicle (bus, freight, cars)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• River Users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Plan Consistency</td>
<td>Crossing is consistent with State, Regional &amp; Local Emergency Management Plans</td>
<td>Level of plan consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Long-term Function (independent of earthquake)</td>
<td>Level of maintenance</td>
<td>Maintenance required to achieve design life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term multi-modal functionality</td>
<td>Ability of crossing to improve accommodating multi-modes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Closing Remarks

Next Steps

• Stakeholder Representative Group and Policy Group Meetings
• Screen Alternative Groupings
• Agency Technical Meetings
• Develop Draft Evaluation Criteria
• Stakeholder Briefings
• SASG Meeting #2 – July 2017 (potential dates?)
• Feedback – 2 weeks from this meeting
• Questions?
Thank You