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Policy Group Charter

Policy Group Purpose

• Review Feasibility Study Findings
• Represent Agency and Constituent’s Interests

Expectations

• Provide Informed Feedback
• Attend Three Policy Group Meetings
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 Background

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

* Source: Multnomah County Willamette River Bridges Capital Improvement Plan (2015-2034)
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
Senior Agency Staff Group Members

- Multnomah County
- Metro
- TriMet
- Portland Development Commission
- Oregon Department of Transportation (Region 1)
- City of Portland
- Portland Streetcar
- City of Gresham

- City of Beaverton
- Clackamas County
- Washington County
- Federal Highway Administration (Oregon)
- Oregon State Senator Taylor (District 21)
- Oregon State Representative Smith Warner (District 45)
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)
Project Overview

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
Project Overview
Comments on Animation

• Helps to show the magnitude of the event
• Animation can be frightening
• Should provide more information on what the project is focused on preventing
• Some of the wording is very technical, for example liquefaction
• Should add information at the end on how people can prepare for the earthquake
Project Context
What Alternative Groupings create an earthquake-ready crossing?

Alternatives Development

1. PRESERVE
2. SEISMIC RETROFIT
3. REPLACEMENT
4. HYBRID
5. ENHANCE ANOTHER BRIDGE
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?

ALTERNATIVE GROUPINGS

1. PRESERVE

2. SEISMIC RETROFIT

3. REPLACEMENT

4. HYBRID

5. ENHANCE ANOTHER BRIDGE

Bridge

Tunnel
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)
Are we missing any alternatives?
Alternatives Development

Multi-Step Process

AGENCY PASS/FAIL

PROBLEM STATEMENT SCREENING

COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION

NEPA DOCUMENTATION
Problem Statement Screening

AGENCY PASS/FAIL

PROBLEM STATEMENT SCREENING

COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION

NEPA DOCUMENTATION

Multi-Step Process

Good/Fair/Fails

Seismic Resiliency

Emergency Response

Good/Fair/Poor

Multi-modal Needs

Emergency Plans

Long-term function

Multnomah County
Example of Future Evaluation Topics

- Social Elements
- Recreation
- Land Use
- Right of Way Impacts
- Historical/Cultural Resources
- Natural Environment
- Equity and Diversity

- Sustainability
- Congestion/Traffic Operations
- Economic Development
- Construction Impacts
- Multi-modal
What We Have Heard

Senior Agency Staff Group

• Support for the project and its purpose.

• Project benefits include regional connectivity, multi-use and emergency response.

• TriMet is considering improvements to the Steel Bridge, including seismic resiliency.

• How are we considering construction methods and costs during this phase?

• How long are we assuming river traffic will be impacted by the earthquake?

• The process should not eliminate alternatives too early.
• The need for at least one seismically resilient downtown bridge is vital.

• What clearances are we considering for high-bridge options?

• Are we maintaining vertical clearance requirements over freeways?

• Are we looking at other available plans broader than emergency response plans?

• The project should be aligned with established regional priorities.
What We Have Heard

Stakeholder Representative Group

• Support for the project and its purpose.

• Concern the project will take a long time to implement.
  – What is the interim plan?
  – Can the project happen sooner?

• How will the bridge support post-earthquake recovery demands?
  – Support large trucks.
  – Allow large cargo ships.
  – Who and what modes get priority on the bridge after an event?

• There should be more than one crossing usable after event.
  – In addition to Burnside Bridge, can there be temporary bridges available or other bridges?
  – Can stairs be provided for pedestrian access to the Tilikum Crossing?
What We Have Heard

Stakeholder Representative Group (continued)

• How do we accommodate the project needs and still maintain the historical integrity of the bridge?
• What will happen to the skate park?
• Are pedestrian uses considered in the Pass/ Fail criteria?
• Pontoons were noted as missing from the draft list of alternatives.
• Concern that weighting the screening criteria will diminish the importance of multi-modal access relative to seismic safety.
Stakeholder Briefings

- Kerns Neighborhood Association
- Multnomah County Bike/ Ped Advisory Group
- Buckman Community Association
- Office of Emergency Management Lunch and Learn

- Surprise that the downtown bridges are not all up to seismic code
- Interest in complete range of options being considered, including things such as ferries
- This is a priority for our region and can the project be completed faster
- Concerns that fixing or replacing the bridge will remove the skateboard park
- Bicyclists want improved facilities on Burnside Bridge
- Project communications should include emergency preparedness information
- Questions on how people can stay informed and when they can provide input
- Input on evaluation criteria
Closing Remarks

Next Steps

• Screen Alternative Groupings
• Agency Technical Meetings
• Develop Draft Evaluation Criteria
• Stakeholder Briefings
• Senior Agency Staff and Stakeholder Representative Meetings #2
• Policy Meeting #2 – August 2017
• Feedback – 2 weeks from this meeting
• Questions?
Thank You