Online Survey Summary Report

Survey Overview

An online survey was made available between July 15 and August 21, 2017 for the purpose of gathering input about the public’s priorities, concerns and questions about the Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge project. The survey collected 170 responses. It was promoted online on Multnomah County’s Facebook and Twitter pages, as well as by email to 340 stakeholders on the project’s interested parties list.

The survey presented a brief project summary, including the project overview video, followed by four open-ended questions and a set of questions pertaining to respondents’ project communication preferences, use of the bridge and demographics.

Open-ended Questions

The survey included four open-ended questions aimed to gather input regarding the community’s thoughts, concerns, and questions about the project.

Question 1: What should Multnomah County consider as we begin to look at options for an earthquake ready river crossing?

The 152 responses to this question resulted in a handful of common themes:

**Safety:** Desire to protect the well-being of bridge users and neighbors both during an earthquake event and afterwards, as well as preserving capacity for emergency response vehicles. People also expressed concern for the everyday safety of pedestrian and bicycle users on the bridge. Examples include:

- “Public safety and ease of emergency traffic getting priority first to cross in an emergency.”
- “Protected bike lanes and wider sidewalks to make travel safer between downtown and the burgeoning Burnside bridgehead on the east side (think Better Naito or the Morrison Bridge)”
Getting a safe crossing in place quickly: Concern that the project moves urgently and quickly, considering that a major Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake could happen at any time. Examples include:

- “Replace the bridge now.”
- “Time is of the essence! The sooner the bridge can be made seismically safe, the better.”

Reliability and resiliency: Need for the new river crossing to withstand an earthquake and be useable immediately afterward, as well as support day-to-day multimodal function. Examples include:

- “In addition to making the crossing earthquake-ready, please design to ensure that everyday functionality is able to serve all residents of the city (i.e. include dedicated transit lanes, protected bike lanes, wide sidewalks). These facilities would also allow emergency services to bypass potential gridlock in an earthquake scenario (or even just during rush hour traffic).”

Enhance multi-modal use: Desire to make improvements to multimodal features on the bridge, such as protected bike lanes, transit-only lanes, or active transportation facilities. Examples include:

- “Would love to see a better-protected bike lane and wider sidewalks (make things like the 2015 pedestrian fatality less likely). And a dedicated bus lane would be AMAZING, as someone who’s spent way too much time on the [TriMet #20 bus] watching what should be a 3-minute trip over the bridge stretch to 15.”
- “Non-car traffic! Add protected bike lanes, bus only lanes, wider sidewalks. And please improve the west side connections to and from the bridge. It would also be good to have a ramp down to the east bank esplanade, instead of stairs, which aren't accessible for those using wheelchairs, strollers, bikes, or other mobility devices.”

Design suggestions: Ideas on specific design features for a new bridge, or something entirely different, like a tunnel, pontoon bridges, or ferry boat service. Examples include:

- “Have the highest quality, military heavy equipment capable floating pontoon bridges housed in 9 quake proof structures immediately adjacent to the bridge location... more reliable and much cheaper than a half billion rebuild of a new bridge.”
Question 2: What opportunities do you see with this project?

Three main themes emerged from 135 responses to this question:

**Making multi-modal improvements**: Desire to make improvements to multimodal features on the bridge. Examples include:

- “BRT lanes, protected bike lanes, and first-class pedestrian infrastructure would improve the bridge’s usability for citizens who aren’t using personal cars. Given the beautiful views of Portland from the top of the span this could be a draw — not just a drawbridge.”
- “Making the bridge work for PEOPLE rather than just cars.”

**Raising general public awareness of the earthquake threat**: Interest in making the public aware of the earthquake and emergency preparedness. Examples include:

- “This should be the start of a large public conversation on the results of a major earthquake in the Pacific Northwest.”
- “Learning how bridges react in an earthquake. Learning how to make both sides of PDX more resilient. Using this as an opportunity to deal with the other bridges, and the big fuel tanks near the river, which will burst when the quake hits!”

**Creating jobs**: Interest in how the project can help create jobs. Examples include:

- “Jobs for local area and development potential.”
- “Job creation, general earthquake preparedness awareness.”

Question 3: What questions do you have about this project?

This question received 104 responses, many of which show that people are thinking about the design and financing of a new river crossing and what local government agencies are doing to prepare for an earthquake disaster. Three of the most prominent themes that emerged are:

**What option is the best approach to solving the problem?** For example:

- “Does a single bridge structure allow for the emergency response necessary for this type of disaster? Or, does a second crossing need to be created at another point up or down river?”

**How much will it cost, and how is it paid for?** For example:

- “Is there funding yet? Where from?”
- “Will you spread the cost across the board? Property taxes are too high already.”

**How quickly can the project be built?** For example:

- “What can we do to help hasten this project and others like it? This should be treated like an emergency.”
Question 4: Is there anything else you want to tell us?

The 97 responses to this question covered a broad range of sentiments. Many respondents reiterated what they had expressed in their answers to the previous three questions. Others urged fiscal constraint, hoped that the project would avoid getting caught up in bureaucratic red tape, or expressed appreciation that the project was underway. Examples include:

- “Thanks for making this a priority project. It’s overdue.”
- “Please put in dedicated bus lanes and protected bike lanes. Continuing to throw away all our money and space on cars is unsustainable.”
- “Please don’t over-design this bridge. Nothing too fancy and stick to the needs, not the wants, for this bridge project.”
- “The bridges of Portland are part of the city’s character and though all are in need of seismic repair or replacement, I would hope that any replacement bridge adds to the city’s atmosphere.”
- “I am excited that Multnomah County is anticipating our transit needs and soliciting public feedback in a convenient form. We are a city of bridges, and our bridges should be built to reflect who we are.”

Other Questions

Questions 5–10: Contact information and staying informed

These questions were related to contact information and preferences. About half of respondents indicated that they would like to be added to the email list, and provided their contact information.

Question 11: How often do you use the Burnside Bridge?

The plurality of respondents indicated that they use the bridge “once per week or less” (38%), and a total of about 45% of respondents use it a few times per week or more frequently.
Question 12: How do you usually cross the bridge? (Check all that apply)

Most respondents (80%) selected “Automobile” as how they usually cross the bridge. About one in four respondents indicated that they use the bus, bicycle, and/or walk. Answers were not mutually exclusive, so some respondents chose more than one option.