



# Meeting Summary

---

<b>Project:</b>	Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge
<b>Subject:</b>	Policy Group Meeting #4
<b>Date:</b>	Tuesday, October 30, 2018
<b>Time:</b>	1:00 - 3:00 p.m.
<b>Location:</b>	Multnomah County Board Room. 501 SE Hawthorne Blvd., Portland

## Policy Group Members and Alternates Present

Art Pearce, *Alt. for Commissioner Chloe Eudaly, City of Portland*  
 Co-Chair Jessica Vega Pederson, *Multnomah County*  
 Councilor Cate Arnold, *City of Beaverton*  
 Councilor Karylenn Echols, *City of Gresham*  
 Doug Kelsey, *TriMet*  
 Jagjit Nagra, *Alt. for Senator Jeff Merkley, U.S. Senate*  
 Justin Douglas, *Alt. for Kimberly Branam, Prosper Portland*

Jon Makler, *Alt. for Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1*  
 Tom Goldstein, *Alt. for Phil Ditzler, Federal Highway Administration*  
 Representative Barbara Smith Warner, *Oregon State Legislature*  
 Roger Gonzalez, *Alt. for Metro Council President Tom Hughes*  
 Tara Sulzen, *Alt. for Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. House of Representatives*

## Policy Group Members Absent

Chair Deborah Kafoury, *Multnomah County*  
 Brendan Finn, *Oregon Governor Kate Brown's Office*  
 Phylcia Haggerty, *Alt. for Representative Suzanne Bonamici, U.S House of Representatives*

Senator Kathleen Taylor, *Oregon State Legislature*  
 Phil Ditzler, *Federal Highway Administration*  
 Grace Stratton, *Alt. for Senator Ron Wyden, U.S. Senate*

## Staff and Consultants

Megan Neill, *Multnomah County*  
 Ian Cannon, *Multnomah County*  
 Mike Pullen, *Multnomah County*  
 Kim Peoples, *Multnomah County*  
 Jamie Waltz, *Multnomah County*  
 Liz Smith Currie, *Multnomah County*  
 Chris Fick, *Multnomah County*

Emily Miletich, *Multnomah County*  
 Heather Catron, *HDR*  
 Steve Drahota, *HDR*  
 Cassie Davis, *HDR*  
 Jeff Heilman, *Parametrix*  
 Alice Sherring, *EnvirolIssues*  
 Mari Valencia, *EnvirolIssues*

## Welcome and Introductions

Alice Sherring, EnviroIssues facilitator, opened the meeting. She welcomed committee members to the fourth Policy Group meeting for the project, noting that this meeting will wrap-up the Feasibility Study phase and kick off the Environmental Review phase of the Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge Project. She reviewed the discussion guidelines, the safety protocol, and led group introductions.

## Opening Remarks

Multnomah County Commissioner and Policy Group Co-Chair, Jessica Vega Pederson, thanked the committee for their attendance and continued commitment to the Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge process. She reviewed the meeting agenda and desired outcomes. She stated that a critical component of the meeting is gaining concurrence from Policy Group members on the draft purpose and need statement and the range of alternatives in advance of the Board of County Commissioners meeting on November 1. She emphasized the importance of the Policy Group's support as a critical component of the project process.

Alice thanked Commissioner Vega Pederson for her remarks.

## Project Update

Heather Catron, HDR, introduced herself as the consultant team project manager, and introduced the rest of the project team – Jeff Heilman, environmental lead, Steve Drahota, technical lead, and Cassie Davis, public involvement lead. She then introduced Megan Neill as the Multnomah County project manager and Mike Pullen as the Multnomah County public involvement lead. Following introductions, she gave the group a project update.

Heather began with an overview of the feasibility study goals, including:

- Raising public awareness about the purpose and need for a seismically resilient Burnside crossing
- Cultivating relationships with regional partners who will be key stakeholders throughout the process
- Developing a shortlist of recommended alternatives for further study

She stated November will wrap up the feasibility study process and the goals above could not have been achieved without the help of the policy group, project staff, project committees, and all community members engaged in the process thus far.

Heather provided an update of the project team's activities since the last policy group meeting on Apr. 26, 2018. She stated the feasibility study report, which documents the process and findings that helped identify four recommended alternatives, was published for agency and public review in September 2018. She highlighted that the report includes a series of technical reports that documents and provides

more detail on the process and findings. The project team conducted outreach throughout the month of September to receive feedback on the Draft Feasibility Study Report, draft purpose and need statement, the recommended range of alternatives for further study in the environmental review phase, and scope of the environmental study. The team also met with the other two committees (Senior Agency Staff Group meeting on Oct. 11 and Community Task Force on Oct. 17), sharing information about the study process and findings and feedback received through the engagement process. The project team will present the Feasibility Study findings before the Board of County Commissioners on Nov. 1. This meeting will conclude the Feasibility Study Phase and the project will transition to the Environmental Review phase.

Heather invited Jeff Heilman, Parametrix, to provide an overview of the draft purpose and need statement. Jeff began by stating the draft document is a fundamental document required as part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review process. The purpose and need are the baseline for comparing alternatives in NEPA.

Jeff reviewed key aspects of the draft purpose and need:

- Create a seismically resilient Burnside Street lifeline crossing of the Willamette River that will remain fully operational and accessible for vehicles and other modes of transportation immediately following a major Cascadia Subduction Zone (CSZ) earthquake.
- Support the region's ability to provide rapid and reliable emergency response, rescue and evacuation after a major earthquake, as well as enable post-earthquake economic recovery.
- Provide a long-term, low-maintenance and safe crossing for all users.

He pointed out that since the last Policy Group meeting, the project team narrowed the proposed alternative options from nine to four per the group's recommendations and input received from the other committees and stakeholders.

Jeff mentioned the bike/ped community did not favor the stacked bridge option due to safety and security concerns associated with the darkness of the lower bridge deck. The bike/ped community also suggested that being separated from other modes via a different bridge entirely also poses challenges for safety and connectivity, and therefore did not favor the two mode separated bridge options. Stakeholders suggested that previous community conversations identified Ankeny as a bike route and would like to discourage cars from using it, thus the East Ankeny Couplet option did not perform as well as the East Couch Couplet and therefore was not recommended to move forward. The Enhanced Seismic Retrofit Widened bridge option was more expensive than the unwidened option and therefore also not moved forward.

Jeff invited Steve Drahota, HDR, to provide an overview of the four selected alternatives going into environmental review phase of the project process.

Steve began by reminding the group of the key constraints. No alternative shall significantly disrupt the operation of the following key adjacent infrastructure (including during construction):

1. TriMet Max service (SW/NW 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.; SW 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. and SW 6<sup>th</sup> Ave.)
2. City of Portland Roadway (Naito Pkwy., NE/SE MLK Jr. Blvd., NE/SE Grand Ave.)
3. City of Portland Combined Sewer Overflow
4. Oregon Department of Transportation Highway Facilities (I-5 and I-84)
5. Union Pacific Railroad Mainline
6. U.S. Coast Guard/River Navigation

Steve presented the recommended four alternatives, referring to the PowerPoint presentation.

**1. Enhanced Seismic Retrofit (Unwidened).** A rehabilitation and retrofit to the existing Burnside Bridge to meet the Project seismic design criteria. This option will maintain the existing bridge width, i.e. 110 ft at the approaches and 86 ft over the river. However, a portion of the east side of the bridge will require replacement to avoid significantly disrupting ODOT facilities during construction.

- **Question: Will the retrofit have the same lifespan as the replacement options?** All options will be designed for a 100-year lifespan.

**2. Replacement: Fixed Bridge (Widened).** A new fixed bridge with a maximum 97-foot clearance to allow boat travel. A key component for this option is determining the best landing point on the west side. The west landing could touch down up to three blocks further west of the existing bridge.

- **Question: Why not the east side?** The approach landing is higher in elevation on the east side of the Willamette River than the west side. A longer clearance is needed due to the lower level on the west side.
- **Question: What is the clearance of the Marquam Bridge?** 120 feet
- **Question: Why a 97-foot clearance for this option?** A clearance of 97 feet is a threshold point; it's the point before impacting various streetcar lines on the east side (i.e. Grand Ave. and MLK Jr. Blvd.) and TriMet Max lines on the west side (SW 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Ave).
- **Question: Have there been changes in the vessels coming down the river?** This will be studied in detail during the forthcoming NEPA phase. During the NEPA phase the project team will also study ships that are better suited for natural disaster recovery.
- **Question: Will there be long term maintenance costs (i.e. dredging, operational, etc.)?** Yes, these costs will be analyzed in the forthcoming phase.
- **Question: Do any of the options take longer to build?** Yes, but all will ultimately fall within four-to-five years based on approach, demolition, etc. The key will be determining options for handling traffic during construction.

**3. Replacement: Movable bridge (Widened).** A new movable bridge at roughly the same height and location as the existing bridge. The primary difference with this option is that the bridge width will remain a constant 110 ft from one end to the other. This option also allows opportunity to consider bascule or lift bridge types. The NEPA phase will help identify impacts without defining a bridge type.

- **Question: How is this option expected to perform, specifically the lift, in the event of an earthquake?** Steve said the performance criteria will be formed to ensure that it performs well in the event of the earthquake and will ensure it is functional after the earthquake.

**4. Replacement: NE Couch Connection (Widened).** A new movable bridge at roughly the same height as the current bridge. This option will also maintain a constant width of 110 ft from one end of the bridge to the other. The east landing splits to connect to NE Couch St. Westbound traffic enters from NE Couch St.

Steve provided an overview of the capital costs for all the bridge options. Overall, the more bridge that needs to get constructed, the more expensive it will be to construct. Two assumptions were made to determine an estimated cost for each option. The first assumption considers detouring traffic away from the site during construction. The second assumption considers building a temporary bridge facility during construction to allow vehicles to cross the river at Burnside. The lowest cost option is the non-widened enhanced seismic retrofit.

- **Question: Are there any safety considerations for workers?** Yes, safety is always a consideration with bridge projects; however this won't be analyzed during the NEPA phase. This analysis will be conducted during the design phase.
- **Question: Are the costs calculated in future dollars?** Yes, these cost estimates have been escalated to account for inflation.
- **Question: Why is the retrofit option cost like the other new bridge options? One would think it would be lower.** The foundation drove the costs on this option. Each of the columns and their foundations must be strengthened and virtually all the bridge members must be upgraded. Upgrading the bridge to current standards results in similar costs as those for a new bridge.
- **Question: What are the risks to the buildings adjacent to each bridge option?** The forthcoming NEPA phase will analyze these impacts and risks.

## September Engagement – What we heard

Alice welcomed Mike Pullen, Multnomah County, to provide an overview of the results from outreach since the policy group's last meeting.

Mike presented an overview of the summer outreach and engagement efforts conducted by the project team. A total of 13 briefings and/or presentations were conducted from April to October 2018. Mike noted the City Club published a report on seismic resiliency and has been identified as an early advocate for the fixed bridge option.

Mike noted the Burnside Bridge is a key lifeline and major access point for many social service providers located on the west end of the bridge and in Old Town/China Town. To promote engagement between service providers and the project, the project team conducted a workshop where nine social service providers participated and provided feedback on the process. This workshop took place at Mercy Corps on July 31, 2018. Participants were encouraged to apply for the Community Task Force, a community stakeholder committee for the project. Staff from Central City Concern, Mercy Corps and Portland Rescue Mission ultimately joined the Community Task Force.

Many outreach tools were utilized as part of the September engagement effort including an online open house, in-person open houses, videos and social media, news releases and e-blasts, direct mail, and news coverage. All outreach tools directed the community to participate in an online survey or open house to provide feedback on the four recommended alternatives. In total, 168 survey responses were received.

Mike walked through the key themes heard throughout the September outreach effort. Overall, people are excited about the project but expressed urgency for completing the project sooner. People expressed desire for public transit and bike/ped improvements. Others expressed concern about impacts to the transportation system and impacts to nearby buildings. There wasn't strong opposition to any of the options but more support for the replacement bridge options. People want the bridge to be aesthetically attractive.

Mike provided an update on the project Community Task Force (CTF). There are more new members that joined the committee. The project team reached out to many organizations to expand diversity but were not able to recruit as many as desired. Many organizations did express interest in participating and/or supporting future engagement efforts. Many of the new committee members were social service organizations/providers or from East County.

## **Environmental Review**

Heather provided an overview of the Environmental Review committee framework. She stated the structure would be very similar to that of the Feasibility Study structure. The Project Management Team will continue to meet on a monthly schedule to focus on project deliverables. This team includes the County, consultant team, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Metro, City of Portland and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The Senior Agency Staff Group includes staff appointed by the members of the Policy Group. This group is charged with representing their agency's views and interests, and ensuring they keep their agencies up to speed on the project. The CTF includes community members from various backgrounds and interests. They will provide community insight to the project team throughout the project. The CTF will provide recommendations to the Policy Group at key milestones so the Policy Group can make informed project decisions.

Jeff provided a brief description of Cooperating and Participating Agencies. He stated both groups are required and specific to the NEPA process. Cooperating Agencies are federal agencies with specific expertise and approval authority while Participating agencies are any other local or state agency or tribe that chooses to participate in the process.

- **Question: Is FHWA a Cooperating Agency?** FHWA is the lead agency that oversees the NEPA process.

Heather explained the process and schedule for the Environmental Phase, referring to the PowerPoint presentation. She said the project team is wrapping up the scope of work for the environmental phase. In December, work plans will be developed for the environmental phase planned to kick off in early 2019. The first step in the process will be to refine the range of alternatives for the technical environmental analysis. Following this work, a notice of intent will be initiated (anticipated for mid to late 2018), which will kick off the formal NEPA process.

Alice moved the group to the next agenda item, charter review. She stated this document will guide the group's work during the NEPA phase. She asked Policy Group members to review and provide comments, edits and feedback. The document will be refined by the next scheduled group meeting.

- **Question: Should the policy group meeting discuss risks related to other major construction projects?** The project team is partnering with other agencies who are delivering major projects to ensure all are talking and working together to reduce impacts. **Action item:** The project team will update the charter to include this partnership piece.
- **Question: When is the TriMet MAX Red Line extension expected for completion?** 2021.

Commissioner Jessica Vega Pederson re-emphasized the importance of gaining the group's concurrence on the draft purpose and need statement and the proposed range of alternatives.

Alice asked all policy group members to provide their level of support on the draft purpose and need statement.

- Justin Douglas – Support
- Representative Barbara Smith Warner – Support
- Councilor Cate Arnold – Support, both items are very clear and organized
- Art Pearce – Support
- Commissioner Jessica Vega Pederson – Support
- Roger Gonzalez – Support
- Jon Makler – Support
- Thomas Goldstein – Support
- Councilor Karylinn Echols – Support
- Doug Kelsey – Support

- *Tara Sulzen – Abstained as non-voting member of the Policy Group*
- *Jagjit Nagra – Abstained as non-voting member of the Policy Groups*

Alice thanked policy group members for their support. She then asked members to provide their level of support on the proposed four alternatives.

- Justin Douglas – Support
- Representative Barbara Smith Warner – Support
- Councilor Cate Arnold – Support
- Art Pearce – Support
- Commissioner Jessica Vega Pederson – Support
- Roger Gonzalez – Support
- Jon Makler – Support
- Thomas Goldstein – Support
- Councilor Karylenn Echols – Support
- Doug Kelsey – Support
- *Tara Sulzen – Abstained as non-voting member of the Policy Group*
- *Jagjit Nagra – Abstained as non-voting member of the Policy Group*

Alice thanked the Policy Group members for their support and noted that the Charter will provide more role clarity for those members who had abstained from this vote. These members are participating in this group in non-voting roles, as per their practice.

## **Public Comment**

No comments were provided.

## **Next Steps and Closing Remarks**

Commissioner Jessica Vega Pederson provided closing remarks. She invited group members to submit comments/feedback at any time to any of the project team staff members. She thanked all members for their participation in the process and the project. She expressed her excitement to continue working on this project with group members then adjourned the meeting.