



Multnomah County is creating an earthquake-ready downtown river crossing.

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

December 21, 2020

Community Task Force – Agenda Meeting #22

Project:	Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge
Subject:	Community Task Force Meeting #22
Date:	December 21, 2020
Time:	<i>Early Arrivals: 5:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.</i> Meeting Timing: 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Location:	WebEx Virtual Meeting

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Amy Rathfelder, Portland Business Alliance
 Art Graves, Multnomah County Bike and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee
 Dennis Corwin, Portland Spirit
 Ed Wortman, Community Member
 Frederick Cooper, Laurelhurst Neighborhood Emergency Team and Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association
 Gabe Rahe, Burnside Skate Park
 Howie Bierbaum, Portland Saturday Market
 Jackie Tate, Community Member
 Jane Gordon, University of Oregon
 Jennifer Stein, Central City Concern
 Marie Dodds, AAA of Oregon
 Neil Jensen, Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce
 Paul Leitman, Oregon Walks
 Peter Englander, Old Town Community Association
 Peter Finley Fry, Central Eastside Industrial Council
 Sharon Wood Wortman, Community Member

Stella Funk Butler, Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations
 Susan Lindsay, Buckman Community Association
 Tesia Eisenberg, Mercy Corps
 William Burgel, Portland Freight Advisory Committee

PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS

Megan Neill, Multnomah County
 Mike Pullen, Multnomah County
 Heather Catron, HDR
 Cassie Davis, HDR
 Steve Drahota, HDR
 Liz Stoppelmann, HDR
 Jeff Heilman, Parametrix
 Allison Brown, JLA
 Sarah Omlor, EnviroIssues

Meeting Purpose:

- Provide a project update on recent and upcoming working group meetings and activities
- Review and confirm draft evaluation criteria topics
- Review and confirm a range of bridge type options to move forward





Multnomah County is creating an earthquake-ready downtown river crossing.

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

December 21, 2020

Agenda:

Time	Session	Lead
5:30 p.m.	<i>Early Arrivals</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WebEx meeting platform will be available for folks that want to join early and test computer functions before meeting start 	Project Team
6:00 p.m.	Welcome, Introductions and Housekeeping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting Protocols Round Table Introductions 	Allison Brown
6:05 p.m.	Public Comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledge Any Public Comments Received 	Allison Brown
6:15 p.m.	Project Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bridge Seismic Working Group Historic /Cultural & Section 106 Process Draft Environmental Impact Statement 	Steve Drahota Jeff Heilman
6:30 p.m.	Evaluation Criteria Development <u>CTF Discussion:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend Criteria Topics 	Allison Brown Jeff Heilman Steve Drahota
7:00 p.m.	Bridge Types Review <u>CTF Discussion:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend Range of Bridge Types 	Allison Brown Steve Drahota
7:40 p.m.	Public Outreach – January/February <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bridge Type Selection Draft Environmental Impact Statement 	Cassie Davis
7:45 p.m.	Next Steps	Allison Brown
7:50 p.m.	Open Discussion	Allison Brown
8:00 p.m.	Adjourn	All

The purpose of the CTF is to serve as an advisory body to Multnomah County by:

- Considering the potential environmental impacts of the alternatives
- Providing informed insights and opinions on the impacts being evaluated
- Discussing technical recommendations, suggesting measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential impacts
- Representing the interests, needs and opinions of community, business organizations and groups
- Considering input and information from other community members, stakeholders and interested parties.

CTF members approached by interest groups other than their own constituencies are encouraged to share these conversations at CTF meetings. For information contact Mike Pullen, County Communications Office at mike.j.pullen@multco.us



DRAFT Evaluation Criteria

1 Human Experience & Bridge Surroundings

- A. On-bridge Experience:** How well does the option provide benefits to people when they are on the bridge?
- Clear views from the bridge deck of:
 - The cityscape, including downtown and the Eastside
 - Distant landscapes and natural environment (West Hills, Willamette River, Mt Hood, Mt St Helens, and open skies)
 - Adjacent bridges in the up-river and down-river directions
 - Other key viewpoints (e.g., Portland Oregon sign, Oregon Convention Center towers, Moda Center, Waterfront Park, US Bank Tower)
 - Bridge deck as an open space for public events (such as the Rose Festival Grand Floral Parade) and civic gatherings
 - Create a gateway and enhanced sense of arrival to and from each side of the river
 - Intuitive ability to understand wayfinding, mode split, location of overlooks and connections without excessive clutter that detracts from the bridge design (**Note: likely common to all options; not expected to be differentiating.**)
 - Pedestrian and bicycle safety: sight lines, noise, vibration, lighting and physical separation of modes (**Note: likely common to all options; not expected to be differentiating.**)
 - Ability to provide river overlooks for users to stop and enjoy the adjacent scenery (**Note: likely common to all options; not expected to be differentiating.**)
- B. Below-bridge Experience:** How well does the option provide benefits to people when they are under the bridge (in areas such as parks, roads, the river)?
- Column location that improves personal safety by providing adequate sightlines and clearances below the bridge
 - Ability to further activate and enhance the under-bridge space within Waterfront Park for community events and other activities (e.g., Portland Saturday Market and Bridgetown Nightstrike)

- Maximize vertical clearances to create an “urban roof” that enhances the under-bridge experience
 - Preserve the integrity of park features such as Japanese American Historical Plaza, Ankeny Plaza, Bill Naito Legacy Fountain, Better Naito Forever, Vera Katz Eastbank Esplanade, Burnside Skatepark, and Tom McCall Waterfront Park and its existing trees
 - Ability to enhance the under-bridge space at Skidmore Fountain Max Station
 - Visually open connectivity with the river in the space beneath the bridge
- C. Relation to Surroundings:** How well does the option’s scale and form complement the character of surrounding neighborhoods, buildings, parks and historic districts/structures while being distinctive?
- Surroundings include the:
 - Old Town/Chinatown and Downtown neighborhoods, including the Skidmore / Old Town Historic District (75 ft. height limit) and the west bridgehead buildings and physical infrastructure shapes and scale
 - Kerns and Buckman neighborhoods and Central Eastside Industrial District (250 ft. height limit), including the east bridgehead buildings and physical infrastructure shapes, scale, textures, and colors
 - Other bridges up-river and down-river
- D. Pedestrian and Cyclist Connectivity:** How well does the option ensure safe and accessible connections on and off the bridge for people walking, biking or with disabilities? *(Note: likely common to all options; not expected to be differentiating.)*
- This considers the:
 - Americans with Disabilities Act and Universal Design concepts
 - West bridge deck to Waterfront Park, Naito Parkway, SW/NW 1st and SW/NW 2nd Avenues
 - East bridge deck to surrounding local streets, and pedestrian open spaces, and the Vera Katz Eastbank Esplanade

2 Overall Look and Feel of the Bridge

- A. Bridge Overall Look:** How well does the option’s overall form create a look of balance, unity, and flow from key viewpoints above, under, and away from the bridge?
- This includes the:

- Willamette River
 - Waterfront Park
 - Vera Katz Eastbank Esplanade
 - I-5 / I-84 users
 - Bridgehead buildings
 - High-rise buildings
 - Surrounding bridges
- B. Bridge Form and Style:** How well does the option acknowledge the historic surroundings while presenting a seismically-resilient, modern design that sets the tone for future development throughout its 100-year design life?
- This includes the bridge’s ability to:
 - Balance the qualities of openness and transparency (i.e., minimizing the massing) while conveying a sense of seismic stability and reliability
 - Ensure overall design compatibility of fixed and moveable bridge spans; reflecting proportions and scale that feel balanced amongst the various structural elements
 - Reflect the distinctive setting of each side of the river, considering buildings, parks and infrastructure
 - Reflect best practices in technologies, engineering, and architectural design that represent the era in which the bridge is designed and constructed, including potentials for exposing/expressing the movable bridge mechanisms
 - Honor Portland’s moniker as a “City of Bridges” and the bridge’s unique location at the center of the City quadrants
 - Provide opportunity for memorable, distinctive lighting for nighttime viewing while adhering to “dark skies” principles
 - Reflect Portland’s transportation values in bicycle and pedestrian safety and accessibility (Note: likely common to all options; not expected to be differentiating.)
- C. Flexible Design:** How well does the option allow flexibility for engineering and architectural features in final design, as well as adaptability of the bridge for future user needs?
- This includes the bridge’s potential to:

- Express Portland values and aspirations for inclusiveness, resiliency, accessibility, creative expression, vitality, and sustainability
- Become an identifiable beacon of safety, landmark, city center, and destination within the city during the day and after dark
- Provide tactile, human-scale features, close proximity of pedestrian view and touch, including overlooks
- Enable a wide range of complementary secondary design features that are cohesive with the overall bridge design (e.g., operator’s house, multi-use path connections, Streetcar elements, overlooks, etc.)
- Accommodate varied river uses and water-level changes
- Minimize effects on natural resources such as wildlife, fisheries, and shoreline / shallow-water habitat
- Reduce noise impacts to bridge users generated by on-bridge and adjacent freeway traffic (Note: likely common to all options; not expected to be differentiating.)
- Implement sustainable and equitable design principles during the Final Design phase (Note: likely common to all options; not expected to be differentiating.)

3 Cost and Construction Impacts to Users

A. Total Project Cost: How well does the option minimize the Project’s total cost?

- This includes:
 - Construction costs, including the influence of constructability over and around existing transportation infrastructure, the Willamette River, adjacent buildings, and utilities
 - Permanent and temporary right of way acquisition costs
 - Utility relocation and protection costs
 - Pre-construction design phase costs
 - Permitting and environmental mitigation costs
 - Construction inspection and engineering support costs

B. Long Term Costs: How well does the option minimize long-term costs and support future needs after construction?

- This includes:
 - Direct cost of bridge operations and inspections
 - Direct cost for routine maintenance and rehabilitation improvements (e.g., movable bridge repairs, deck wearing surface rehabilitation, re-painting, lighting maintenance, structural upgrades, etc)
 - Direct costs for bridge repairs following major events (e.g., major earthquake, major flood, vessel collisions, civic unrest, fires, etc)
 - Direct cost for potential bridge use changes (e.g., adding Streetcar equipment, systems, and armatures onto the bridge; adding more bicycle/pedestrian space; adjusting for future lane uses; etc)

C. Construction Impacts: How well does the option minimize impacts to the traveling public and surrounding property owners and tenants during construction?

- This includes:
 - Detour durations for bridge users
 - Detour durations for bicyclists and pedestrians using Waterfront Park and the Vera Katz Eastbank Esplanade
 - Temporary property impacts
 - Utility service disruptions