



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

October 11, 2021

Community Task Force (CTF) Meeting #27

Meeting Information

Project: Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge

Subject: CTF, Meeting #27

Date: Monday, October 11, 2021

Time: 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.

Location: WebEx Video Conference Call and Livestream

Attendees:

CTF Members:

Amy Rathfelder,
Art Graves, MultCo Bike and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee
Dennis Corwin, Portland Spirit
Ed Wortman, Community Member
Frederick "Fred" Cooper, Laurelhurst Neighborhood Emergency Team and Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association
Gabe Rahe, Burnside Skatepark
Howie Bierbaum, Portland Saturday Market
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 Finley Fry, Central Eastside Industrial District
Sharon Wood Wortman, Community Member
Stella Funk Butler, Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations
Susan Lindsay, Buckman Community Association
Tesia Eisenberg, Mercy Corps
William "Bill" BURGEL, Portland Freight Advisory Committee

Project Team Members:

Megan Neill, Multnomah County
Mike Pullen, Multnomah County
Steve Drahota, HDR
Liz Stoppelmann, HDR
Brianna Dunn, HDR
Cassie Davis, CDavis Consulting
Allison Brown, JLA
Sarah Omlor, EnviroIssues
Patrick Sweeney, PBOT

Apologies: Jackie Tate





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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

October 11, 2021

Summary Notes

This online virtual meeting was held over WebEx and livestreamed to the public via Vbrick. 12 public attendees logged in to view the livestream. A recording of this meeting is available on the [Committee Meeting Materials](#) page on the project website.

This summary includes the nature and dialogue of the meeting, including questions and comments submitted by CTF members through the WebEx chat function.

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND HOUSEKEEPING

Allison Brown, JLA, welcomed everyone to the meeting, reviewed the agenda and took roll call.

PUBLIC COMMENT

In advance of the meeting, the public was invited to submit comments to the CTF. No comments were received.

PROJECT UPDATE

Workplan

Steve Drahota, HDR, updated the CTF on the project timeline including the status of the Environmental Review and upcoming CTF meetings. The project team would be presenting their findings on the various cost-saving measures and bridge type options for the west and movable spans at this meeting. CTF members will be asked if they recommend the package of refinements to the Preferred Alternative at their next meeting on October 25th.

After the CTF's recommendation, there will be a public outreach period to share the cost measures and movable span recommendation with the community. In January, the team will present what was heard from the public back to the CTF where the group will have the chance to confirm their recommendation. After that, the Policy Group will consider the recommendation for approval. It will then go to the Board of County Commissioners and City Council before being adopted into the Metro Regional Transportation Plan amendment in April.

Steve reiterated that there would be no voting at tonight's meeting, but the CTF should ask for any information they need in order to make their preliminary decision at the next meeting. He also acknowledged that there was a disconnect around information presented at the last meeting about the girder option for the west approach bridge type. More detail and discussion would be had at tonight's meeting.

Jeff Heilman, Parametrix, reviewed the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and how it affects the decision-making process. The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS)



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

October 11, 2021

will be published in Spring 2022, followed by a formal comment period. The input from the public will be documented in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

Jeff explained that once the Preferred Alternative is chosen, the project team must demonstrate how it complies with federal environmental regulations. The Preferred Alternative cannot have adverse effects on parks, historic resources, endangered species, water quality and river navigation unless there is no reasonable alternative. The Federal Transportation Act Section 4(f) (parks and historic resources) has more authority to it than many of the other regulatory agencies – in particular, around the west approach span which affects the Skidmore/Old Town Historic Districts and Waterfront Park.

Steve shared that NEPA’s rules about a ‘least harm alternative’ will be one of the project’s biggest constraints. Although the project is asking for the CTF to make a recommendation, the team will have to ultimately consider what is legally possible. If the least harm alternative is not chosen, the project will not be able to receive federal approval and funding.

Steve shared a table outlining which groups will be involved in each of the refinements to the Preferred Alternative (see slide 12).

Revised Preferred Alternative Refinements	Why?	CTF Recommendation on 10/25?
1. Bridge width: Reduced by approx. 26 feet	• Cost savings	✓
2. Vehicle Lanes: Reduced from 5 to 4 vehicular lanes	• Cost savings	✓
Lane Configurations: 4 Options under consideration	• Minimize traffic impact	City decision
3. Bike / Ped Space: Reduced from 20’ to 15.5’ (or 17’)	• Cost savings	✓
4. West Approach bridge type: Reduced to only the Girder type	• Regulatory permitting • Cost savings	✓
5. Movable span bridge type: Select either Lift or Bascule type	• Regulatory permitting • Community preference • Cost savings	✓
6. East Span Bridge Type: Dismiss Truss (Tied Arch and Cable Stayed types advanced to Design Phase)	• Community preference	✓
Eastside column location for Tied Arch: Advancing option west of NE 2 nd Avenue	• Regulatory permitting • Cost savings	County decision
ADA Connections to Bridge: Advance stairs and elevators (dismiss Ramps)	• Minimize cost	County decision

Allison paused to ask for questions:

- Fred Cooper, Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association, asked if the National Parks Service (NPS) gave a written response about the adverse effects of the west approach bridge alternatives.
 - Steve and Jeff said the project received verbal comments during a meeting with the NPS. Their statements are included in transcribed meeting notes that were approved by NPS.
 - Jeff explained that the project was initially directed to work with the NPS office in San Francisco but because of their small staff and major workload, an out-of-state project was not their first priority. Over the summer, the project was reassigned to be reviewed by NPS staff at Fort Vancouver in Washington who felt that above-deck structures were a clear adverse effect. This delayed review is why this hadn't been discussed sooner.
- Peter Finley Fry, Central Eastside Industrial Council, asked who legally determines what is an adverse effect.
 - Jeff said the State Historic Preservation Office ultimately decides. The Federal Highway Administration has some input too. If there was disagreement, the decision would be made by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation in Washington DC.
- Bill Burgel, Portland Freight Advisory Committee, asked how the MAX was routed through the Old Town Historic District if they had to follow these rules.
 - Jeff explained that the height of new structures is the particular issue in question for the Old Town Historic District. He added that in most cases light rail is considered similar to the historic streetcars so tracks and other infrastructure are not considered adverse effects.
- Fred asked if there was concern that the above-deck structures on the east side would cause adverse effects.
 - Jeff answered that there was concern that the towers of the movable span lift option would be an issue, but they are far enough away to not be considered adverse impacts. There were no concerns about the east span of the bridge.
- Marie Dodds, AAA of Oregon, asked if the cost reductions will impact the seismic resiliency and if the reduced width impacts the project's main objective of moving freight and emergency vehicles across the bridge after an earthquake.
 - Steve said the bridge will retain the same level of seismic resiliency even with the cost-saving measures. He said the minimum emergency route width of 44 feet will be retained regardless of the cross-section option that is chosen.

See NPS Notes attached.

Note: Until the National Park Service reviews the actual submission of updated environmental documents with the appropriate conveyance correspondence, including any updated analyses of effect, comments at this meeting by the National Park Service should be considered pre-decisional and are part of the deliberative process we are conducting as part of Section 106 compliance.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

October 11, 2021

- Bill noted that after an earthquake the six other downtown bridges would be inoperable for years. The Burnside Bridge would need to sustain the entire city for years and it seems short-sighted to decrease the width.
 - Steve said these comments are important to hear and that CTF members will be able to add comments to their recommendations for the record at their next meeting.
 - Jane Gordon, University of Oregon, agreed with Bill's point.

REFINEMENTS TO THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Bridge Type

WESTSIDE GIRDER

Steve reviewed the range of bridge types and movable span combinations for the west approach and presented the feedback given by the following groups around the following topics:

Permitting Requirements

- **NPS** - Above deck elements in the West Approach create an Adverse Effect on the Skidmore/Old Town Historic District that is avoided with a girder concept. Since this is an avoidable impact, it isn't reasonable to choose another alternative.
- **Historic Landmarks Commission/Design Commission (DAR)** – Had similar comments to NPS and expressed preference for the “observable asymmetry” due to distinct differences in urban landscape on the west and east sides.

Cost – The modified girder option is \$20-40 million less expensive than any above deck option.

Community Preferences – Survey results from early 2021 showed that respondents were generally not in favor of the girder option. This was, in part, because most respondents also preferred higher vertical clearance in Waterfront Park. Since the project team has redesigned the support column placements of the girder to increase the vertical clearance, some of these concerns have been mitigated.

UDAWG – Didn't vocalize any opposition to the girder option and also has preference for asymmetry.

Multnomah County – Recommends the girder option for the west approach.

Allison paused to ask for questions:

- Neil Jensen, Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce, asked if the girder option had a higher long term maintenance cost.
 - Steve said the girder is not expected to be more expensive long term than the other options but it may depend on whether or not the bridge is painted.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

October 11, 2021

- Bill asked if the height clearance under the bridge would be taller than it is today.
 - Steve said yes, the updated girder design has about 1 more foot of clearance than the existing bridge.
- Bill asked how the in-water piers will line up with the bridge deck if it's a foot higher.
 - Steve said that the bridge deck elevation would stay at the same location as exists today. Despite the longer span between supports, the 1' vertical clearance increase is a result of a thinner bridge section, which is because of today's modern technology versus that constructed in the 1920s.
- Fred asked if the project cost is now within the *Not to Exceed* limit set by the County.
 - Steve said that current Project costs would be shared at the next meeting. He noted that the COVID-19 pandemic has led to many supply chain problems that have dramatically increased construction costs.

MOVABLE SPAN

Steve showed all of the existing bridges in downtown Portland, noting the diversity of bridge and span types. He reminded the CTF of the two movable span options; lift or bascule, and presented the feedback given by the following groups around the following topics:

Permitting Requirements

- **NPS** - Recommends the bascule option to complement the Skidmore/Old Town Historic District.
- **Historic Landmarks Commission/Design Commission (DAR)** – Believes the bascule movable bridge option minimizes impacts to views and expressed preference for the “observable asymmetry”. Also prefers the cable stayed option for the east approach because it has better visibility and complements the east side architecture.

Cost – Bascule is \$25-35 million less expensive than the Lift option.

Community Preferences – Survey results from early 2021 were largely in favor of the bascule option.

UDAWG – No members are in support of the lift option because the lift towers are too large for the scale of the river.

Multnomah County – Recommends advancing *only* the bascule option.

Steve gave a refresher on the type selection evaluation criteria developed by the CTF earlier in the year including Human Experience & Bridge Surroundings, Overall Look and Feel of the Bridge, and Cost and Construction Impacts to Users. He then walked the group through a series of renderings of the different bridge options from various viewpoints. Each viewpoint includes renderings of the following options (see slides 31-63):

- Tied Arch with Bascule
- Tied Arch with Lift



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

October 11, 2021

- Cable Stayed with Bascule
- Cable Stayed with Lift

MOVABLE BRIDGE SUPPORTING INFO: BASIC FORM BRIDGE VIEWS

- View 1: From I-84 to I-5 Southbound
- View 2: Looking NE from Waterfront Park
- View 3: Looking West from Burnside Bridge
- View 4: Looking East from Burnside Bridge Midspan
- View 5: Looking SW from Waterfront Park
- View 6: Looking North from Morrison Bridge

Allison paused to ask for questions:

- Jennifer Stein, Central City Concern, appreciated the renderings and thanked the project team.
- Jane said she had strong reactions to the renderings and was curious what others thought. She shared her preference for the Cable Stayed with Bascule.
 - Bill agreed that he had a strong reaction as well.
 - Howie Bierbaum, Portland Saturday Market, also preferred the Cable Stayed with Bascule.
 - Gabe Rahe, Burnside Skatepark, preferred the bascule.
 - Stella Funk Butler, Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations, agreed with the bascule choice but was unsure whether she preferred the Cable Stayed or Tied Arch options.
- Bill shared that the renderings would be better if the boat and buildings were a different color than white.
- Tesia Eisenberg, Mercy Corps, and Neil agreed with the UDAWG's opinion that the movable lift was disproportionately large for the area.
- Bill asked if the size of the lift towers increased due to seismic considerations.
 - Steve said the lift towers were reduced as much as possible and because the river is relatively small, the towers are very close to the shore making them feel very large.
- Peter said the girder decision on the west approach was a surprise to him and asked if the east approach should be reexamined. He also thought it was interesting that the historic district considerations didn't affect the east side historic district, since it's only 300 feet away from the bridge. He asked if there was a possibility to have a girder on the east approach to match. He also asked how much money the girder would save.
 - Steve said the girder isn't possible on the east approach because the approach span is too long and would require the girder to be prohibitively thick to support the load. A girder on the east side would not allow for the required vertical clearance over the highway and the railroad tracks. He explained that the net cost for a girder on the east side would end up being much higher because of the support columns it would require to span over the highway and railroad tracks.

- Sharon Wood Wortman, Community Member, asked to see view 6 of the Cable Stayed with Lift again (slide 61) and noted that the lift towers and cable stayed towers create a theme with the lift towers of the Steel Bridge and the Convention Center towers in the background. Sharon sent a follow-up email to the project team to further clarify her statement:
 - “I’d like it clarified for the record that view 6 looking north from the Morrison Bridge with the vertical lift and cable-stayed options in place makes, in my opinion, a bold and pleasing visual statement what with the tessellation of the ten spires going on between the Steel Bridge towers, the Burnside’s vertical lift towers, the convention center towers, and the cable-stayed towers.”
- Art Graves, MultCo Bike and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee, noted that the two bridge options are essentially asymmetrical versions of the Fremont Bridge and Tilikum Crossing. He asked if the renderings are very realistic to what the final design would be or if there were still possible variations to these bridge types.
 - Steve said these renderings only show the basic form and structure. The final design process will involve creating a bridge that is more unique and dynamic than the renderings depict.
 - Art asked if the renderings are the most basic, inexpensive bridge options.
 - Steve said yes, they show the least expensive bridge option without much architectural enhancement. He said the Tilikum Crossing is very close to this basic structure but enhanced towers supports and belvederes in the river. The scale of the towers was also designed to emulate the mountains in the distance.
- Fred asked when the project will involve bridge contractors to decide the east approach bridge type.
 - Steve said the contractor will likely join the project a few months after the final design firm is selected, likely sometime in late 2022.
- Bill asked if there is a possibility to lighten the scale of the bascule piers.
 - Steve said it is likely possible and that this work would be explored during the final design phase.

Bridge Width

TRAFFIC LANE REDUCTION

Steve reviewed the existing bridge’s cross section, including the current widths of each lane for context. He shared that a narrower bridge would mean reducing vehicle lanes from five lanes to four and slightly reducing the plans for the bike and pedestrian space from the Draft EIS. This would save the project \$140-\$165 million. The project team has studied a variation of the reduced width bridge that would slightly decrease the width of each vehicle lane and reallocate that width to the bike and pedestrian lanes. That variation would allow 17 feet for bike and pedestrians on either side of the bridge with 44



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

October 11, 2021

feet for vehicle lanes in the center. Without that adjustment, the bike and pedestrian space on either side would be 15.5 feet and 47 feet for vehicle lanes.

Steve shared the four options for configuring the four traffic lanes (see slide 66) and presented the results of traffic modeling for each option.

- **Option 1** includes two westbound and two eastbound vehicle lanes. One of the eastbound lanes would be a bus-only lane.

This option meets the needs for morning rush hour traffic operations, morning and evening transit needs, emergency service, and complies with City policy of an eastbound bus lane. However, this option may be fatally flawed by significant congestion and queuing during the evening rush hour out of downtown.

- **Option 2** has an eastbound focus. It would have one westbound lane and three eastbound lanes. One of the eastbound lanes would be a bus-only lane. This is the same configuration that was temporarily used during the recent two-year Burnside Bridge maintenance project, with the addition of a dedicated bus-only eastbound lane. This option is feasible because there is much more traffic going eastbound in the evening than there is going westbound in the morning. Traffic volumes over the bridge are not projected to increase very much over the next 20 years.

This option meets the needs for evening rush hour traffic operations, evening transit needs, emergency service, and complies with City policy of an eastbound bus lane. This option may lead to some congestion during the morning westbound rush hour for cars and transit.

- **Option 3** would have one westbound lane, two eastbound lanes, and a reversible lane in-between that would allow for an additional lane of traffic in the appropriate direction during peak hours. One of the dedicated eastbound lanes would be a bus-only lane. Steve said this option would be ideal so long as the engineering and operations can be worked out. The biggest challenge is making a reversible lane operationally safe so it is clear which way traffic is moving at a particular time without adding permanent barriers that could interfere with emergency vehicles in the event of an earthquake. The team is currently studying these issues.

This option would work well for morning and evening rush hours in both directions for cars and transit, emergency services, and complies with City policy of an eastbound bus lane. There is the possibility of some moderate eastbound traffic congestion in the mornings.

Option 4 would have two westbound lanes and two eastbound lanes without a bus-only lane. Instead of one eastbound bus-only lane, there would be a queue jump for buses at the traffic light at each end of the bridge. This would allow the buses to have priority over vehicle traffic without taking up an entire dedicated lane.

This option is flawed due to transit reliability. Vehicle backups would likely exceed the length of the bus queue lane and render the queue jump ineffective. It is also not compliant with the City's Rose Lane Policy and could present delays for emergency services.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

October 11, 2021

The project team is studying Option 3's reversible lane further for feasibility. They are looking at the lessons learned from other reversible lanes around the country including traffic operations, speed limits, and examples of overhead signage and end treatments.

Steve showed diagrams of the traffic lanes on the west and east sides of the bridge during morning and evening hours (see slides 73-76) and pointed out where gates could be installed to prevent traffic from entering the reversible lane from the wrong direction during off hours. Conceptual locations for gates could be in the left-hand lane of the Couch Street S-curve on the east side and between 2nd and 3rd Avenue on the west side.

- Bill asked if a 10-foot vehicle lane was too narrow for heavy trucks and vehicles.
 - Steve said this is the preferred lane width and considered the standard by PBOT for an inside General Purpose lane without buses.
 - Bill asked if the traffic analysis assumes that the other downtown bridges are intact and handling their normal traffic volumes.
 - Steve said yes, the models assume normal traffic operations and not post-earthquake projections. He also noted that even with some congestion on the bridge, the models show that it would still take longer to reroute to another bridge than wait in some congestion so it is not expected that drivers would reroute.
- Howie asked if there is a higher accident rate with reversible lanes and if there are currently any in Portland.
 - Steve confirmed there are currently no reversible lanes in Portland, however, the team recently discovered that the Burnside Bridge had a reversible lane in the 1960's. He noted that data from reversible lanes on bridges hasn't shown a significant increase in accident rates, in part, because there are no right or left-hand turns interacting with the reversible lane and as long as it's accompanied by good signage. Plus, the bridge's speed limit is slow enough that increased accidents are not expected.
 - Susan Lindsay, Buckman Community Association, shared that she remembered this from the 60's.
- Bill asked if bus stops will back up traffic and affect the reversible lane.
 - Steve said it was possible that even with the reversible lane, there would be a moment when the bus stops could cause some backup. This is one of the reasons TriMet is considering moving the stop on the west side off the bridge on the west side of 2nd Ave.

EAST APPROACH SUPPORT LOCATION

Steve reviewed the refinement to relocate the eastside approach columns further to the east, either within or adjacent to the Burnside Skatepark, in order to avoid some of the unstable soils near the river. This would move the columns from the geotechnical hazard zone (or minimize work in the hazard zone) and reduce the need for expensive groundwork. This option only applies to a tied arch bridge type, not the cable stayed option.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

October 11, 2021

Three options for the placement of the columns were studied. Option 1 would place a row of four columns in the west portion of the Skatepark, making it partially unusable. Option 2 would place the supports just to the west of the Skatepark in the current sidewalk area. This would reduce impacts to the Skatepark but would require a sidewalk relocation that would encroach into 2nd Ave. Option 3 would place the columns on the westside of 2nd Ave to be as close to the edge of the geotechnical hazard zone while still avoiding the Skatepark and the sidewalk.

After further study, the project team dismissed Option 1 because of direct impacts to the usability of the Skatepark and Option 2 because of impacts to Pacific Coast Fruit Co. and The Yard. The team is advancing Option 3 into the Preferred Alternative. This measure will save the project up to \$5 million.

CONNECTIONS TO SKIDMORE MAX STATION AND EASTBANK ESPLANADE

The County has committed to funding an option to connect the bridge to the Skidmore MAX Station and the Eastbank Esplanade that meets ADA requirements. There were many options studied including switchback ramps, on-bridge signalized crossings, elevators & stairs, sidewalk improvements, or a combination of those options. The County is proposing to advance the concept of stairs and elevators on the east and west sides of the bridge. The County is also proposing making ADA upgrades to sidewalks along the routes from the bridge to the MAX and bus stops so that users can choose to walk around the bridge instead of using stairs or elevators.

Steve reviewed several ramp options that the County had looked into, including a switchback ramp with a more compact footprint as well as a larger ramp that would extend further out over the river. The County is open to ramp options if funding from other agencies can be identified.

Steve shared that TriMet has alerted the project team to two new considerations: a potential bus stop relocation from 1st Ave. to west of 2nd Ave. on the west side of the bridge and closing the Skidmore MAX station in 2024 after studying the ridership patterns. The project team will include assumptions for the stairs and elevators in the SDEIS materials but will remain flexible to other options as more information becomes available.

- Howie said that the elevators at the Skidmore MAX station will cause perpetual maintenance issues and asked if the County is aware of this.
 - Mike Pullen, Multnomah County, confirmed that the County realizes that public elevators downtown cause big security and maintenance issues. He said TriMet's decision on the bus stop on the bridge could impact the need for elevators on the west side.
 - Howie also believes they will close the Skidmore MAX station.
- Susan shared that the proposed stairway around the elevator onto the Esplanade looks scary.
 - Steve shared that the rendering is only a concept drawing and that final design could definitely improve the look and feel.

- Paul Leitman, Oregon Walks, asked to clarify whether the stair and elevator connections to the Eastbank Esplanade would only be on the south side of the bridge.
 - Steve responded that the connections to/from the north and south sides of the bridge would be made from the existing concrete platform located on the southern side of the bridge (where the existing stairs connect with the Eastbank Esplanade). When asked about the possibility of constructing a connection on the north side of the bridge (to the floating portion of the Eastbank Esplanade), Steve responded that this was not considered due to the additional environmental impacts that it would have. .
- Tesia noted that an elevator is more inclusive for people of all physical abilities.

NEXT STEPS

Steve reiterated the decision process for the CTF beginning with:

- An **initial recommendation** on the refinements at the **October 25th** CTF meeting
- Public input throughout November and December
- The **final recommendation** at the **January** CTF meeting

He reminded the group that they can provide additional feedback to include in the official record along with their recommendation. Steve asked if there was any additional information that the CTF needs in order to make their decision at the next meeting:

- Gabe asked if there is any possibility of continuing with the original Preferred Alternative (the wider version).
 - Steve said unfortunately no, due to cost, the reduced width bridge has to be applied regardless of which bridge type is chosen.
 - Gabe asked whether the project is achieving one of its goals to increase bridge capacity if it is choosing a narrower bridge.
 - Neil agreed that this may not be the best option for the long term.
 - Jane noted that there isn't a choice in order to get the bridge built at this point.
 - Allison said the project team will discuss how to document these concerns in the recommendation at the next meeting.
- Bill asked if it's possible for the CTF members to meet before the next meeting and talk amongst themselves.
 - Allison said the CTF has to follow public meeting laws if there is a quorum of members, which means they could not meet without giving the public a fair warning and invitation. She added that the project team will build in ample time at the next meeting for group discussion.
 - Susan agreed that she'd like more time to discuss.
- Susan asked if the CTF would be making a recommendation on the east approach bridge type at the next meeting.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

October 11, 2021

- Steve clarified that the east approach recommendation will *not* be made at the next meeting. The project will be deferring that decision until the contractor is onboard during Final Design. The CTF will make a recommendation on the movable span type at the next meeting.
- Neil requested that cost savings be included in the Preferred Alternative Refinements table.
 - Steve ran through the cost savings for each option and agreed to include it in the table for next week.
- Tesia said she felt comfortable with the information provided and looks forward to the next meeting to hopefully reach a consensus at that time.
 - Stella agreed.

Steve shared the upcoming meetings and next steps with the group again. The next CTF meeting will be October 25th where the group will make a preliminary recommendation on the Refined Preferred Alternative. A public outreach period will be held this fall. In January, the CTF will be briefed on the outreach and will make a final recommendation, followed by the Policy Group's approval of the CTF recommendation, the County Commission and City Council's adoption of the recommendation, and the release of the SDEIS and NEPA public comment period in Spring 2022. The Final EIS and Record of Decision is expected in mid-2022.

ADJOURN

Allison thanked everyone for their time and adjourned the meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

- Action 1: Project team to share County's Project cost findings at the next CTF meeting.
- Action 2: Project team to include cost savings in the Preferred Alternative Refinements table.
- Action 3: Send notes from National Park Service meeting to CTF.

Meeting Notes

Project:	Multnomah County Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge (EQRB) NEPA	
Subject:	Section 106 Findings of Effect Meeting with National Parks Service (NPS)	
Date:	Wednesday, August 18, 2021	1:00 to 2:30 p.m.
Location:	Virtual	
Dial-in:	WebEx	
Attendees:	Robert Hadlow, ODOT Roy Watters, ODOT Dave Ellis, WCRA Paul Solimano, WCRA Adam Alsobrook, WCRA	Doug Wilson, National Park Service Megan Neill, Multnomah County Steve Drahota, HDR Christina Tomaselli, HDR Jeff Heilman, Parametrix

Note: Until the National Park Service reviews the actual submission of updated environmental documents with the appropriate conveyance correspondence, including any updated analyses of effect, comments at this meeting by the National Park Service should be considered pre-decisional and are part of the deliberative process we are conducting as part of Section 106 compliance.

Welcome

- The purpose of this meeting is to provide an overview of current EQRB project elements in the Skidmore/Old Town National Historic Landmark (NHL) District context and receive NPS input to help develop the Section 106 Finding of Effect for the NHL district.

Project Update

Project Schedule

- Currently the project team is preparing a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for publication in February 2022 to consider potential cost-saving measures.

Review Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) Alternatives

- The Long-span Alternative was identified as the preferred alternative in the DEIS. The DEIS studied multiple bridge types for the west, center and east approach spans.

Briefing on Proposed Design Modifications for SDEIS

- Megan Neill walked through the proposed design refinements which would be applied to the Long-span Alternative only (not the other DEIS alternatives), ensure the project's purpose and need is met, maintain the County's equity lens, and be fiscally responsible.

- Design/project refinements include:
 - West approach - dropping the cable-stayed, tied arch and through truss options and advancing a refined girder design (both City Design and Historic Landmarks Commissions were supportive of the girder concept on the west approach);
 - a narrower bridge width (four lanes) and multi-use path (up to 15.5 ft each direction);
 - Revised span lengths on the East approach;
 - Reduced right-of-way acquisition options for potential future streetcar; and
 - lower cost ADA connections to the MAX and Eastbank Esplanade.

Review Project Elements Being Considered for Potential Impacts

Adjacent Buildings

- Not all buildings adjacent to the Burnside Bridge are considered “contributing features” to the NHL district. For example, the White Stag sign has been recommended as eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places but is from a different era than the district and is not a contributing feature to the NHL district.
- Bob Hadlow noted that when the current Burnside Bridge opened in 1926, it was built wider than the previous bridge and had separated grades at Front Street (Naito Parkway) and First Avenue. This design required removing 10-20 feet from the fronts of adjacent buildings to accommodate the wider, taller bridge. The proposed refinements to the replacement bridge’s cross section in the NHL district will be narrower than the existing bridge’s cross section, which would create a gap between the bridge and the fronts of two historic contributing buildings within the district characterized as the White Stag Building.
- Doug Wilson thought the graphic showing the White Stag Building with the proposed gap (slide 29) looked like an improvement over existing conditions. (Note: The White Stag Building for purposes of this meeting includes the Willamette Tent & Awning Building from 1907 and the White Stag Block to the west of it from 1889. There are two other buildings within that city block to the north, the Blagen Block from 1888 and the Bickel Block from 1883.)
- Adam Alsobrook noted the existing condition of the White Stag Building had an architecturally interesting façade at the ground level. The below deck façade after detaching from the bridge is unknown. Creating a gap between the buildings and bridge structure would allow them, during a major seismic event, to move without hitting each other.
- Doug Wilson noted that after the bridge to building connection is removed, funds may be needed to restore or repair marks to the building façade that have resulted from its connection to the bridge. He thought creating the gap between the buildings and the bridge would be an improvement over existing conditions.
- Bob Hadlow noted the Templeton/Frigidaire Building (east side of river, outside NHL district) may also need mitigation after it is separated from the bridge.

- 108 W Burnside Street is not a contributing building to the NHL district and is proposed to be removed (below deck there are parking spaces and restrooms for Saturday Market adjacent to it for use during the Saturday Market).

Views of Bridge from the District

- Jeff Heilman presented various views from Ankeny Plaza (Skidmore Fountain) for the different bridge type options as well as existing conditions.
- Doug Wilson asked which option was cheaper: bascule or lift? Megan Neill said bascule is cheaper based on most recent designs and estimates. Doug Wilson thought bascule would be preferred from a historical context due to the potential visual impacts of the lift towers.
- Doug also noted that he was happy to see the way the underside of the proposed west approach span looked in the views presented.
- Doug did not feel that any of the bridge type examples shown for the east approach would adversely affect the district.

ADA/Pedestrian Access

- The existing stairs from the bridge down to First Avenue would be replaced with elevators and stairs in order to meet ADA requirements. This would be on both the north side and the south side of the bridge. As shown in the graphics, the shafts and stairs would be a larger footprint on the sidewalk, compared to the existing stairs, and the shafts would extend above the bridge deck.
- Doug Wilson commented that the visual element of the elevator shafts could be mitigated with design and materials selection. He said that the elevators would be much less impact than ramps on the historic district. He would like to see ideas for how to make the elevators more sympathetic to the landscape (he mentioned examples such as glass or a design aligned with the City's guidelines for the district). Dave Ellis asked how far along would Doug like to see a design concept for the elevator/stairs? Doug responded that conceptual designs or existing examples from other projects would work. Jeff Heilman noted that selection of materials and detailed design don't usually happen until final design, and suggested that we could work on developing text of the desired outcome for the elevator shafts within the NHL, and these could be conditions within the Programmatic Agreement that could guide final design. Doug Wilson thought that made sense. **ACTION** Bob Hadlow to determine.

Further Discussion of Adverse Effects and other topics

- Jeff Heilman noted that the project team's goal within the NHL district is to first avoid having an adverse effect, and asked Doug if he saw any red flags based on the visual simulations looked at today. Doug said that he saw no red flags for the NHL.
- Doug noted that the proposed designs were all positive for the district.
- Doug noted that narrowing of the road is net positive.

- **ACTION** Bob Hadlow to confirm that the White Stag Block buildings were already seismically retrofitted.
- Dave Ellis noted that construction vibration will be monitored during demolition and construction.
- Doug asked about stakeholder input. Megan noted the support from Design Commission and Historic Landmarks Commission for the girder bridge on the west approach and a cable-stayed bridge on the east approach, and a bascule for the center span. Also noted that not everybody likes the idea of an “asymmetrical bridge”, although others do. Many people noted a desire to maintain open views of downtown, and the historic district from the bridge, and because of that they like the girder bridge for the west approach. The project will be going out this fall to get more input on the proposed design refinements, including the narrower bridge, and will publish a supplemental DEIS on these proposed refinements early next year. There are advocates for retrofitting the existing bridge, but the reasons that it was not the preferred alternative are still valid.
- WCRA will develop Findings of Effect for the district as well as for four to six buildings in the NHL adjacent to the bridge. Will need to determine if all six need and FOEs, or just four of them. **ACTION** Dave Ellis to confirm if four or six buildings need a Finding of Effect.
- Bob Hadlow noted that the city planning bureau did an update in the last couple years to the NHL district nomination. Dave Ellis noted non-contributing buildings may be eligible but not within the period of significance. Dave Ellis noted there were a couple of buildings in the area that were approved by the City for HLC-demolition.

Next Steps

- Items indicated with **ACTION** throughout this document.
- The team asked Doug Wilson to let the team know if he had any questions.
- **ACTION** Jeff Heilman to make sure that the meeting materials, relevant notes and Doug’s input are all documented for the project and Section 106 records.