



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

March 11, 2019

# Community Task Force Meeting #2

## Meeting information

**Project:** Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge

**Subject:** Community Task Force, Meeting #2

**Date:** Monday, March 11, 2019

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

**Location:** Mercy Corps; Aceh Room / 45 SW Ankeny Street, Portland

**Attendees:** **CTF Members:**

Art Graves, Multnomah County Bike and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee  
Cameron Hunt, Portland Spirit  
Dan Lenzen, Old Town Community Association  
Ed Wortman, Community Member  
Frederick Cooper, Laurelhurst Neighborhood Emergency Team  
Gabe Rahe, Burnside Skate Park  
Howie Bierbaum, Portland Saturday Market  
Jackie Tate, Community Member  
Paul Leitman, Oregon Walks  
Kathy Pape, Central City Concern  
Rina Eleanor Jimmerson, Central Eastside Industrial Council  
Sharon Wood Wortman, Community Member  
Stella Funk Butler, Gresham Neighborhood Coalition  
Susan Lindsay, Buckman Community Association  
Tesia Eisenberg, Mercy Corps  
William Burgel, Portland Freight Advisory Committee

**Public Attendees:**

Arthur Smith, Code for PDX  
Billy Meiners, Northwest Skateboard Coalition

**Guest Speakers:**

Sara Mae O'Brien-Scott, Multnomah County  
Emily Cline, Federal Highway Administration  
Roy Watters, Oregon Department of Transportation

**Project Team Members:**

Megan Neill, MultCo  
Mike Pullen, MultCo  
Heather Catron, HDR  
Steve Drahota, HDR  
Cassie Davis, HDR  
Jeff Heilman, Parametrix  
Alice Sherring, Enviroissues  
Aascot Bohlander, Enviroissues

**Apologies:**

*Kevin Anderson, Timothy Desper, Marie Dodds, Matt Hoffman.*





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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

March 11, 2019

## Summary Notes

The following meeting materials are appended to this meeting summary; please refer to the materials for more details and images:

- Community Task Force (CTF) Meeting Packet
- CTF Meeting Presentation
- History of the Burnside Bridge Presentation

### WELCOME

Alice Sherring, facilitator, opened the meeting with roundtable introductions and asked the question: *“when was the last time you crossed the Burnside Bridge and where were you going?”*.

Alice acknowledged that Paul Leitman is replacing Drew DeVitis to represent Oregon Walks. She also noted that the CTF member from the Portland Business Alliance had stepped down and the team is seeking his replacement. She then reviewed the meeting’s agenda, purpose and welcomed the County Project Manager Megan Neill for opening remarks.

Megan welcomed everyone and noted activities that had taken place since the group last met in October of 2018.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

Arthur Smith offered public comment asking if any of the potential designs could survive a significant earthquake event. Alice thanked Arthur and noted that Arthur’s question would likely be addressed later in the evening by the technical team’s presentation.

### NEPA 101

Emily Cline, FHWA, and Jeff Heilman, Parametrix provided an overview of the NEPA process and the regulatory requirements for the project. The CTF’s questions for Emily and responses were as follows:

- Frederick Cooper: Are the statuses of these agencies [involved in the project] changing?
  - Their statuses are continuing to evolve. They may or may not give us a formal response to cooperate, but they may still be participating. Some parties have not yet responded.
- Frederick : Suggest adding Port of Vancouver, Clark County and Marion County.
  - Those are good additions to the list.
- Jackie Tate: If the status is nothing, does that mean they haven’t responded? If not, what does that mean?
  - Jeff Heilman, Parametrix, responded: It’s more complicated with some agencies and with the tribes. Under Section 106 of the *Historic Preservation Act*, tribal coordination is a government-to-government relation. We are required to coordinate with the tribes



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

March 11, 2019

regardless of their status as an official cooperating/participating agency or not. They are not a cooperating agency unless we're on tribal land.

- Heather Catron, HDR: The participating/cooperating agency headings are related to terminology during the NEPA process. For example, cooperating agencies that accept the formal invite from FHWA must concur at certain points throughout the project. If agencies or tribes have declined the formal invite, it doesn't necessarily mean that they won't be involved in the project.
- Emily continued: A party may decline an invitation to cooperate on the project due to the higher expectations of cooperating parties. This might include lack of available staff time, for example.
- Jeff added: The FAA had a question about that. There is a possibility of needing approval in case cranes obstruct access to a heliport downtown. They chose to wait and see if that was a real concern as we get closer to that point in the project.

Roy Watters, ODOT, shared his presentation on cultural resources as they pertain to the NEPA process. He noted that the relationship with each tribe is typically founded within the group's treaty, if one exists. Tribal regulations also lie within the NEPA process itself.

After sharing the list of topics that will be studied during the environmental review, Alice invited the group to respond to the question: *"Are there any topics you feel are missing from the areas of study?"* She asked the group to share any matters they'd like to see considered as part of the alternative evaluation process. The CTF's additions and discussion included:

- Jeff: An example is Marine Mammals
- Frederick: Nesting sites; raptor birds, bats
  - Are there any known nesting sites that should be considered during construction and possible demolition of the bridge, such as raptor or bat nests?
- Frederick: Hazardous building materials disturbed during renovation. What about the consideration of hazardous materials that the bridge contains?
  - There may be creosote runoff from the bridge and asbestos in the operator booths. We need to make sure any demolition of these materials is addressed.
- William Burgel: Truck turning radius and lane widths
- Ed Wortman: Maximum load after a seismic event
- Ed: Historic status of the existing bridge; National Historic Register
- Jackie: Demographic makeup of the CTF
- Susan Lindsay: Call out individual tribes the project team will be working with

The CTF's questions for the team and their responses follow.

- Art Graves: Are the issues to be evaluated ranked in any way?



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

March 11, 2019

- Jeff: Under NEPA, there is no issue hierarchy. However, some issues are regulated by several layers of regulations we will need to follow, such as historical resources and endangered species.
- Jackie: Under Environmental Justice and equity, is there going to be any effort to expand diversity on the CTF instead of it just being a topic area here?
- Susan: A liaison and efforts to work with existing groups and regulations is nice, but tribes are not listed here as a topic.
  - Jeff: 'Tribes' is on the list of topics. That's part of a list of the fundamental topics to be evaluated. This list is not meant to list all groups involved.

Heather presented on the NEPA process timeline. She described each milestone on the timeline and how the CTF will help with each decision.

- **Action 1:** Add the Port of Vancouver, Clark County, Marion County and call out all tribes that may be engaged to the NEPA process agencies list.
- **Action 2:** Add the eight (8) recommended issues for consideration during the environmental review process.
- **Action 3:** Outline Environmental Justice and equity efforts and confirm how this information will be presented to the CTF members at a future CTF meeting.

### HISTORY OF THE BURNSIDE BRIDGE

Sara Mae O'Brien-Scott, Multnomah County, presented an overview of the history of the Burnside Bridge. Sara Mae acknowledged Sharon Wood Wortman's contributions to her research.

### CURRENT AND UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

Heather reiterated the CTF's role in the decision-making process. Jeff and Steve Drahota, HDR, jointly presented the tasks required prior to Notice of Intent.

Steve continued, responding to Arthur's question raised in public comment, saying that the alternatives to be reviewed have been built elsewhere. However, each site and seismic event is different. There are also two sides to the build decision: how the bridge functions day to day and how it might function after an earthquake. Alternatives 2 through 4 are similar to other bridges in the Pacific Northwest. The level of detail needed to evaluate each alternative will be determined by the need to analyze each design's effectiveness. There are 26 different NEPA components required. The CTF's questions for Steve and his responses included:

- Cameron Hunt: Are you looking into different forms of lift bridges within that category?
  - Steve: We're only going to look as far into each alternative as needed to evaluate its performance. We will look at different ways to counter the weight of the lifted section.
- Art: Were there a lot of similarities between the end NEPA product of the Sellwood Bridge and Tillikum Crossing?



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

March 11, 2019

- Jeff: We are trying to incorporate lessons learned from each of those projects. Each bridge requires a unique approach. Tillikum, for example, being part light rail, had to involve the Federal Transit Administration. They do an EIS differently even though they are theoretically similar bridges because there are different requirements there.
- William: Don't we need the traffic study resolved sooner than listed here? Where are we at with that?
  - Steve: The study has already started. We have technical questions out to the city regarding how to best model traffic for the bridge based on their experience. We understand it's urgently needed.
  - Frederick: Is it possible to participate in this working group?
  - Heather: The working groups are primarily agency focused and we anticipate bringing the outcomes of this process through to the CTF in future meetings.
- **Action 4:** Provide an update to the CTF at a future meeting on the status and outcomes of the working groups, including the traffic study.

### CTF WORK PLAN AND GROUP CHARTER

Heather presented the CTF draft work plan and its timeline. She briefly touched on the topics to be covered in upcoming meetings. Heather then asked Alice to confirm what the proposed timeline means for the group's charter.

Alice outlined the group's need for expediency to ensure alignment with the project schedule. Alice confirmed that the project team was requesting two meetings in April and May to kickstart the initial conversations. Heather added that the desire to allow for summer breaks drove the decision to add extra meetings in the spring. Alice then talked through the edits to the Charter since it was first sent to CTF members in October 2018. Alice also referred to the Conflict of Interest guide to assist the group with their conversation. The CTF's questions for the project team included:

- Jackie: There is a lot of information presented before we get to the actual meeting. Can we refine this or are the topics too disparate? I want less time at the beginning of the meeting and more time dedicated to the actual working group.
  - Alice responded: In terms of reducing time, yes. Early in our process we need to spend time reconfirming our ways of working. We will certainly pick up our speed as we move forward as a group.
  - Heather added: For the additional meetings, we wanted to make sure you had enough time. But, if as a group you feel comfortable making recommendations for evaluation criteria, we're happy to take the second meeting off the calendar. But if you feel the conversation isn't quite fully 'baked,' we wanted to provide the opportunity to continue the discussion. We also want to be respectful of your time and manage it well by providing less frequent meetings in the summertime and keeping meetings to 2 hours.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

March 11, 2019

- Alice confirmed: proposed dates in April for future meetings and committed to scheduling May meetings as soon as possible.
- **Action 5:** Move forward with scheduling the April and May CTF meetings.

Alice then asked the group to make their first decision as the CTF and sought their endorsement of the Charter document. Alice outlined that for the group to make recommendations such as this, she would ask for them to offer their indication of support, accept or reject the proposal. If required at these times she would collect majority or minority statements from the CTF to confirm their recommendations.

- **CTF Recommendation 1:** CTF members in attendance unanimously supported the adoption of the Charter.

Alice then passed around a copy of the Charter for group signing.

## ADJOURN

Megan addressed the group. She thanked everyone for their time, volunteer spirit and commitment. She said she was excited by what she heard from the group in the way of passion and ideas.

## SUMMARY OF ALL ACTION ITEMS:

The following items will be addressed by the project team at the request of the CTF:

- **Action 1:** Add the Port of Vancouver, Clark County, Marion County and call out all tribes that may be engaged to the NEPA process agencies list.
- **Action 2:** Add the eight (8) recommended issues for consideration during the environmental review process.
- **Action 3:** Offer an answer to the question, “Under environmental justice and equity, is there going to be any effort to expand diversity on the CTF instead of it just being a topic area here?” at the next CTF meeting.
- **Action 4:** At the next CTF meeting, update the group on the status of the traffic study.
- **Action 5:** Move forward with scheduling the April and May CTF meetings.

## SUMMARY OF CTF RECOMMENDATIONS

CTF members made the following recommendation:

- **CTF Recommendation 1:** CTF members in attendance unanimously supported the adoption of the Charter.