



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 8, 2019

# Community Task Force Meeting #3

## Meeting information

**Project:** Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge

**Subject:** Community Task Force, Meeting #3

**Date:** Monday, April 08, 2019

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

**Location:** Mercy Corps Community 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  
Jacqueline (Jackie) Tate, Community Member  
Paul Leitman, Oregon Walks  
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  
Timothy Desper, Portland Rescue Mission  
William Bergel, Portland Freight Advisory Committee

**Public Attendees:**

Mary Stewart, MultCo CBAC

**Project Team Members:**

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

**Apologies:**

*Howie Bierbaum, Kathy Pape, Kiley Wilson, Marie Dodds, Matt Hoffman, Neil Jensen.*





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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 8, 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 Agenda
- CTF Meeting Presentation
- CTF Work Plan
- Technical Working Group and Focus Group Schedule

### INTRODUCTION AND HOUSEKEEPING

Alice Sherring, facilitator, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone. She explained the format of the meeting would be a little different than previous meetings; small group discussions led by facilitators would hold the bulk of the meeting time. She introduced the small group discussion facilitators. Alice then briefly reviewed the agenda for the evening, relating topics to meeting packet contents.

Mike Pullen, Multnomah County, summarized his conversation with Jackie Tate between CTF meetings regarding equity and inclusive representation on the committee. They discussed the equity efforts already incorporated into the recruiting process for the CTF, concluding most feasible options had been exhausted. Jackie has offered to try to recruit more diverse committee members. Jackie and Mike also discussed opportunities for future engagement with local equity organizations and historically underrepresented groups.

Mike noted that the project area overlaps a historically African-American neighborhood, underlining the importance of involving that group. Jackie noted that asking for feedback on an already-done piece of work is very different from involving a diverse group of individuals in the development of that piece of work. One concept asks for feedback and another seeks partnership. Jackie noted the efforts by the County to date to achieve diverse committee membership. Alice wrapped up by sharing that an outreach plan will be presented to the CTF at a future date. That plan will detail that information and the specific outreach activity detailed in the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Plan.

Jeff Heilman, Parametrix, summarized his conversation with Frederick between CTF meetings regarding adding additional agencies (Port of Vancouver, Clark County and Marion County) to the agency list. Frederick raised a question at the previous CTF meeting. Jeff explained that the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) is the final decision-maker around which agencies are invited as participating or cooperating agencies. Jeff spoke with Emily Cline of the FHWA after in response to Frederick's question, and they concluded that those agencies, among any others, may provide input on the project without a formal invitation.

Alice noted that the final follow-up action from the last meeting was regarding the Technical Working Group process. Alice invited Heather to address this action in the project update.





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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 8, 2019

## WELCOME AND PROJECT UPDATE

Heather Catron, HDR, welcomed CTF members and presented slides on the Technical Working Group. She responded to the interest expressed during the previous CTF meeting about CTF members attending other project working group meetings. Noting the project team's commitment to transparency and inclusion, she encouraged CTF members to fill out sign-up sheets to get notifications on future meetings of the working groups they are interested in following.

Steve Drahota, HDR, summarized the first Multi-Modal Working Group meeting, which occurred earlier the same day. The Multi-Modal Working Group discussed:

- Bridge cross-sections and possible width allocations for each mode to be accommodated
- Locations of mode lanes and how they intersect
- The location of bike and pedestrian lanes

Steve concluded by inviting interested CTF members to attend future meetings of the Multi-Modal Working Group.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Alice acknowledged that registrations had been received for public comment.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA 101

Jeff presented his slides on 'Evaluation Criteria 101'. He asked CTF members to focus on what they care about most. The technical team can align those priorities with measures at a later time. He also asked those who are representing the interests of other groups to reflect on what they've heard from their group and voice it here. He asked that folks try to help the project team differentiate between alternatives by pointing out preferences.

## COMMUNITY TASK FORCE WORK SESSIONS (PART ONE AND TWO)

### INTERESTS, VALUES AND INFORMATION NEEDS

Alice outlined the purpose of this session was to commence early discussions about evaluation criteria and measures, and this input would help to inform the technical team's development of this work. She invited participants to work in small groups and CTF members were asked to move around the room to hear the views and discussions from other participants.

In part one, CTF members worked to identify interests and values that would help inform the early development of the evaluation criteria. To achieve this, CTF members responded to the following question:

- *What interests and values does our community feel strongly about that must be considered? We care about...*



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 8, 2019

In part two, CTF members were asked to identify the corresponding information needs to help explore the interest and concern. This information would inform the technical team’s early identification of potential measures. To achieve this, CTF members responded to the following question:

- *What information would you need to have to ensure that community interests and values have been considered? I want to know...*

The CTF then broke out into small group discussions. The outcomes from those discussions are listed below. *Note: These are CTF comments as scribed with spelling errors, short-hand abbreviations and symbology expanded for ease of reading.*

<b>Interests and Values</b> <i>What interests and values does our community feel strongly about that must be considered? We care about...</i>	<b>Corresponding Information Needs:</b> <i>What information would you need to have to ensure that community interests and values have been considered? I want to know...</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintaining channel for commercial and shipping traffic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compare height to other bridges</li> <li>• Compare height to lift frequency</li> <li>• Coast guard and local business input</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smooth and unencumbered access for emergency vehicles:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Minimize choke points like 84-205N, ensure shoulders are available, causes a choke point,</li> <li>○ Understanding temporary bridge might not be feasible due to costs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid shortening bridge, even by inches due to bend in river:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ wider channel would be appropriate, Fleet Week is peak traffic and they cannot pass bridge</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For maritime: Any fixed bridge below height of Tilikum Crossing is unacceptable</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Being a resident without a local employer, Eastside gets forgotten and there are underserved communities there.</li> <li>• Consider Central Eastside, don't want to minimize momentum:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Don't want stacking, Obstructed space, limiting parking</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't minimize access to Eastside</li> <li>• Improve bike and Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant (ADA) access</li> </ul>



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 8, 2019

<b>Interests and Values</b> <i>What interests and values does our community feel strongly about that must be considered? We care about...</i>	<b>Corresponding Information Needs:</b> <i>What information would you need to have to ensure that community interests and values have been considered? I want to know...</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emergency response:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ preference for fixed</li> <li>○ Wider = better: shoulder, sidewalk, or bike</li> <li>○ Width will only help with earthquake response and rebuild, widen now to minimal changes later</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aesthetics:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If remodel, maintain façade, want public input on options, vote</li> <li>○ Markum bridge there was no input</li> <li>○ Tilikum is beloved there was input!</li> <li>○ This is something the public should be proud of, should look good for 100 years</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Places for signage</li> <li>• Future tech 'future proofing' modes</li> <li>• Maintenance ease and cost</li> <li>• %of cost of bridge going to aesthetics</li> <li>• Important in retrofit as well (maintain current facade)</li> <li>• Use iconic components (towers, rail)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General safety for traffic on bridge:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All modes post-construction</li> <li>○ No S curve</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Separate modes with levels, barrier or protected lanes for bike/pedestrian</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tilikum is too steep</li> <li>• Sellwood has a comfy slope</li> <li>• Scariest sidewalk is on the St. Johns Bridge, narrow, fast traffic nearby</li> <li>• Comfiest are the Tilikum, Sellwood, Hawthorne</li> <li>• Prefer separate bike and pedestrian lanes</li> <li>• Hawthorne bridge has too narrow car lanes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridge grade elevation and comparison to local bridges</li> <li>• Sidewalk width offers sense of safety</li> <li>• Limited entry width if retrofitted?</li> <li>• Width needs to be above and beyond ADA minimums</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety during construction:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ air, water, dust, debris falling, environmentally safe</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proper material gathering and disposal</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost factors:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ fixed vs. lift vs. rise, long-term effects, longevity, alternative modes, vision zero</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance ease and cost</li> <li>• Anticipating modes</li> <li>• Resurfacing ease and cost</li> <li>• Proper, durable, sustainable materials</li> </ul>



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 8, 2019

<b>Interests and Values</b> <i>What interests and values does our community feel strongly about that must be considered? We care about...</i>	<b>Corresponding Information Needs:</b> <i>What information would you need to have to ensure that community interests and values have been considered? I want to know...</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic flow disruptions during construction: timelines, lift times               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Prefer fixed bridge due to less traffic interruption, height will dictate lift frequency</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Future traffic volumes and weights</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Usability of under bridge:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ skate park, Saturday market, American Medical Response (AMR)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weight of trucks safe for bridge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seismic modelling, use metrics from other projects</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Camber of bridge is easy to cross for all</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridge bike and pedestrian facilities should not be blocked regularly for maintenance</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That historic district at west end not be harmed by the aesthetics of the bridge, same for Eastside</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Care about traffic flow and impacts that slow travelers</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Care about how permanent completed project impacts traffic such as bridge lifts. Better or worse than now?</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Care about historic value of bridge, even if it's rehabbed or replaced</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Care about bridge being open the day of the quake</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Care that areas below the bridges on land are safe for everyone: use crime prevention by environmental design</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large trucks being able to use bridge in both directions</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That local service providers are not harmed during or by the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access maintained during and after project</li> </ul>



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 8, 2019

<b>Interests and Values</b> <i>What interests and values does our community feel strongly about that must be considered? We care about...</i>	<b>Corresponding Information Needs:</b> <i>What information would you need to have to ensure that community interests and values have been considered? I want to know...</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bike and pedestrian access to Waterfront Park and East Esplanade</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That local businesses aren't harmed</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Displacement of any buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of buildings displaced</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintaining access to the neighborhood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of streets impacted during and after construction</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintaining access to the buildings near bridge during and after project</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seismic strength of bridge, that it can survive a big earthquake</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engineer specifications</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That all modes can use bridge after earthquake</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not harming the historic landmarks near the bridge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Physical impacts, contextual impacts</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First responders crossing the river during and after the project, bridge lifts can slow response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel times; bridge closures to response locations; AMR response times</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic flow access river isn't harmed during construction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel times by alternative; travel times with and without detour bridge, mitigation impacts for travel time, ways to reduce trips</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build bridge to survive an earthquake ASAP</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making the best long-range decision</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There's a reference to the existing bridge somehow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of old bridge (book, interpretive signs)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not remove parking permanently</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Count spaces; most used spaces (like on-street spaces)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian and bike facilities are safe, welcoming, comfortable:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ have places for bikes and pedestrians to linger</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade is reasonable: 4.75 grade</li> <li>• Width of facilities</li> <li>• Amount of Separation</li> <li>• Follow vision zero</li> <li>• Future expansion possibility</li> </ul>





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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 8, 2019

<b>Interests and Values</b> <i>What interests and values does our community feel strongly about that must be considered? We care about...</i>	<b>Corresponding Information Needs:</b> <i>What information would you need to have to ensure that community interests and values have been considered? I want to know...</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Bridge looks good up-close and from a distance               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sellwood example verse Tilikum (latter is better detailed)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visual and Aesthetics:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Vantage point of view from moving, on esplanade, on bridge, on water</li> <li>○ Look and feel that doesn't overwhelm;</li> <li>○ Appeal and impacts featuring a look and feel that enhances the environment</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify key historical resources of the bridge that makes it special/unique, what are historical structure that would be impacted, can it retain historical values</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transportation usability:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Invest the time and money to do it right for usability and visually</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic and architectural values:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Capture feeling of history and culture; create environment that is pleasing and enjoyable</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to the esplanade, riverbanks, businesses, services, parks, etc. without re-routing.</li> <li>• Access for cyclists and the disabled from bridge to esplanade with easy grade. Connections:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ADA access challenges and feasibility.</li> <li>○ What's the easiest?</li> <li>○ Ease of use... particularly for people in a wheelchair/disabled.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Origin and destination data for all users, length, height, geometrics of bridge impacts to ADA and people with disabilities, walkability, new modal uses, adaptability for future transportation needs, transit.</li> <li>• Allows accessibility for emergency response.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What are the impacts of the bridge on safety?</li> <li>○ Lighting, connection points, separating traffic to enhance safety</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do the approached lend themselves to safety and access?</li> <li>• Visibility - create an environment that makes people feel safe/comfortable.</li> <li>• Structure resilience: capacity for weight, fixed vs movable</li> </ul>





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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 8, 2019

<b>Interests and Values</b> <i>What interests and values does our community feel strongly about that must be considered? We care about...</i>	<b>Corresponding Information Needs:</b> <i>What information would you need to have to ensure that community interests and values have been considered? I want to know...</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Displacements or relocations</li> <li>• Maintains access and usability getting from bridge to destinations (during and after construction)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of service providers displaced or impacted by construction and post-construction and level of impact.</li> <li>• How would the option impact access to service providers?</li> <li>• Relocate key services and ability to get to and from these services?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporary bridge:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ From commuter standpoint, how do you maintain routes for people walking, transit, during and don't sacrifice long-term opportunities for short-term issues but minimize impacts to travelling public... is there a middle ground?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aesthetics</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efficient transportation for all modes</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction impacts</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural resources</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental and water quality for fish and recreation</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social service impacts and those they serve</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe for active transport</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessible, inviting and comfortable for all different ages and abilities</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flat and accessible, what slope is too steep?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For people on foot and bike:</li> <li>○ For everyday travel and for an emergency</li> <li>○ When it is icy</li> <li>○ Gaps and surface</li> <li>○ Safety (Morrison Bridge ramp is too steep)</li> <li>○ Put pedestrians on the part with the least slope</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	



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

<b>Interests and Values</b> <i>What interests and values does our community feel strongly about that must be considered? We care about...</i>	<b>Corresponding Information Needs:</b> <i>What information would you need to have to ensure that community interests and values have been considered? I want to know...</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridge should be built before the earthquake</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respect history, maybe by interpretation</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic value and impacts on historic resources:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the neighborhoods, the historic nature and legacy of existing bridge</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel capacity and speed of travel for commuters on all modes</li> </ul>	

At the end of the work session, the table facilitators reported back to the entire room and participants added to the contributions from the group. This report out was categorized during the report out by the project team. The purpose of this process was to advance the early identification of potential themes to help inform the development of preliminary-draft evaluation criteria would need to consider.

The high-level themes were recorded during the group report out and included:

- Access to businesses
- Access to social services, impacts and displacements
- Access to parks and public spaces
- Aesthetics
- Historic preservation
- Cost
- Construction
- Natural Resources
- Emergency response
- Community safety
- Travel, traffic, modes and mobility

## NEXT STEPS

Alice outlined that the input provided tonight would be used by the project team in the early stages of developing the evaluation criteria. This work would then come back to the CTF for further discussion and consideration. The CTF’s questions and responses were as follows:

- William Bergel: Will the CTF have input on the recommendations of a value engineering study if one is conducted on the selected alternative?



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 8, 2019

- Heather: The CTF will continue into the design phase and will have an opportunity to provide input.
- Bill: Who will ultimately decide on the recommendations from a value engineering study?
- Ian Cannon, Multnomah County: Multnomah County Board of Commissioners would be the decision makers and they would consider the CTF's recommendations as part of the approval process.

Alice shared that the next meeting would take place on April 29, 2019. At this meeting, the project team will present evaluation criteria developed from the outcomes of the working group sessions at this meeting for the CTF members to review and provide further input on. At the next meeting the CTF will start to consider the temporary detour bridge. The CTF's questions and responses were as follows:

- William: Will we have design sketches to review?
  - Steve: We will have a crude concept. We are also working with other groups to refine that concept. At the next meeting, the project team will be able to show you the types of impacts it could create and some pictures of comparable examples. We will be able to paint a picture of what we are looking at and offer some options to consider.
- Timothy Desper: Will the examples include different modes?
  - Steve: Yes. We will offer enough information to have a productive conversation.

### ADJOURN

Alice asked CTF members to register if they'd like to participate in the Working Group Process. Alice also circulated the CTF charter, approved at the last meeting, for signature if CTF members hadn't already signed.

Mike shared that the architecture program at PSU will be presenting some bridge replacement concepts on May 15. He promised to send more details to the CTF in case they'd like to visit the exhibit.

Megan Neill, Multnomah County, thanked everyone for their work and great input.

### POST SESSION CTF CONTRIBUTIONS

The following contributions were made by CTF members who could not attend the meeting:

- I care about successfully re-locating Portland Sat Mkt, a major tourist attraction, during Burnside Bridge construction
- Post-construction, I care about having a space for PSM that's comparable or better than our current site on the waterfront and SW Ankeny.