



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

December 2, 2019

Community Task Force Meeting #11

Meeting Information

Project: Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge

Subject: Community Task Force, Meeting #11

Date: Monday, December 02, 2019

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

Location: Mercy Corps, 45 SW Ankeny Street, Aceh Room

Attendees: **CTF Members:**

Art Graves, Multnomah County Bike and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee
Frederick Cooper, Laurelhurst Neighborhood Emergency Team
Howie Bierbaum, Portland Saturday Market
Jennifer Stein, Central City Concern
Neil Jensen, Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce
Paul Leitman, Oregon Walks
Peter Finley Fry, Central Eastside Industrial Council
Stella Funk Butler, Gresham Neighborhood Associations
Jackie Tate, Community Member at large
Tesia Eisenberg, Mercy Corps
Robert McDonald, American Medical Response

Community Members:

Cris Moss, University of Oregon
Peter Englander, Old Town Community Association, Portland Saturday Market
Mimi Phillips, PBOT

Project Team Members:

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

Apologies: *Cameron Hunt, Dan Lenzen, Ed Wortman, Gabe Rahe, Kiley Wilson, Sharon Wood Wortman, Susan Lindsay, Timothy Desper, William Burgel, Marie Dodds, Matt Hoffman*



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

December 2, 2019

Summary Notes

INTRODUCTION AND HOUSEKEEPING

Allison Brown, JLA, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone. She noted that Megan Neill, Multnomah County, is back from maternity leave. Megan remarked on how much progress the group has made since she last saw them. Allison began roundtable introductions and then reviewed the meeting agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Allison called for public comments from attendees. No public comments were made.

PROJECT UPDATE

POLICY GROUP & BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS MEETINGS

Heather Catron, HDR, provided an update on the status of the project since the Community Task Force (CTF) last met. She said that the Policy Group (PG) met and approved the CTF's recommendations on the range of alternatives and the evaluation criteria. She thanked Peter Finley Fry and Susan Lindsay for attending the PG meeting and speaking on behalf of the CTF. After the PG meeting the two recommendations were approved by the Board of County Commissioners.

Heather invited Mike Pullen, Multnomah County, to give an update on the Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF). Mike said that at the same meeting the County Board unanimously voted to raise the VRF. He said there will be a final vote on Dec. 5 to officially raise the fee and noted that it is likely to pass. He explained that the County is exploring their options to lower the fee for low income residents to ensure there isn't an inequitable burden placed on them. The County will conduct outreach with advocacy groups for low income residents and people of color to discuss this. Mike also noted that KATU news is covering this CTF meeting because of the VRF media coverage.

PORTLAND CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Heather told the group the project team will present to Portland City Council on December 19.

NOTICE OF INTENT

Heather explained the project's timeline regarding the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. She said that when the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) issues the Notice of Intent (NOI) the NEPA clock will start which now has a stricter timeframe because of recent policy changes.

Jackie Tate, Community Member at large: Asked Heather to explain the acronyms for FHWA, NEPA and NOI.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

December 2, 2019

WINTER OUTREACH PLANNING

Heather gave an update on the upcoming outreach and workshops being planned for the winter. There is an upcoming Urban Design Working Group meeting and there will be more one-on-one meetings with impacted stakeholders. She said more details of the outreach plan will be shared with the CTF at the next meeting in 2020.

- Fredrick (Fred) Cooper, Laurelhurst Neighborhood Emergency Team: With more Working Group meetings occurring, such as Transportation and Urban Design, how will those findings be fed back into the CTF process?
 - Heather: Beginning next year the CTF will start weighting the range of alternatives using the evaluation criteria and measures. The information from these working groups will come back to the CTF to inform how they are weighted.

EVALUATION MEASURES REVIEW – KEY CHANGES

Heather introduced Steve Drahota, HDR, and Jeff Heilman, Parametrix, to present suggested edits to the evaluation criteria measures from the agency workshop. She explained that the measures are the last step for the CTF to review by the end of the year. She said Steve and Jeff will present only the measures that have additions or substantial changes. She clarified that the CTF is not formally voting on these changes, they will only be asked to give comments and a thumbs up or down. It was noted that the measures can be adjusted after the technical data comes in so tonight’s job is to get them to 80-90 percent complete.

Edited Item	CTF Discussion, if applicable	CTF Discussion Resolution
1a.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Art Graves, Multnomah County Bike and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee: Does “adjacent” mean directly adjacent to the bridge? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steve: It’s meant to denote buildings close enough to the bridge that they would pose a risk to the bridge. The bigger picture is to provide a measure for the unique exposure to buildings of the Couch Connection Alternative. • Peter Finley Fry, Central Eastside Industrial Council: The sentence doesn’t make sense to me. Is the question whether the buildings are a higher risk to the bridge? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steve: Yes. The intent is to measure the difference in risks of the Couch Connection versus the other alternatives due to nearby building hazards. 	<p><i>Reword sentence to improve grammar.</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tesia Eisenberg, Mercy Corps: I echo Peter, grammatically the sentence needs work. ○ Heather: URM stands for unreinforced masonry. ○ Peter: Could we add the word “pose” as in “pose a higher risk?” ● Neil Jensen, Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce: My understanding is that there is another committee studying buildings falling and debris. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steve: Yes, there is. We are only trying to assess the debris risk between the bridge and the immediate buildings. ● Fred: Will we get data on seismic resiliency before we review the ratings? When this rating comes back, I want to know how it incorporates certain design elements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steve: We are working on that right now. You will see that information. ● Art: When talking about adjacent buildings we jump to the East Side with the Couch Connection. I’m more concerned with the impacts to the buildings in the West Side’s historic landmark district. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steve: This criterion is only looking at building stability in relation to the bridge itself. Landmarks will be addressed in ‘Aesthetics and Historic Landmarks.’ 	
2a.2	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
2b.1	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
3a.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Peter: Will we include transit? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mike: That is important, let’s add it. ● Jennifer Stein, Central City Concern: I’m not sure what replacement of social services would be. Does this imply that other agencies or facilities would be able to handle overflow? This measure doesn’t capture the idea that an agency may lose business by other agencies taking clients. How will that loss of business be measured? Central City Concern is at risk to losing capacity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jeff: The idea of replacing functions for a net zero loss comes from the EIS process. The measure was intended 	<p><i>Add “transit access.” Add the phrase “for the social service provider affected”. Remove the word “duration”.</i></p>

	<p>to be from the perspective of clients but that can be expanded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jackie: Are you referring to the impact to clients or impacts to business, which could be long term? ○ Allison: There is a hierarchy of long-term and short-term impacts. ○ Jennifer: Central City Concern has property with unique facilities and would be nearly impossible to replicate in another location. Social Service agencies will lose quite a bit of clients and business. The impacts to the physical facility and impacts to business should be measured. Are all impacts created equal? ○ Jeff: No, if it can't be easily replaced or will affect more people it will be weighted as such. Not all impacts are equal. ● Peter: I'm not arguing for the word displacement to be changed, but displacement goes against the long-term goal. By displacing a non-profit you could destroy it permanently. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jeff: That is a high priority to this group and will be reflected as a high score, and the CTF has the ability to weight criteria. Mitigating the impact is a separate issue, we are first trying to measure the impacts and then consider mitigation options. ○ Peter: Measurement doesn't help the health of the agency by hurting the social service provider ○ Jeff: The wording is meant to address that. ○ Peter: I'm thinking of an analogy of business to 7/11 versus a Plaid Pantry store. If we measure only the net effect, we might miss the impact to one business or the other. Does that sound right, Jennifer? ○ Jennifer: We would need to have more Social Service providers in the room to really understand. But loss of clientele would result in less business. ○ Jeff: Should it measure whether the client is diverted to the same provider or a not? ○ Jennifer: Yes, that's fair. Clients aren't necessarily able to be moved to different providers. ● Paul: "Duration" should be deleted, it's redundant. 	
--	--	--



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

3b.1	-	<i>Add the phrase “for the social service provider affected”.</i>
3b.3	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
4a.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neil: What does “activated space” mean? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jeff: A space where people are interacting. • Fred: To the point of personal safety, I think we should account for the slope of areas under and around the bridge because steep slopes can be hazards with ice build-up. Secondly, should we incorporate suicide prevention? Since suicide has happened in the past on the bridge, should we consider ways to mitigate it? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Megan: The County has policy around this. We are asked this a lot since there’s been a spike in suicide attempts on Multnomah County bridges. Bridge operators are all trained in de-escalation techniques for people in a suicidal state, and are also trained first responders. There are also signs posted on the bridges that point people to the suicide prevention hotline. As for spending money on physical barriers, the County at this time has not taken this approach. But this may come up during the design phase. ○ Jeff: Personal safety will be addressed in evaluation criteria #10. 	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
5a.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter: If newly vacant land is measured by acres then we would be positively reinforcing displacement. Is vacant land consistent with local plans? This would be a conflict of interest for consultants because it would be up to the consultant to judge. I have personal experience with this happening, and I think it should be removed completely. I’d like to minimize public agencies getting greedy, I don’t want this to turn in to a redevelopment project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jeff: That’s not the intent of this measure. Maybe it could be changed to “number of businesses being displaced” as opposed to redevelopment. That would require the criterion being changed as well. 	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Megan: Isn't that already a criterion on the full list? ○ Neil: Don't most places have a watchdog organization to look out for this so that redevelopment doesn't run wild? ○ Peter: This is a bigger issue nationally. Agencies have tried to condemn property for the sake of redevelopment. I don't want to see historic buildings destroyed. 	
5b.2	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
5b.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Jennifer: "Minimize" implies there will be impacts. What businesses must close and what will be done? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jeff: There is federal law with guidelines and requirements when businesses are displaced and relocated. This will be a part of the EIS. 	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
6a.1	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
6b.1	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
7a.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Neil: What if a building isn't on the National or Local Historic Register? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jeff: Buildings can be on the National Register or determined eligible for listing. Recommendations will be made for buildings not currently registered but eligible for listing. In addition we will be looking at impacts to local historic resources even if they aren't on the National Register. ● Peter: We should add the word "district" to account for districts listed on the register like Old Town Historic District. 	<i>Add "and districts" after both references to "resources."</i>
7b.1	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
8a.1	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
8a.2	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
8a.3	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>

9a.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neil: Do we know what’s underneath the silt in the river? If we dig will we have a superfund on our hands? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steve: We have a limited number of borings in the area, but we don’t believe there is a superfund risk at this location. ○ Jeff: A fair amount of testing has occurred for the superfund site downstream and that designation was not extended to the area around Burnside. 	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
9a.2	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
9b.1	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
9b.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter: Don’t all plants eat carbon? Why does tree cover specifically matter? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jeff: There are some small shrubs and lawn in the affected area that sequester carbon. We can look into that but currently the smallest unit of measuring carbon sequestration potential for that criteria would be trees. 	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
10a.1	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
10a.2	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
10a.3	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
10b.1	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
10b.2	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
10b.3	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
11a.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter: What is the “TBD” in 11a.1 and 11a.2 for? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steve: For additional design and technical details. ○ Peter: Could instead say “including but not limited to” rather than setting the expectation to come back to it. ○ Steve said that this change would be made throughout the criteria. 	<i>Replace “TBD” with “including but not limited to”</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Art: The Couch Connection would make it easier to for vehicles to speed compared to the current S curve which naturally slows speeds. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steve: Yes, there is recognition of that. 	
11a.2	-	<i>Replace “TBD” with “including but not limited to”</i>
11b.1	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
11b.2	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
11b.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fred: Does “motor vehicle” include loading and unloading zones for freight vehicles? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steve: There was no difference with freight, so it wasn’t specifically called out. 	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
12a.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mike: The streetcar is noted but does the measure also apply to TriMet buses? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steve: Yes it does. 	<i>Add “bus” after ‘streetcar’. Replace “TBD” with “including but not limited to”.</i>
12b.1	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>
13a.2	-	<i>Change accepted as presented.</i>

CTF DISCUSSION

After all the proposed changes were reviewed, Allison asked the group for any other comments or questions.

- Mike reiterated that Fred’s comment about suicide prevention would be addressed in the Design Phase and that discussion about Social Service providers would continue after hearing from other providers besides Central City Concern.

Allison reminded everyone that there won’t be a formal vote on the changes to the measures. She asked everyone to give a thumbs up, down or in the middle. All present CTF members gave a thumbs up, approving the measures as edited at the meeting.



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

CTF WORKPLAN REVIEW

Heather reviewed the CTF meeting schedule for the next few months. She explained that the next order of business was weighting the criteria which needs to be done in one session. The team anticipates this will take 3-4 hours so Heather asked the group if a four-hour session on a Monday afternoon or a Saturday is preferred. The CTF was split on preferring Monday or Saturday.

- Jennifer: A Saturday meeting could conflict with the Saturday Market and Howie may not be able to attend.
 - Howie Bierbaum, Portland Saturday Market: The market will be closed in February and I could make March work around his Saturday Market schedule.
- Tesia: I would effectively have a 12-hour workday if the meeting is on Monday, so that's not my preference.
- Art: I have hearings on these Mondays because the meeting schedule has shifted to the second and fourth weeks rather than the first and third weeks when we signed up for the CTF.
 - Heather: Weeks will be shifted back to be on track with the original schedule.
 - Megan: Don't forget that the third Monday in February is a holiday.
 - Cassie Davis, HDR: Calendar invites will go out to reflect these changes.
- Mike: Won't the CTF be on hiatus while the project team works on the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)?
 - Heather: Yes. The pace will slow down after June when choosing the Preferred Alternative will begin.
- Peter: I want to clarify that I am here representing the Central Eastside Industrial Council (CEIC). I can share my opinions, but I can't provide a vote on the Preferred Alternative without consulting CEIC.
 - Mike: We will work with you on that.
- Fred: Will we vote on the Preferred Alternative at the June 15 meeting? Will the rankings of our weighting be suddenly unveiled to the CTF then, or will we have time to look at them ahead of the meeting?
 - Heather: We will have a few meetings to go over it. There will be time to review the rankings, for example we can do sensitivity tests to see how different factors influence the outcomes.
 - Fred: I won't be able to attend the meeting when we vote on the Preferred Alternative.
 - Heather: We will get your vote another way.

CLOSING REMARKS



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

October 21, 2019

Allison thanked everyone for their patience on meeting scheduling and closed the meeting. She reminded everyone that they wouldn't meet again until 2020.