



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

NOVEMBER 9, 2020

# Community Task Force (CTF) Meeting #19

## Meeting information

**Project:** Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge

**Subject:** CTF, Meeting #19

**Date:** Monday, November 09, 2020

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

**Location:** WebEx Video Conference Call and livestream

### Attendees:

#### CTF Members:

Amy Rathfelder, Portland Business Alliance  
Art Graves, MultCo Bike and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee  
Dennis Corwin, Portland Spirit  
Ed Wortman, Community Member  
Frederick Cooper, Laurelhurst Neighborhood Emergency Team and Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association  
Gabe Rahe, Burnside Skate Park  
Howie Bierbaum, Portland Saturday Market  
Jackie Tate, Community Member  
Jane Gordon, University of Oregon  
Paul Leitman, Oregon Walks  
Peter Englander, Old Town Community Association  
Peter Finley Fry, Central Eastside Industrial Council  
Sharon Wood Wortman, Community Member  
Stella Funk Butler, Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations  
Susan Lindsay, Buckman Community Association  
Tesia Eisenberg, Mercy Corps  
William Burgel, Portland Freight Committee

#### Project Team Members:

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

**Apologies:** Timothy Desper, Neil Jensen, Jennifer Stein, Marie Dodds



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

NOVEMBER 9, 2020

## Summary Notes

This online virtual meeting was held over WebEx and livestreamed to the public via Vbrick. Nine 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, went over the virtual meeting protocols and took roll call.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

In advance of the meeting, the public was invited to submit comments to the CTF. One comment was received from John Czarnecki who submitted a letter about historic preservation. Jeff Heilman, Parametrix, explained John's suggestion to reconsider the enhanced seismic retrofit option or to preserve and reuse some of the existing design elements in the long span alternative, especially the control towers. Jeff told the committee that John has been added to the Section 106 consulting parties list after submitting multiple public comments to the project about historic preservation.

### PROJECT UPDATE

#### Working Groups

Steve Drahota, HDR, and Jeff shared an update on the project's recent Working Group meetings:

- Urban Design and Aesthetics Working Group (UDAWG) – This group has met twice since the last CTF meeting and has another meeting on November 18, 2020. They are working at a rapid pace in order to provide input to help the CTF make a recommendation on bridge type. Steve said the UDAWG reviewed urban design themes and then went through a menu of existing bridge types around the world and discussed which types would be most appropriate and technically feasible for the Burnside Bridge's location. In their second meeting, they focused more on the bridge types for the fixed approaches and worked to narrow the field in order to provide the best options for the CTF's considerations. Findings will be shared with the CTF at their next meeting.
- Bridge and Seismic Working Group – This group has met once since the last CTF meeting and will meet again in December. Steve said the group is comprised of industry leaders on bridge engineering and seismic design. They reviewed the key technical parameters for the movable span that drove different design analyses, findings about the weight of the bridge options, and the total costs. The next meeting will be in mid-December and will review findings from additional analyses.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

NOVEMBER 9, 2020

- **Constructability Working Group** – This group will be performing a cost risk analysis in December that will expose different risks and opportunities that go with each of the bridge options. This working group will meet again in January to go over results. Steve noted that some CTF members will be a part of this process because of their related backgrounds.
- **Multi-modal Working Group** – This group will be meeting in early 2021. This working group is comprised of a number of individual agencies and practitioners to discuss how bus, streetcar, and vehicle traffic will interact with bike, pedestrian, and ADA accessibility in the new bridge design. They will provide input on various connections for bikes and pedestrians, including the connection to Eastbank Esplanade.
- **Natural Resource Working Group** – Jeff explained that the Natural Resource group that included representatives from federal and local agencies is no longer meeting as one group and has instead divided into smaller groups working on specific natural resource permits at the federal, state, and city level. There is a subgroup that is focused on the state and federal applications that need to be submitted shortly after the draft Environmental Impact Statement is published in January.
- **Historic & Cultural Resources Working Group** - Jeff explained that this group has primarily been comprised of the project team coordinating with the Oregon Department of Transportation, ODOT, because they have been delegated the lead role to implement Section 106. To broaden involvement, the team will be holding a consulting parties meeting on November 30, 2020 to review Determinations of Eligibility for historic resources, Findings of Effect, and discuss potential mitigation measures. He noted that CTF members Sharon & Ed Wortman, as well as John Czarnecki, will be a part of that group.
- **Diversity Equity & Inclusion Working Group** - Cassie Davis, HDR, shared that this group has been comprised of staff from several social service agencies throughout the Environmental Review phase. They will be opening up their meeting to others in order to hear new perspectives on potential mitigation and provide input on bridge type selection evaluation criteria. This group will be meeting early next year.

Allison shared that Paddy Tillet, a UDAWG member, would be joining the next CTF meeting to give an update to the group.

CTF members asked the following questions:

- Sharon Wood Wortman, community member, asked if there would be any change in the project's NEPA schedule in relation to the recent presidential election results.
  - Mike Pullen, Multnomah County, said it's too early to know if anything will change.
  - Jeff explained that the project's work was started under One Federal Decision Executive Order, but the NEPA process has since changed. If this executive order is rescinded by the next administration the project would likely need to default to the current NEPA regulations, which are very similar to the regulations this project has been working with.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

NOVEMBER 9, 2020

He also noted that even if the One Federal Decision executive order was undone, it would take at least a year to take effect, so would not likely impact our project.

- Paul Leitman, Oregon Walks, asked if the presentation slides from UDAWG and the Bridge & Seismic Working Group will be made available to the committee.
  - Cassie said the UDAWG meeting materials are available on the Project’s website and would follow up with a link. She also noted that CTF members who signed up for the various Working Groups also receive materials via those email updates. She invited anyone who was interested in receiving materials from any of the working groups to reach out to her.
  - Megan Neill, Multnomah County, shared the website link where the UDAWG meeting materials can be found: <https://multco.us/earthquake-ready-burnside-bridge/urban-design-and-aesthetics-working-group>

### BRIDGE TYPES OVERVIEW

Steve gave a presentation on bridge types that have been shown in the Working Group meetings. The presentation included animations of the bascule and lift options with the three primary bridge types being considered. He reminded the committee that the bridge is being thought of as “three bridges in one” separated into the west approach span, main river movable span, and east approach span. He also noted that the bridge width has an influence on bridge types because it narrows down a bit at both approaches. The design team is looking at how to best integrate the three pieces together with what is technically feasible. These options generally include either through truss, cable-stayed, or tied-arch approaches and a bascule or lift movable span, although there are a few other types that the team will also consider.

Steve reviewed the constraints that the bridge must be designed around. On the west side, this includes Portland Rescue Mission, the “Made in Oregon” sign, the Portland Saturday Market pavilion, the combined sewer overflow (CSO) pipeline underground easement that extends all the way up to ground level, and the geotechnical hazard zone. He reminded everyone that the long span option was chosen because it has significantly fewer columns making it easier to avoid these constraints. The tied-arch concept includes a support column close to Naito Parkway and avoids the CSO easement and geotechnical hazard zone. The cable-stayed option requires its main support column to be placed in the middle of Waterfront Park due to load distribution. The UDAWG and CTF will have to decide the importance of this tradeoff and its impact to the park.

Building a long steel girder system is also an option on the west side to avoid the need for an above-deck structure. The tradeoff of the girder is that it would reduce the vertical clearance over Waterfront Park in some areas to about 14 feet (compared to 23 feet with the other options). If the girder support is moved to the middle of the park, similar to where it would be for the cable-stayed option, it’s possible to gain about three feet of clearance. The UDAWG is considering the importance of these tradeoffs between views above and clearance below the bridge deck.

Steve shared an animation of the tied-arch concept with a lift movable span. He said that the team had found a way to avoid an above-deck superstructure on the lift span. This means that the movable span could have an open view for either the bascule or lift types. The animation included a cutaway showing the mechanism within that allows the lift to move by using counterweights housed within the towers.

- William “Bill” Burgel, Portland Freight Advisory Committee, asked what prompted the girder design in Waterfront Park.
  - Steve explained that this was a design option that was put forward in response to concerns about the above deck superstructure affecting views of the “Made in Oregon” sign and downtown. This same design could also allow the movable lift span to avoid an above deck structure as well.

Steve showed an animation of the tied arch option with a movable bascule span. The animation included a cut away of the structure to show the machine room where the counterweights pivot to lift the two bascule leaves. This animation uses a delta pier, similar to an upside down triangle, design to allow the in-river support piers to be on the outside of the existing piers without needing to extend the length of the bascule leaves, which are already longer than most bascule bridges. He also noted that this example included built in “dolphin” pylons to protect the delta piers from collisions by ships. The project team is still looking at options that would avoid dolphins and reduce the size of the delta piers because of their potential impact to the river.

Steve then reviewed the constraints on the east side including the highway, the railroad, the Skatepark, the CSO pipeline easement, the geotechnical hazard zone, and multiple streets. He shared the range of vertical clearances that will need to be maintained over many of these elements. The geotechnical hazard zone also extends much further on the eastside than on the westside. The long span concepts only require one set of supports in this area. That support location is about the same for the tied-arch and cable-stayed options.

Steve shared zoomed out images of different bridge type combinations: vertical lift with cable-stayed concept on both approaches, a delta pier bascule with tied arch concept on both approaches, and a delta pier bascule with a tied arch on the east side and a girder on the west side. Michael Fitzpatrick, HDR, is considering additional design elements that could be incorporated.

- Peter Englander, Old Town Community Association, asked if the delta pier was the only form of bascule that would be possible.
  - Steve said the team also looked at a traditional design, but it would require building the piers on top of the existing support structures which would be risky. With a traditional design, shifting the new piers to the outside of the existing piers would require longer bascule leaves and larger counterweights. The delta pier design allows the leaves to be a more reasonable length. The design team is exploring ways to decrease the scale of the delta piers.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

NOVEMBER 9, 2020

- Jane Gordon, University of Oregon, asked what the current clearance height is over Waterfront Park.
  - Steve explained that the tied-arch and cable-stayed options would add about 3-5 feet of clearance and a girder option would subtract about 3-5 feet of clearance compared to the existing bridge.
- Allison asked Steve to remind the group when they would be making a bridge type recommendation.
  - Steve said it will be in about June 2021.
- Fred Cooper, Laurelhurst Neighborhood Emergency Team and Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association, asked about a discrepancy he found in the length of the bridge. When he added up the 3 separate spans he didn't get the same number as the total length in the seismic study.
  - Steve responded that there is additional bridge length on both ends of the bridge that wasn't included in this presentation for the sake of clarity.
- Bill asked if there would be a graphic showing the girder option.
  - Steve explained that the girder option is only possible for the west span and river span. It is not feasible for the east span because it is so long. There will be more renderings available during the upcoming CTF meetings.
- Paul asked how the project will be affected by the failure of the Metro transportation measure in the recent election.
  - Mike explained that the Metro transportation bond would have funded \$150 million, or about 25% of the project's construction phase. He reminded the group that currently 25% of the project will be funded through the County's Vehicle Registration Fee. He noted that even if the measure had passed, the project would still have needed to secure half of the construction funding. There may be an increased chance of a new infrastructure bill with President-elect Biden's administration. The failure of the bond was bad news, but there is still time to secure funding. He also explained that the County was hiring an Owner's Representative to support the project. That team will also support funding efforts.

### CRITERIA DEVELOPMENT

Jeff reminded the committee of the evaluation process to get to a recommended bridge type and noted that the group is currently in the midst of identifying criteria topics. The process is very similar to the process used to get to a Preferred Bridge Alternative (see slide 25). He told the group that the interests and values the CTF developed in breakout groups at the last meeting have been consolidated into a list of topics. The project team will also ask the Working Groups and agency workshop participants for their feedback. Jeff presented a list of key topics organized into three categories:



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

NOVEMBER 9, 2020

- Bridge users
  - Active transportation/ADA enhancement
  - Motorized vehicles/freight operations
  - Personal safety
  - Public gathering place/destination
  - Transit operations
- Technical design and function
  - Environmental stewardship
  - Fiscally smart
  - River navigation operations
  - Seismic resiliency
  - Utilities
- Urban setting
  - Community connectivity
  - History and culture
  - Site integration
  - Visuals, views, and aesthetics

## CTF Discussion

Comments from the CTF discussion were as follows:

- Fred asked if the list of key topics needs to be agreed upon and finalized at tonight's meeting and where the UDAWG was in this process.
  - Jeff assured him it did not need to be finalized tonight and reiterated that the Working Groups and agency workshops would be weighing in too.
  - Steve added that a list of ideas around criteria development from the UDAWG and the Bridge Structural & Seismic group was available on slide 27.
- Fred noted that "relationship to neighborhoods" was missing from the list.
  - Jeff noted that this idea was meant to be captured under the "community connectivity" topic.
- Peter Englander asked how the phrase "Environmental stewardship" was chosen as opposed to "enhancement" like with "ADA enhancement".
  - Jeff explained that the specific wording had not been scrutinized to that level, but if the group felt strongly about enhancing the environment, that could be included in the criteria and measures. Jeff also noted that the project was anticipating building a coffer

dam around the existing piers during construction to de-water the area and complete the necessary construction within those boundaries, but National Marine Fisheries Service was concerned about impacts associated with construction techniques. They felt building the new piers outside of the existing structures would be better for construction, but the project will still need to address what to do with the old piers and how much material to remove.

- Mike noted that “enhancement” is used when talking about ADA accessibility because the current bridge is not very accessible. Stewardship is more about not causing harm but doesn’t imply net benefit. The CTF may want to imply something stronger than “stewardship”.
- Jane seconded using a stronger word than “stewardship” in relation to the environment.
- Jackie Tate, community member, suggested adding the word “enhancement” in addition to “stewardship” to the environmental topic because “enhancement” could imply aesthetic changes rather than addressing harm to the environment.
- Tesia Eisenberg, Mercy Corps, also agreed with Jackie’s suggestion.

Heather Catron, HDR, clarified that the list of key points was a reflection of the CTF’s discussion around values and interests at the last meeting. She asked the committee to point out any topics that might be missing at this time.

Jeff added that the CTF would get into much more detail about what these topics encompass when they start talking about the measures that go underneath each criteria topic.

- Ed Wortman, community member, thought that the current list covered most of the topics that the group talked about and that he was interested in how the list would evolve.
- Fred commented that the list of key topics is too broad to give specific feedback on at this time. He suggested that staff flesh out each topic so CTF members could see what is encompassed within each category. He noted that specifics about transit connectivity and distance between stops needs to be included.
  - Jeff agreed and said these are only meant to be the topics that the specific criteria would go under. Developing criteria and measures will be the next step. He added that the primary purpose of the criteria is to differentiate between the bridge types. Fred’s example about transit stops and connectivity may not be different across bridge type. If there is a difference, that would be a key differentiator.
- Stella Funk Butler, Coalition of Gresham Neighborhoods, reminded the committee of the PSU architecture class that created ideas for a new Burnside Bridge.
  - Mike shared a link to the project website with more information about the designs: <https://multco.us/bridges/news/psu-architecture-students-present-new-burnside-bridge-concepts-may-15-open-house>
- Bill asked if discussion around how the current bridge will be demolished has already happened. He commented that the current bridge might be hard to remove.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

NOVEMBER 9, 2020

- Steve said there have been some meetings on this topic and the next step will be the cost risk analysis associated with ways to demolish and rebuild. The Constructability Working Group will be discussing this process early next year in more detail. He noted that the most difficult demolition will be to remove the portions over the highway and railroad on the east side. More information will be available in January.

### NEXT STEPS

Allison and Steve shared the schedule for upcoming CTF meetings and agenda topics.

- November 23: Evaluation criteria per topic and menu of bridge types refinement
- December 7: Measures per evaluation criteria and range of feasible bridge types
- December 21: Finalize criteria and measures and range of feasible bridge types

The December 21, 2020 meeting will be a major milestone. The criteria and range of feasible bridge types that come out of that meeting will be shared with the public and the Policy Group in early 2021.

### OPEN DISCUSSION

- Ed shared some background on the Burnside Bridge and ideas for historical preservation of architectural components. He noted the interest people had in the control towers and other architectural details and his interest in the conversations that the CTF will have around the value of keeping some of these elements compared to moving towards something more modern. Ed recommended that everyone read through John Czarnecki's public comment. Ed didn't agree with all his points but acknowledged that many people will have thoughts about it. Ed also commented on the values of the existing bridge on the economic development of the city in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century in his breakout group during the last meeting. He had shared that the aesthetics of the current bridge had been applied after the engineering team designed the main structure and that he questioned the value of keeping ornamentation that had not been considered until the end of the process. He then discovered that the design contract for the architects had been signed earlier than he thought and that the architecture firm likely had substantial input on the design.
  - Mike shared steps that the County has taken in the past for historic sites like the Burnside Bridge. In order to remove historic structures, the County has to have a mitigation plan. For the Sellwood Bridge, this included hiring an historian to document the history of the structure, posting commemorative plaques on the new bridge, and creating a website about the historic bridge. The County will also offer Burnside Bridge as a resource for anyone who wants to preserve it, but they would have to pay for it. It's something that has been done in the past and sometimes it takes private sector support. He noted an example of historic preservation of the Lovejoy ramp and columns where the Pearl District is today. There will be more conversation on the matter in 2021 and 2022.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

NOVEMBER 9, 2020

- Jeff added that this will also be a topic of conversation with the City's Landmark Commission.
- Fred thought that if the bridge towers can't be incorporated on the bridge itself, maybe they could be placed on the Esplanade. One of the trunnions could also be kept as an industrial sculpture.
- Susan Lindsay, Buckman Community Association, agreed that the towers could work nicely at certain parts of the Esplanade along with an interpretive area.
- Jane and Stella agreed.
- Jackie agreed and added that she will miss the bridge when it's gone and would love to see parts of it be preserved.
- Sharon noted that there are currently interpretive panels on the Esplanade that are good examples of a historic display.
- Mike shared that the current Burnside Bridge is actually the second Burnside Bridge. He asked Ed to share about the original bridge.
- Ed told the committee that the original bridge was dismantled around 1925 and when it was removed some parts of it were used in other parts of the County including in the old Sellwood Bridge. He noted that bridges were frequently recycled back then because they were smaller and easier to move.
- Peter Finley Fry shared that a portion of that original Burnside Bridge is near his house and still in use over the Sandy River.

## ADJOURN

Allison closed out the meeting and thanked everyone for their time.

The next CTF meeting will be November 23, 2020.

## ACTION ITEMS

- **Action 1:** Cassie to send Paul Leitman meeting materials for the UDAWG and Bridge & Seismic Working Groups.