



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 7, 2020

Community Task Force (CTF) Meeting #21

Meeting information

Project: Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge

Subject: CTF, Meeting #21

Date: Monday, December 07, 2020

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

Location: WebEx Video Conference Call and livestream

Attendees:

CTF Members:

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
Marie Dodds, AAA Oregon
Neil Jensen, Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce
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

Additional Invitees:

Paddy Tillett, ZGF Architects

Apologies: Amy Rathfelder, Jennifer Stein





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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 7, 2020

Summary Notes

This online virtual meeting was held over WebEx and livestreamed to the public via Vbrick. Seven 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.

Cassie Davis, HDR, noted that Timothy Desper, Portland Rescue Mission, is unable to continue on the CTF due to capacity constraints and will be retiring from the committee. He will continue to stay up to date on the project through other channels.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

PROJECT UPDATE

Working Groups

Steve Drahota, HDR, and the project team gave an update on the recent working group meetings.

URBAN DESIGN & AESTHETICS

Steve said the Urban Design and Aesthetics Working Group (UDAWG) has been very busy, with frequent and lengthy meetings but is starting to wind down for the year. The group has one more four-hour meeting on December 16, 2020.

Paddy Tillett, ZGF Architects, gave an update on the UDAWG's recent discussions.

He explained that the UDAWG is concerned with two aspects of the evaluation criteria; urban context & experience, and visual & aesthetic considerations. The group focused on three major topics:

1. Views and experiences of drivers, passengers, people on foot, bike, transit etc. - He said crossing the river can and should be an extraordinary experience, especially traveling west. The UDAWG is thinking of this westward passage as the front yard of the city and that it should be capitalized on by keeping the above deck structure to a minimum so the west hills and the mountains looking east remain visible.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 7, 2020

2. Scale of the bridge elements vs. architectural scales on the east and west side - They are exploring how to establish a cohesive concept that will connect the scale of the city on either side of the river, which differ greatly. The west side is predominantly small buildings with height maximums at around 75 feet. On the east side, the building height limit is 250 feet and has a completely different feel with more modern buildings of varying shape and color. The east side landscape is much more tolerant of big structures than the west side. The UDAWG talked about how to make the most of these circumstances.
3. Usability of Waterfront Park – Especially the issue of the vertical height clearances in Waterfront Park with certain bridge types. He conveyed the importance of a sense of openness in the park. Bridge types with no columns and maximum head room would be ideal. He noted that a new feature of the bridge would be having a clear view of the river from under the bridge.

The UDAWG also discussed how to have a natural looking link from the bridge to the Eastside Esplanade and Waterfront Park for those who can use stairs. This topic will continue to be discussed in more detail later on.

He said UDAWG participants would take a deeper dive into the composite and bridge type renderings and look at how the elements of the bridge interact during their next meeting on December 16th. The intention is for the UDAWG to report back to the CTF on December 21st.

BRIDGE AND SEISMIC

Steve reminded everyone that this working group is focused on the technical aspects of the project. They will be meeting again on December 18th.

CONSTRUCTABILITY

Steve said this working group is expecting to meet again in January 2021. They will dive into specific topics around construction methods and the range of potential impacts.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Jeff Heilman, Parametrix, said this working group is expected to meet in March 2021. They will be discussing impacts to natural resources.

DIVERSITY, EQUITY & INCLUSION

Cassie shared that the team will reconvene the Social Services group in January. They will be amending the group to include other organizations that are interested in the findings of the Environmental Justice and Equity Technical Report and engaging them on type selection and the range of options and criteria.

MULTI-MODAL



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 7, 2020

Steve said this working group is expecting to meet again in January 2021. The group will discuss how all modes of transportation can use the bridge in a safe and functional manner.

HISTORIC/CULTURAL RESOURCES

Jeff told the CTF that the project team had a meeting on November 30th about Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act with all consulting parties, including two indigenous tribes, multiple State agencies, the City of Portland, multiple non-profits, and individuals with expertise or interest in historic resources the project would be impacting. Jeff noted there were some new participants at this meeting who had some differing opinions on the recommended Preferred Alternative that the CTF identified earlier this year. The project team will be hosting a meeting with these attendees to catch them up on the project and give some more background about how the Long Span came to be the recommended Preferred Alternative and not the Enhanced Seismic Retrofit.

Jeff introduced Sharon Wood Wortman and Ed Wortman, community and CTF members, to provide more detail on the meeting since they also attended. Sharon said the meeting was very informative and she felt that mitigations to Section 106 impacts are being taken seriously. She enjoyed listening to Bob Hadlow, an ODOT bridge historian, and others on ways to memorialize the bridge after it is replaced. Sharon was inspired by the meeting to submit some written comments and ideas to the rest of the CTF including an obituary-style letter about the existing Burnside Bridge. Allison noted these materials will be shared with everyone after the meeting.

Ed detailed the differing opinions on the Preferred Alternative of the new participants in the working group. He explained their concern around the fact that the recommended Preferred Alternative had already been identified. He noted that some of these folks are bridge preservation professionals who are committed to advocating for bridge preservation around the county.

Mike Pullen, Multnomah County, noted that the project team is working to bring these folks up to speed on the last five years' worth of project decisions to help them better understand why the CTF and the Policy Group recommended the long span alternative.

Mike also thanked Sharon and Ed for their update and for the list of memorialization ideas submitted by Sharon. He told the group that the County held a farewell celebration for the Sellwood Bridge before it was replaced that was well attended. He is looking forward to the creative ways that the Burnside Bridge can be memorialized.

CTF members and project team members shared these comments and questions:

- Mike thanked Paddy for being a great UDAWG ambassador.
- Neil Jensen, Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce, said the bridge obituary is a great idea.
- Peter Englander, Old Town Community Association, asked which two tribes attended the Historic/Cultural Resources and if they provided any input.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 7, 2020

- Jeff said the Siletz and Yakima tribes were represented and were primarily interested in how they can be more engaged around impacts and mitigation for fisheries. This topic is not part of the Historic Section 106 process, but the team will provide the tribes with the draft biological assessment that is being prepared for endangered salmon. Jeff added that the project team will be having another meeting specific to archeological impacts where the out of state participants will have more time to ask questions. That meeting will be another opportunity for tribes to give input.

BRIDGE TYPES UPDATE

Steve gave a brief update on the bridge types and noted that this meeting would focus on the evaluation criteria. 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. The design team is looking at how to best integrate the three pieces together with what is technically feasible. These feasible bridge type 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. He said the possible combinations of each of these options will be presented at the next meeting.

Steve reviewed the presentation from the last meeting on the technically feasible bridge options. For the movable bridge spans there are two basic categories; a lift or a bascule. More details about these two options will be shared in future meetings. The fixed approach spans have four technically feasible options; a tied arch, truss, cable-stayed and extradosed. Since the cable-stayed and extradosed options are very similar, the team and CTF may decide to combine them into one cable structure option. More details about these options are available on slides 12-14 and in materials from CTF meeting #20.

Steve said it will be up to the CTF to decide which sets of bridge types the criteria should be applied to; all of them or a subset.

- Neil asked what the difference in deck thickness between the bascule and extradosed styles is.
 - Steve said it was hard to make a direct comparison between the two, but the bascule would be thicker because of the movable mechanisms. A closer comparison would be between the cable stayed and the extradosed decks. The extradosed would be about five to six feet thicker.
 - Neil commented that it seemed like the deck thickness has more of an impact on the west side because of Waterfront Park.
 - Steve agreed and noted the cable stayed and extradosed options aren't necessarily an either/or choice. There is a direct relationship between the height of the tower and the thickness of the deck. The cable stayed column can be partially shortened rather than go all the way down to the extradosed height. This would only require a partially thicker deck. He noted that the extradosed option is a subset of the cable stayed option.

- Jane asked if there is a way to tell how each bridge type impacts the openness under the bridge.
 - Steve said the UDAWG is looking at this right now and will present more information at the next meeting. The cable stayed and tied arch options present the opportunity for additional vertical clearance under the bridge and the girder would have less clearance.
- Jackie Tate, community member, mentioned the recent article in the Tribune that included fears that the bridge design would be utilitarian and not beautiful.
 - Mike shared that the author of the article in the Portland Business Tribune, Brian Libby, is a proponent of hiring an architect to choose a bridge type and do the design simultaneously. This differs from Multnomah County's process. Because the County is working through the NEPA process, they are gathering input from a variety of sources on bridge type, and then hiring an architect to design the chosen bridge type. He compared the process to deciding on a type of car first and once a type is chosen, a sedan, for example, then a designer can come in to design a beautiful sedan.
- Peter Finley Fry asked how the team decided on the specific boundaries on each side of the river for the historic impact assessment.
 - Jeff explained that the boundary was based on the range of alternatives before the DEIS was drafted when the range of bridge alternatives included the high fixed bridge. This alternative was much higher and therefore extended much further on either side of the bridge. The boundary was drawn around that alternative. It also took into account the two historic districts on the west side that the boundary touched and was extended to include both of them. After the high fixed bridge was eliminated, the team decided to keep the same boundary. The east side was mostly concerned with direct impacts over the long term. Boundaries were also reviewed by the Oregon State Historic Preservation office.

EVALUATION CRITERIA DEVELOPMENT

Allison told the group the project team is at a critical point in the evaluation criteria process where they need feedback from the CTF. Jeff reminded the committee of the evaluation process and noted that the group is currently in the midst of identifying evaluation criteria per topic. A process graphic is available on slide 16. The process is very similar to that used to get to a Preferred Bridge Alternative.

After the measures and criteria are finalized, the weighting process will let the committee compare the importance of each measure against each other. Each bridge type will then be scored against the criteria and weighting. Jeff reminded the committee that just like the Preferred Alternative process, this score is just a tool to guide the group on their recommendation, but the CTF does not have to choose the bridge type with the highest score.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 7, 2020

Jeff explained the source of the draft topics and criteria. He reminded everyone that most of the list comes directly from the CTF's breakout groups in meeting #18. Some information comes from the previous NEPA phase criteria that weren't relevant to the Preferred Alternative phase but are relevant to the Type Selection phase. Finally, some ideas came from the working groups and project staff input.

Jeff explained that the next four slides, 19-22, showed the evaluation criteria assessment sheets from the NEPA selection criteria. The project team used this table to categorize the anticipated level of differentiation between bridge type options. They determined each criteria measure on a scale of *unknown, none or very small, small, moderate, large, or very large*. Criteria that was deemed moderate or higher is shown highlighted in green on the table. Jeff presented a summary of each criteria that would differentiate between bridge types broken out into three major categories:

Urban Context & Experience

- Minimize long-term impacts to community facilities and events under and near the bridge (e.g., Skatepark, Saturday Market, park festivals, parades, organized runs, etc.).
- Maximize personal safety and crime reduction by following principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).
- Minimize park displacements and adverse functionality impacts, (include impacts to river recreation).
- Minimize historic resource impacts.
- Minimize adverse impacts to existing views and view corridors.
- Maximize aesthetic experience for all users approaching, on, and under the bridge.

Visuals & Aesthetics

- Minimize historic resource impacts.
- Minimize adverse impacts to existing views and view corridors.
- Maximize aesthetic experience for all users approaching, on, and under the bridge.
- Create opportunity for a crossing that provides an iconic/demonstrative visual experience.

Cost and Construction

- Minimize impacts to water quality and flooding.
- Minimize total project cost.
- Minimize long-term maintenance needs/cost.

Jeff noted that the above categories could change. He said the project team developed proposed wording to explain each of these criteria in detail. He also noted that the categories *Urban Context & Experience* and *Visuals & Aesthetics* may appear to have overlap, but the team felt there was an important distinction between them.

Next, Jeff shared the list of key themes from the last CTF meeting. This list included notes on whether each topic was deemed a key differentiator or not, and if so, which criteria the topic is captured in. See slide 24. He noted that just like the Preferred Alternative phase, the topics that are not differentiators in



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 7, 2020

this phase, identified with black text, could be used in later phases. Non-differentiators in this phase may be used for final design decisions.

Jeff showed the list of refined key themes on slide 25. These are the key themes that have been refined for differentiation. He noted that “Construction Impacts to Users” has been added since the last meeting. Construction impacts will mostly be the same for all build options and therefore not differentiators but there will be some specific impacts that are different between bridge types.

Urban Context & Experience

- On-bridge Experience
- Urban Setting
- Public Use and Context

Visuals & Aesthetics

- Visual Coherence
- Bridge Form and Style
- Bridge Aspirations

Cost & Construction

- Total Project Cost
- Long Term Costs
- Construction Impacts to Users

Jeff asked the CTF for their feedback on the refined list of key themes. Discussion was as follows:

- Paul Leitman, Oregon Walks, asked to confirm that however the Eastbank Esplanade is connected to the new Burnside Bridge, that connection will not change considerably across different bridge types.
 - Steve explained that the bridge type doesn’t affect the access points to either side. He said that they are important aspects of the overall project, but they don’t seem to have a significant influence on the type selection process. For this same reason, there is a lot of design-related criteria that doesn’t appear on the list Jeff presented.
- Peter Finley Fry asked why it was determined that the “minimize impacts to water quality and flooding” criteria was a moderate differentiator and why it didn’t make it into the updated list.
 - Steve said there would be different sizes and shapes of supports in the water for the different bridge type options. For instance, the delta pier has a trapezoidal shape and a much wider face and is anticipated to obstruct river flow more than the lift towers. This could impact water surface elevation and dredging that could change the shape of the channel bottom as a byproduct of that support shape. Stormwater impacts are expected to be similar across all bridge types.
- Peter Finley Fry also asked if different bridge types would have different noise impacts.

- Steve said yes but that’s not something that the team believes will manifest itself among the bridge types being looked at.
- Jackie noted that some of the titles of the key themes are hard to understand and don’t hold meaning for a lot of people. The terms are not transparent or accessible. For instance, urban setting, visual coherence, and bridge aspirations wouldn’t mean much to someone out of context.
 - Allison agreed that Jackie’s comments were important and noted that this will be addressed later on. She added that the focus for this discussion was a little broader and that the project team wanted to know if the CTF approved of the current high-level categories.
- Ed asked where history and culture fits into the refined list of key themes. Slide 24 notes that it is included in “Urban Context and Experience” criteria, but it isn’t explicitly listed on slide 25.
 - Allison proposed coming back to this question after Steve presented the next few slides.
- Peter Englander asked for clarification on how the criteria were deemed differentiators or not. He felt that environmental enhancement and stewardship was discussed widely among the CTF but is not listed as a key theme. He thought that the use of different building materials and amounts of materials needed for different bridge types could have different impacts on things like fish and wildlife. He also asked if the cable stayed option’s towers would have an impact on birds.
 - Steve explained that he and the project team assessed each criterion across all technically feasible bridge options to determine if they were differentiators or not. They found that some criteria would be the same for any technically feasible bridge option, while others will be very different across options. In some cases, it is too soon to tell, the differences are primarily during construction. As for building materials, he said that it’s too soon to make those decisions because the team is working to allow for maximum flexibility for final design rather than mandate what materials should be used.
 - Peter Englander clarified that he meant the amount of material needed for different bridge options.
 - For the purposes of type selection, a bridge type that has less mass will be both cheaper and have less of a carbon footprint. Reducing the carbon footprint through material type and sourcing would be addressed in final design.
- William “Bill” Burgel, Portland Freight Committee, asked why personal safety in the “Bridge Users” category was not deemed a differentiator. He noted that cable stayed bridges have a propensity to drop ice when the cables freeze over.
 - Steve acknowledged that this could happen but because it is so infrequent that Portland has ice storms, he felt it should not be a deciding factor. If the CTF disagrees, it could be considered a differentiator.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 7, 2020

- Mike said Bill raised an interesting question about ice falling from a bridge structure. In recent decades we have not had a case of ice falling from our truss or arch bridges, but ice can add weight that becomes an issue for movable bridges.
- Frederick “Fred” Cooper, Laurelhurst Neighborhood Emergency Team and Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association, agreed with Peter Englander that an environmental differentiator should be included. He feared that the public would question why it was left out. He disagreed with the determination that the environmental enhancement and stewardship theme would not be a differentiator. He cited multiple environmental factors that should be considered including the possible need for more dredging to account for a wider navigation channel between the bascule and lift options. He also agreed with Peter Englander’s point about different bridge types having different impacts to birds.
 - Peter Finley Fry said Environmental impact is critical. He assumed that the staff's position is that all bridge types will have the same environmental impact. He agreed with Peter Englander's question about the impact to birds citing an article in the Oregonian that said millions of birds are killed every year due to bridges and other industrial activities.

Steve presented the details that the project team developed for each key theme and sub-theme. He explained that each sub-theme was given a definition and some qualifying bullet points to begin to outline how they will be measured. Each topic was given a numerical value, and the criteria below them are denoted with letters. Steve said the project team was looking for the CTF to decide if categories and criteria are correct and wordsmithing will be informed by the other working groups and decided at a future meeting.

Preliminary Criteria Topics	Notes
1. Urban Context and Experience	
<p>A. On Bridge Experience: How well does the bridge option provide public benefits from its deck surface, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Views from the bridge deck toward the cityscape, including downtown and the Eastside, distant landscapes and natural environment, adjacent up-and down-river bridges, and other key viewpoints. ● Bridge type that provides opportunities for programming and public events (such as the Rose Festival Parade) and civic gatherings ● Others? 	<p>Steve noted this criterion is specifically considering public events on the bridge itself.</p>



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 7, 2020

<p>B. Urban Setting: How well does the bridge option’s scale and form authentically fit with the scale and character of surrounding neighborhoods, buildings, parks and districts, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westside Old Town/Chinatown and Downtown neighborhoods • West bridgehead buildings and infrastructure shapes, scale, textures, and color • Eastside Kerns and Buckman neighborhoods and Central Eastside Industrial District • East bridgehead buildings and infrastructure shapes, scale, textures, and colors • Others? 	<p>This criterion is specific to the how the bridge connects the two areas on either side of the bridge and how scale is taken into account.</p>
<p>C. Public Use and Context: How well does the bridge option fit within park and river environments under and adjacent to the bridge, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to improve safety by minimizing columns, and creating adequate sightlines and clearances beneath the bridge structure • Ability to further activate and enhance the under-bridge space within Waterfront Park for community events and other programmed activities • Flexible open space and opportunity for an “urban roof” that provides public benefit • Integration with the Japanese American Memorial Plaza, Ankeny Plaza, Bill Naito Legacy Fountain, and Better Naito Forever, and Vera Katz Eastbank Esplanade • Compatibility with the varied Willamette River uses, water-surface variability, and reflectiveness on the river surface • Compatibility with the Burnside Skate Park and local streetscape on the East side • Attractive under-bridge design consideration, including lighting, materials, and detailing • Others? 	<p>This criterion is specific to spaces under and adjacent to the bridge. He told the committee to think of the three criteria in the Urban Context and Experience category as concentric circles.</p>
<p>2. Visual and Aesthetics</p>	
<p>A. Visual Coherence: How well does the bridge option’s composition provide the perception of visual balance, unity, and flow from key</p>	<p>This criterion will need to measure how a bridge option</p>



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

<p>viewpoints, including: Willamette River, Waterfront Park, Eastbank Esplanade, I-5 / I-84 users, Bridgehead buildings, high-rise buildings, and surrounding bridges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Others? 	<p>works together to give visual balance from different viewpoints.</p>
<p>B. Bridge Form and Style: How well does the bridge option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Express the Portland values and aspirations for inclusiveness, resiliency, accessibility, creativity, optimism, vitality, sustainability, and freedom of expression • Become an identifiable landmark and destination within the city • Balance the overall composition, qualities of openness and transparency (i.e., minimizing the massings) while conveying a sense of seismic stability and reliability • Respect the past and context while presenting a “forward-thinking” design aesthetic that sets the tone for future urban development and growth throughout its 100-year design life • Reflect proportions and scale that feel balanced among the various structural portions • Honor Portland’s moniker as a “City of Bridges” and its unique location as the center of the City quadrants • Reflect Portland’s transportation values in bicycle and pedestrian safety and accessibility • Others? 	<p>This criterion considers the stylistic characteristics of the bridge and how it will express the various Portland values being discussed by the UDAWG.</p>
<p>C. Bridge Aspirations: How well does the bridge option enable opportunities for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memorable, distinctive lighting for nighttime viewing • Creation of a gateway and enhanced sense of arrival to and from each side of the river • Technologies that represent the era in which the bridge is designed, including the potential for exposing the movable bridge mechanisms • Tactile, human/pedestrian-scale features within its public spaces, including overlooks • Adapting to future bridge use or under-bridge use changes • A range of complementary design elements (e.g., Operator’s House, Multi-use path Connections, Streetcar features, overlooks, etc.) to be selected during the Final Design phase • Others? 	<p>Many of these decisions will come during final design, but the different bridge types could have different opportunities for these aspirations.</p>



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 7, 2020

3. Cost and Construction	
<p>A. Total Project Cost: How well does the bridge option minimize the total direct Project Cost, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction costs, including the influence of constructability over and around existing transportation infrastructure, the Willamette River, buildings, and utilities • Permanent and temporary right of way acquisition costs • Utility relocation and protection costs • Pre-construction design phase costs • Permitting and environmental mitigation costs • Construction inspection and engineering support costs • Others? 	<p>This section lists out the various components that will impact cost.</p>
<p>B. Long Term Costs: How well does the bridge option support future inspection operations, minimize long-term maintenance costs, and support future adaptability costs, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct cost of bridge operations and inspections • Direct cost for anticipated, routine maintenance and rehabilitation improvements (e.g., movable bridge repairs, deck wearing surface rehabilitation, re-painting, lighting maintenance, structural upgrades, etc.) • Direct costs for any necessary bridge repairs following major events (e.g., major earthquake, major flood, vessel collisions, civic unrest, etc.) • Direct cost for potential bridge use changes (e.g., Adding Streetcar operations onto the bridge; Adding more bicycle/pedestrian space; Adjusting for future lane uses; etc.) • Others? 	<p>Some bridges, such as the truss option, may have more long-term maintenance costs than other options.</p>
<p>C. Construction Impacts to Users: How well does the bridge option's construction approach provide the greatest benefit to stakeholders and adjacent property owners, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapid project completion (i.e., the least construction duration) • Least amount of temporary and permanent property impacts • Least amount of utility service disruptions • Others? 	<p>This criterion would be measured by how fast the bridge can be built. The team initially thought this would not be a differentiator, but there may be some differences across the various configurations.</p>



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 7, 2020

The CTF's discussion was as follows:

- Fred said most of his questions were answered by this presentation. He also mentioned a recent article in the SE Examiner about the project that said the CTF would be making a decision on the bridge based on whether or not the Portland sign is visible. He said he hoped the group could overcome the perception that they are only considering a few criteria.
- Bill explained that in his work siting railroad tracks, long term maintenance is a big deal. He was concerned that this criterion is in a 'second tier' position on the list.
 - Steve explained that there were no tiers. Long term cost is a criteria within the Cost and Construction category. When the CTF weights the criteria, this importance can be reflected but has not happened yet.
- Allison asked Jackie if her earlier question was answered. Jackie said the additional explanation makes sense but unless Steve will be there to explain the details, the list on its own is not very meaningful.
 - Jane suggested that each theme also included the "how well" question that is associated with each to provide clarity.
- Allison asked Ed if his earlier question was answered. Ed said there is still no explicit reference to historic preservation in the details. He thought that the specific historical districts should also be called out in the description of one of the Urban Context and Experience criteria. He also felt there should be mention to the historical integrity of the bridge itself and what kind of mitigation measures will be taken to preserve aspects or refer back to the existing bridge. These are factors that could affect the bridge type. For instance, a bascule bridge would give more opportunities to invoke references to the existing bridge because of their similarities.
 - Neil offered a differing opinion on the notion of historic preservation. He noted the current bridge is only about 100 years old which is not that long when considering other historic features around the world. Additionally, the Burnside Bridge is one of the plainest bridges in Portland. He felt that the idea of fitting the new structure into the current bridge environment in Portland may not be relevant since the current bridges are all different styles. He felt that it's more important to build the best bridge possible from an engineering standpoint and not be quite so sentimental about the design.
 - Stella Funk Butler, Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations, shared that she was still very concerned about the historical value of the bridge.
- Peter Finley Fry reiterated that the CTF can't ignore environmental impacts. He suggested including a reference to that under the Urban Setting criteria.
 - Tesia Eisenberg, Mercy Corps, agreed that including an environmental criterion was necessary and agreed the list of key themes should include more detail to each criteria.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 7, 2020

- Jane complimented the team on getting the group to this point noting the amount of work that went into it. She agreed with Jackie that the summary on slide 24 was very brief and suggested including the explanatory phrase for each sub-topic to help give a little more context.
- Gabe Rahe, Burnside Skatepark, agreed with the criteria at this point.
- Bill noted that occasionally, during a special event, hundreds or thousands of people may want to "get on" the bridge. This happened about 20 years ago on the Golden Gate Bridge. When that happened, the mass-weight of the people on the bridge flattened the camber of the suspension bridge and greatly worried bridge engineers. He asked if the new Burnside Bridge have a "people-load rating".
 - Steve said yes, the team would be checking the bridge design against "pedestrian loads."
- Susan Lindsay, Buckman Community Association, said that she liked the direction the criteria were moving in. She did share an observation that it felt like the UDAWG was focusing more on the visual impacts looking west compared to the east. She felt that although the east side doesn't have height limits and historic districts it should still be valued as much as looking west. She also shared others' concerns about the aesthetics of the connection from the bridge to the Eastbank Esplanade.

Allison asked members if they were feeling good about the direction that the key topics and sub-topics were going in. Most members gave a visual "thumbs up" confirmation.

NEXT STEPS

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

- December 21: Finalize criteria and range of feasible bridge types
- **(Potential)** January 25: Refine measures.

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. Allison told the committee that an additional meeting is being tentatively planned for January 25 to refine the measures. They will discuss if this is needed at the next meeting.

ADJOURN

Allison closed out the meeting and wished everyone a good evening.

The next CTF meeting will be December 21, 2020.