



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 21, 2020

Community Task Force (CTF) Meeting #22

Meeting information

Project: Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge

Subject: CTF, Meeting #22

Date: Monday, December 21, 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
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
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 Attendees:

Paddy Tillett, ZGF Architects
Tate White, Portland Parks & Recreation
Suzanne Carey, DEA
Carol Mayer-Reed, Mayer/Reed

Apologies: Jennifer Stein, Marie Dodds, Dennis Corwin





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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 21, 2020

Summary Notes

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

She noted that the CTF would be voting on two recommendations tonight.

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 & Aesthetics Working group (UDAWG) has done a lot of work since the last CTF meeting. Paddy Tillett, ZGF, and Tate White, Portland Parks & Recreation, were in attendance to provide an update from the UDAWG and Portland Parks & Recreation later in the meeting.

BRIDGE AND SEISMIC

Steve said this group recently had a two-hour discussion. They are using computer models to generate the sizing of the bridge components and geotechnical requirements. This information will drive the ultimate design of the bridge and help the CTF make recommendations. The group is expected to meet again in early 2021 to discuss the geotechnical mitigation approach. He noted that this group has representatives across the bridge design industry, with experts from Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the City of Portland, Multnomah County and other consultant teams who will ensure that the bridge is being designed to meet its seismic performance criteria.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 21, 2020

CONSTRUCTABILITY

Steve said this working group is expecting to meet again in January 2021. They will dive into specific topics around construction methods for the range of bridge types. CTF members are welcome to join if they'd like.

MULTI-MODAL

This working group is expecting to meet again in January 2021. Steve said they will focus on north/south multimodal access ways for multimodal transportation methods traveling onto the bridge itself.

HISTORIC/CULTURAL RESOURCES

Jeff Heilman, Parametrix, said this working group's first meeting was in December and they are expected to meet again in January and February 2021. The group has started the Section 106 process to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act by beginning to meet with consulting parties to get input from people with expertise or particular interest in historic or cultural resources.

Jeff gave an overview of the Section 106 process that is happening concurrently with the NEPA process. He assured those who might be worried that historic and archeological resources are not adequately represented in the Type Selection criteria that the Historic and Cultural Resources working group is keeping a close eye on these topics. Jeff said the earlier work that was done to identify eligible historic resources was the first step in the Section 106 compliance process. Now, the group is beginning the Programmatic Agreement (PA) process that will work to address mitigation to historic resources and potential effects to archeological resources in partnership with the consulting parties. He reminded the group that the consulting parties include a group of over 20 people, some local and some from out of state, who are interested in and have expertise in national historic bridge preservation. Representatives from six Native American tribes are also invited. The first draft of the PA will be released at the end of February immediately followed by a 30-day comment period. A revised PA and a final draft will be released, each followed by a 30-day comment period. The final version is expected in August.

Jeff told the CTF that all input from the consulting parties will be summarized for them in order to assist in the evaluation criteria decisions. Some members of the CTF are also consulting parties in the Section 106 process.

Next, he showed a list of potential mitigation ideas to memorialize the current bridge. He reminded the group that the bridge cannot be moved and reused elsewhere, but there is the possibility of preserving pieces of the bridge to use as architectural elements or public art displays. The initial list of mitigation ideas includes:

- Adaptations to bridge design
- Incorporation of public art
- Use of historic bridge components in the new design or area



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 21, 2020

- Update Historic American Engineering Record (HAER)
- Oral history project
- Interpretive panels
- Support historic documentation efforts of local repositories
- Online encyclopedia submissions
- Creation of a museum exhibit
- Documentation of Willamette River crossings

Jeff noted that consulting parties are still submitting ideas in addition to this list. He noted that Sharon Wood Wortman, a member of the consulting parties, had submitted a list of many creative ideas. This list was shared with the CTF before the meeting. Jeff said the County had a meeting about one of Sharon's ideas to remove the timber pilings in the river for the current bridge and use them for an interpretive display about the old bridge.

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

- Sharon Wood Wortman, Community Member, asked how long the CTF has to discuss historic preservation ideas.
 - Jeff estimated until March. He said the team would like to have a good idea of the mitigation options for the release of the revised draft PA in April.
- Art Graves, Multnomah County Bike and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee, noted that the list of mitigation ideas does not include the Historic Landmarks Commission's ideas.
 - Jeff said the list will be revised with the ideas discussed in that meeting.
- Mike Pullen, Multnomah County, thanked Sharon for her creative ideas to memorialize the old bridge.

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Jeff reminded the CTF that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is getting ready to be published in January 2021. He shared the list of technical reports that were studied as a part of the DEIS. He invited the CTF to ask questions about the technical issues studied either during this meeting or by submitting comments during the public comment period after the DEIS is published.

EVALUATION CRITERIA DEVELOPMENT

Steve showed the current list of evaluation criteria and explained that it had been updated with the UDAWG suggestions. It is now refined into three categories and series of criteria topics within each category. Steve noted that the language in the refined list had been simplified to reflect the CTF's feedback at their last meeting.

The project team also developed draft definitions for each topic but Steve clarified that the CTF is only being asked to vote on the topics tonight, not the detailed definitions. Red text within the draft



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 21, 2020

definitions reflects a recommended change from the UDAWG. Steve noted there was only one recommended change which is a testament to how in sync the two groups are around these issues and interests. The refined criteria topics and detailed definitions are as follows:

Refined Criteria Topics	Draft Definitions
1. Human Experience & Bridge Surroundings	
A. On-bridge Experience	How well does the option provide benefits to people when they are on the bridge?
B. Below-bridge Experience	How well does the option provide benefits to people when they are under the bridge (in areas such as parks, roads, the river)?
C. Relation to Surroundings	How well does the option's scale and form complement respond to the character of surrounding neighborhoods, buildings, parks and historic districts/structures while being distinctive?
D. Pedestrian and Cyclist Connectivity	How well does the option ensure safe and accessible connections on and off the bridge for people walking, biking or with disabilities?
2. Overall Look & Feel of the Bridge	
A. Bridge Overall Look:	How well does the option's overall form create a look of balance, unity, and flow from key viewpoints above, under, and away from the bridge?
B. Bridge Form and Style	How well does the option acknowledge the historic surroundings while presenting a seismically-resilient, modern design that sets the tone for future development throughout its 100-year design life?
C. Flexible Design	How well does the option allow flexibility for engineering and architectural features in final design, as well as adaptability of the bridge for future user needs?
3. Cost and Construction Impacts to Users	
A. Total Project Cost	How well does the option minimize the Project's total cost?
B. Long Term Costs	How well does the option minimize long-term costs and support future needs after construction?
C. Construction Impacts	How well does the option minimize impacts to the traveling public and surrounding property owners and tenants during construction?

CTF Discussion

- Peter Englander, Old Town Community Association, asked how the CTF's feedback from the last meeting was incorporated into the list. He noted that he didn't see anything about how the bridge responds to its natural environment even though there was a fair amount of discussion about this at the last meeting.

- Steve explained that the CTF’s feedback is all captured in the sub-bullets of the criteria topics. He showed the Draft Evaluation Criteria document, included in this meeting’s agenda packet, where the sub-bullets are listed. He also clarified that ultimately the measurements for these criteria will be based on the sub-bullets. CTF members will work on wordsmithing and refining that material in early 2021. He said the project team felt it was important to show the higher-level bullets at this stage, but they are still drafts.
- Peter Englander expressed concern over the lack of language about the natural environment in the topics, despite the language in the sub bullets because he feared that the public may not look that closely. He said all of the topics are written from a human-centric point of view, but the natural environment is a big community concern and deserves to be explicitly stated.
- Tesia Eisenberg, Mercy Corps, and Susan Lindsay, Buckman Community Association, agreed with Peter Englander.
- Heather Catron, HDR, suggested including the natural environment in criteria topic 2B to read “historic and natural surroundings”.
- Peter Englander agreed with Heather’s suggestion along with Peter Finley Fry, Central Eastside Industrial Council, Jane Gordon, University of Oregon, Tesia, Susan, and Fredrick “Fred” Cooper, Laurelhurst Neighborhood Emergency Team and Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association.
- Allison asked the group if anyone disagreed with this edit. There were no objections.
- Fred also suggested adding mention of the natural environment in criteria topic 2C.
- Mike explained that the project team tried to make the language more approachable in response to Jackie Tate’s, Community Member, comment about using too much jargon at the last meeting.
 - Allison asked Jackie if she felt the criteria were more understandable since the last meeting’s version.
 - Jackie agreed that the language is more approachable and understandable.
 - Jane noted that “responds to” in criteria 1C sounds like architect jargon.
- Art asked who changed the word “complement” to “respond to” in criteria topic 1C.
 - Carol Mayer-Reed, Mayer/Reed, shared that the UDAWG requested this change.
 - Steve explained that this was a part of the UDAWG’s recommendations, but he emphasized that they are only recommendations and the CTF can choose to change it back.

- Art felt that “respond to” is vaguer than “complement” and the bridge shouldn’t be thought of as competing with its surroundings which the phrase “respond to” could imply.
- Steve gave some context for the UDAWG’s recommended change. He said it used to say “complement or dynamically contrast with...” but there was some debate over these two terms being contradictory so the UDAWG chose to use “respond to” to be more encompassing. He reiterated that the CTF ultimately decides which word to use.
- Susan said she preferred “complement” because it would be more easily understood by the public in this context.
- Allison asked the group if they all agreed on using “complement” rather than “respond to” in criteria 1C.
- Paul Leitman, Oregon Walks, noted that he preferred “respond to” but was willing to use “complement.”
- Jane and Stella Funk Butler, Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations, supported “complement.”
- Art reiterated that he prefers “complement” because it has a stronger impetus.
- Ed Wortman, Community Member, said he felt that the designers should have the flexibility to design something that may or may not complement the existing surroundings, rather than force them into a box. The group should be thinking about the future, not just focusing on the existing surroundings. He said using “complement” implies making concessions to fit into 2020 context that may not exist in 2030.
 - Paul said that if this is an important issue, some alternate suggestions could be "complement and/or respond to", "acknowledge", "react to" or "respects".
 - Susan shared support for “respects”.
 - Jackie was reminded of her artist friend who likes to say "great art doesn't match your sofa" to Ed’s point about the bridge not needing to complement the existing surroundings.
- Sharon asked if the group needed to decide on the word choice tonight.
 - Allison said that would be preferable because the criteria will be sent out to the public in January.
 - Heather said if there wasn’t agreement tonight, they could continue discussion over email.
- Paul acknowledged that the group seemed stuck on this word. He asked if this word choice mattered enough to impact further steps in the process since the group still has the measures discussion coming up in future meetings.

- Jeff agreed that whichever term is used here (respond, complement, etc.), the measures will define what the term means.
- Heather reminded the CTF that this process is only to develop criteria and measures as a tool to help them evaluate the bridge options to inform their recommendation.
- Jane suggested “relates to” instead of “responds to” but also agreed with Paul’s suggestion to say, “complement and/or respond to”.
- Jane, Tesia, Howie Bierbaum, Portland Saturday Market, and Gabe Rahe, Burnside Skate Park, agreed with this compromise.
- Cassie Davis, HDR, noted from an accessibility standpoint, complement might have more meaning. But this language is only the category for the criteria, the language can get more technical in the definition to include “responds to”.
- Susan said she still didn’t understand “respond to” in this context.
- Peter Finley Fry agreed with Susan. He also noted that this specific issue is the only one that has come up in debate at various levels, meaning this is a key pressure point of the group. The question is whether the existing surroundings lead the bridge design or vice versa.
 - Mike said an example of "responds to" could be the way the newer Portland Building relates to the old City Hall next to it.
 - Jackie and Susan expressed concern with Mike’s suggestion.
 - Tesia suggested using the phrase "visually benefit."
 - Stella showed support for “visually benefit.”
 - Peter Englander made another case for “complement” saying that the bridge needs to complement the newer buildings on the east side as well as the old historic district of the west side too.
 - Art said he is in support of “complement and respond” but not with "and/or".
 - Susan, Stella, and Ed agreed with Art.
- Allison called for consensus on using “complement and respond to” instead of “responds to” in 1C and adding the word “natural” to 2B. The group agreed.

Recommendation

Allison reviewed the voting protocol. A thumbs up means support, thumbs down means do not support, and a thumb in the middle means you can live with the recommendation. She asked the CTF to vote on whether or not they support moving forward with the evaluation criteria topics as listed above with the additional two edits. The official vote is as follows:

- Amy Rathfelder: Support



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 21, 2020

- Art Graves: Support
- Ed Wortman: Support
- Fred Cooper: Support
- Gabe Rahe: Support
- Howie Bierbaum: Support
- Jackie Tate: Support
- Jane: Support
- Neil: Left early, no vote
- Paul Leitman: Support
- Peter Englander: In the middle
- Peter Finley Fry: Support
- Sharon Wood Wortman: Support
- Stella Funk Butler: Support
- Susan Lindsay: Support
- Tesia Eisenberg: Support
- Bill Burgel: Support

BRIDGE TYPES REVIEW

Allison said the CTF is also being asked to vote on advancing all of the current bridge types for further study. She clarified that there would be one vote on the entire set of bridge types rather than each individual type.

Steve briefly reviewed the bridge types currently being studied and reminded the committee that the bridge is being thought of as “three bridges in one” with a west approach span, main river movable span, and an east approach span. The design team is looking at how to best integrate the three pieces together with what is technically feasible. The feasible bridge type options include through truss, cable-stayed, or tied-arch approaches, plus the girder option on the west approach only. A bascule or lift option are being considered for the movable span. He noted that the extradosed approach type is being combined with the tied-arch option to form one “cable” category because of their similarities.

Steve showed drawings and renderings of each option’s various configurations. The tied-arch option includes six variations: four with the lift moveable span and two with the bascule moveable span (see slide 24).

The truss option includes six variations: four with the lift moveable span and two with the bascule moveable span (see slide 28). Steve noted the differences between the truss and tied arch options:

- The truss would be vertically shorter than the tied arch,
- The truss would require bracing on the top of the structures. The tied-arch could be designed with or without top bracing.

- The diagonal bracing pieces of the truss would be much thicker than in the tied-arch.

The cable stayed option includes eight variations: four with the lift moveable span and four with the bascule moveable span (see slides 33-34). Steve noted that the longer the span, the taller the cable support towers need to be.

Steve then showed renderings of what the different bridge options would look like over Waterfront Park compared to the existing bridge. He noted that the vertical clearances under the bridge for the tied-arch and cable stayed options are 25 feet, compared to the existing clearance of 23 feet. The girder option would have a 17-foot clearance.

Steve introduced Paddy Tillett to speak about the recent UDAWG meeting. Paddy said the working group had similar struggles over specific wording. He advised the CTF to unpack the issue at the root of the disagreement over the wording. In the UDAWG's case it was the phrase "dramatic contrast" which all came down to a specific scenario where the west side cable stayed tower would be higher than the permitted heights of the historic district. The group was afraid the bridge would dominate that side of the city, but blend into the taller buildings on the east side and be invisible.

Paddy said the working group then reviewed the composition of each bridge option. The group began with the criteria fresh in their minds and came to some consensus around the suitability of some bridge options versus others. Some members resisted this thinking because they felt that it was too early to judge and that all the current bridge options should be studied and then compared, while others felt the design options were beginning to become self-evident at this point in the process. An example of this is the issue of the girder option's clearance under the bridge in Waterfront Park. He said the drastically reduced clearance will restrict the uses of the park and impact the sense of openness and light. The UDAWG also had concerns about the lift span option because of the scale of the towers. Paddy said regardless of each individual's thoughts are on the bridge type options are, the goal is to evaluate them objectively and then allow the facts to speak for themselves.

Allison introduced Tate White from Portland Parks and Recreation to share the Parks Bureau's considerations for the bridge type options. Tate said the Parks Bureau was not a big fan of the girder option because they are generally in favor of clear, open sightlines and light, airy structures. She mentioned that PBOT has similar feelings about the lower clearances over Naito Parkway. She acknowledged that the girder option does have some trade-offs like the columns at the edge of the park near Naito Parkway rather than in the middle of the park. These columns may also act as a visual barrier to the park and not be inviting to pedestrians from Naito Parkway.

CTF Discussion

- Jackie asked if the Steel Bridge is a truss bridge.
 - Michael Fitzpatrick, HDR, confirmed the Steel Bridge is an example of a truss.
 - Jackie asked what the Hawthorne and Morrison Bridges were.

- Mike and Megan, Multnomah County, answered that the Hawthorne is also a truss and the Morrison has a bascule like the existing Burnside Bridge.
- Jackie asked if the Morrison Bridge had a girder approach with a bascule lift.
- Mike clarified that the Morrison Bridge is a truss bridge on the approaches but the truss is below deck.
- Jackie asked if there were any tied-arch examples in Portland.
- Mike said the Fremont and Sauvie Island Bridges are tied-arch bridges.
- Howie asked if vertical clearance differences impact noise levels under the bridge.
 - Michael said the sound under a bridge has a lot to do with the type and the number of joints. For example, a concrete box is quiet compared to a steel truss.
- Art asked if there were any restrictions from the Army Corps of Engineers around above deck structure for emergency vehicles needing to cross the bridge after an earthquake.
 - Steve said these factors have already been considered and are the reason some bridge types were not feasible. All of the remaining bridge options offer enough clearance, width, and support for the weight load of emergency response vehicles.
- Susan suggested removing the lift and truss options after listening to several UDAWG meetings and realizing that the truss option creates a cage-like experience and the lift adds too much extra structure above the bridge deck.
 - Allison noted that there were only two movable span options so if one of them is removed then there is nothing to compare it to.
 - Steve explained that one of the key tradeoffs between a lift and bascule bridge is whether the mass goes above or below the bridge deck. The lift bridge also costs less than the bascule.
- Howie said he agreed with Tate’s preferences in Waterfront Park.
- Amy Rathfelder, Portland Business Alliance, and Stella were not fans of the truss option.
 - Jackie agreed and noted that there are already many truss bridges near the Burnside Bridge.
 - Peter Englander also agreed with removing the truss because he didn’t think anyone will favor this option.
 - Jane agreed that the truss should be removed, but the lift should be kept for comparison.
 - Tesia, Susan and Peter Finley Fry also agreed with removing the truss.
- Peter Finley Fry argued that there are ways to better utilize space under the west side of the bridge, citing an example in Oakland, that could activate the space and make the low ceilings of

the girder option less of a problem in the park. Peter wanted to challenge the architects to consider what else could be done with that space. He also thought that both the lift and bascule options should stay on the table.

- Ed said he thought it was too early in the process to remove options, especially before the team knows more about the costs.
 - Paul agreed that it would be beneficial to have all the data before eliminating any options. He noted that if an option is bad it will be reflected in the measures.
 - Sharon, Howie, Fred, Gabe, Jane and Stella agreed that all options should be kept.
- Bill Burgel, Portland Freight Advisory Committee, asked if the lift and bascule options were equally stable and whether the lift option was still being analyzed for seismic resiliency.
 - Steve said both options can be built to the same seismic standards and that the project team has run multiple models around counterweight placement for the lift option but still has some final checks to do.
- Fred shared concern with the number of options that are being advanced since each bridge type has many variation options.
 - Steve said that at this point, the group was being asked to just consider the basic bridge forms of truss, tied-arch, cable and girder.
- Fred asked if there will be any comparison of the span lengths and column placements on the west side in the future.
 - Steve confirmed that there will be.

Recommendation

Allison asked the CTF to make their recommendation to move forward with studying the bridge types: the tied arch, truss, cable stayed and girder options plus the two movable span options, lift and bascule. The official vote was as follows:

- Amy Rathfelder: Support
- Art Graves: Support
- Ed Wortman: Support
- Fred Cooper: Support
- Gabe Rahe: Support
- Howie Bierbaum: Support
- Jackie Tate: In the middle
- Jane: Support
- Neil: Left early, no vote
- Paul Leitman: Support



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

DECEMBER 21, 2020

- Peter Englander: In the middle
- Peter Finley Fry: Support
- Sharon Wood Wortman: Support
- Stella Funk Butler: Support
- Susan Lindsay: Support
- Tesia Eisenberg: Support
- Bill Burgel: In the middle

PUBLIC OUTREACH – JANUARY/FEBRUARY

Cassie explained the two major project milestones that will be announced to the public in the next few months: the recommendations that were made this meeting and the publishing of the DEIS. She congratulated the CTF on getting to this point.

The project team will collect comments on the DEIS and gather input on the range of bridge types and evaluation topics through an online survey, briefings, an in-person hearing, a webinar, and more.

NEXT STEPS

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

- January 25: Refine criteria and measures.

ADJOURN

Allison closed out the meeting and wished everyone a great holiday.

The next CTF meeting will be January 25, 2021.

ACTION ITEMS

- Action 1: Update criteria topic 2B to read “historic and natural surroundings”.
- Action 2: Update criteria topic 1C to read “complement and respond to” instead of “responds to.”