



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 27, 2020

CTF Meeting #14

Meeting information

- Project:** Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge
- Subject:** Community Task Force, Meeting #14
- Date:** Monday, April 27, 2020
- Time:** 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.
- Location:** WebEx Virtual Meeting

- Attendees:** **GROUP Members:**
Art Graves, Multnomah County Bike and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee
Cameron Hunt, Portland Spirit
Ed Wortman, Community Member
Frederick Cooper, Laurelhurst Neighborhood Emergency Team
Gabe Rahe, Burnside Skatepark
Howie Bierbaum, Portland Saturday Market
Jackie Tate, Community Member
Paul Leitman, Oregon Walks
Jennifer Stein, Central City Concern
Marie Dodds, AAA of Oregon
Kiley Wilson, Portland Business Alliance
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
Timothy Desper, Portland Rescue Mission
William Burgel, Portland Freight Advisory Committee

- Community Members:**
Suzanne Carey, David Evans and Associates
Patrick Sweeney, City of Portland
Courtney Lords, Multnomah County

- Project Team Members:**
Megan Neill, Multnomah County
Mike Pullen, Multnomah County
Heather Catron, HDR
Cassie Davis, HDR
Jeff Heilman, Parametrix
Steve Drahota, HDR
Liz Stoppelmann, HDR
Allison Brown, JLA
Bridger Wineman, EnviroIssues
Sarah Omlor, EnviroIssues
Marcy Schwartz, MSS

Apologies: Dan Lenzen, Robert McDonald, Neil Jensen





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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 27, 2020

Summary Notes

INTRODUCTION AND HOUSEKEEPING

Allison Brown, JLA, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and reviewing virtual meeting protocols. She began roundtable introductions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Allison read a public comment that was received in advance of the meeting from Aysha Ghazoul. She reminded everyone that the meeting was being recorded and would be posted to the project website at www.BurnsideBridge.org.

PROJECT UPDATE

Heather Catron, HDR, reviewed the project timeline for the next few months. She reminded the group that the results from scoring would be ready in May for the CTF to use to recommend a Preferred Alternative (PA). If necessary, they will meet again in June. After that, public outreach will be conducted in July/August and community feedback will be presented back to the CTF in September. The draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) will be released in early 2021 followed by a formal public comment period.

- Fred Cooper: The key differentiator matrix is color coded either red or green. I think this may be over simplifying things. There should be a third color for differentiators that aren't necessarily good or bad.
 - Heather: That is good feedback for when this will be shown to the public.
 - Steve: In some cases, there is a combination of colors to indicate that there is both a positive and negative differentiator.

TECHNICAL REPORT FINDINGS – KEY DIFFERENTIATORS

Steve Drahota, HDR, began his presentation by explaining that the group will be reviewing the key differentiators of the four bridge alternatives including the traffic options during construction. He started by providing a high level overview of the alternatives.

- Peter Finley Fry: Could the Couch connection possibly be used for only the future streetcar?
 - Steve: Yes, it is possible, but we haven't studied that scenario because the Streetcar alignment fits within the exterior lane for all alternatives. All four design options are being studied for all modes of transportation.
 - Peter: I think having a streetcar-only bridge is an aspiration that we all have and will likely happen in the future.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 27, 2020

- William (Bill) Burgel: The images for the long span and short span replacement alternatives show a lift span style bridge. Do these alternatives have to be a lift span or could they be a bascule bridge?
 - Steve: All replacement alternatives could consist of either a lift or bascule movable span, and this decision will be made during the Type Selection phase (if one of the replacement alternatives is selected as the Preferred Alternative).
- Art Graves: The long span replacement image shows tall vertical “wings”. Are those needed for support or can you make it without the “wings”?
 - Steve: The Long Span alternative shown (the tied arch concept) represents a family of potential bridge types consisting of a tied arch, truss, a cable stay (like the Tilikum bridge), or other types not shown. The “wings” shown are the arch members and are needed because the long-span bridge requires structural elements above the bridge deck.

BRIDGE ALTERNATIVES

Steve began by orienting the group to how the differentiators across bridge alternatives were color coded for each criterion. Green boxes show positive key differentiators while red boxes show negative key differentiators. Steve and Jeff Heilman, Parametrix, then presented the key differentiators for each of the 13 criteria. Questions and comments were as follows:

- Fred: In the Community Quality of life criteria, less light is a negative differentiator but there’s no way to tell in the graphic. Could you add shadow to the images to show this?
 - Jeff: Good point. Yes, this can be done.
- Cameron Hunt: Some of the current bridge support columns are a part of the Skatepark itself. If a long or short span replacement is chosen, could the old columns remain in place or would they need to be removed?
 - Steve: With any of the replacement alternatives, the existing columns could be left in place so long as there is a gap between the top of the columns and the new bridge. The gap is needed for both structural reasons and to enable future maintenance. If a replacement bridge is selected, this would be resolved during Final Design based on stakeholder input.
- Art: As far as historic resources, the harbor wall, potentially buried resources, and the Skatepark are all hypothetical impacts. I think we should remember the established historic resources that are impacted.
 - Jeff: Actually those aren’t hypothetical. The Skatepark for example is recommended eligible for the National Register and it would be demolished by some of the bridge alternatives. Do you mean that we should emphasize that the bridge itself would be impacted?



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 27, 2020

- Art: No, I think people will only think of the Portland sign and the Skidmore Old Town Historic District. I just want to be clear that potential buried resources underwater are hypothetical.
- Jeff: OK, we don't want to underestimate the Skatepark. It wasn't previously designated but we know now that it is historically significant.
- Art: I don't want to take away anything from the Skatepark. I think you need to mention the Portland sign and the historic districts. Even if it's as simple as saying they won't be impacted so people know they're being considered.
- Jeff: Understood. We will mention that. Both were considered but not mentioned in the key differentiators.
- Peter: Since the long span option only has two footings, are they bigger and deeper footings? Does it displace more underground?
 - Steve: Yes, they are generally expected to be larger, especially on land. For those in the Willamette River, however, our preliminary analysis shows they are roughly the same size.
- Susan Lindsay: The bridge itself is on the National Register, right? So, when we talk about demolishing the Skatepark and others, we have to keep in mind we're already destroying one landmark.
 - Jeff: Yes the bridge is on the National Register, but to clarify, being on the register and being eligible for the register are equal in terms of regulatory protection.
- Art: A lot of people don't realize the visual impact the long span option has on the Portland sign. Maybe an image could show that angle.
 - Jeff: The impact is considered in the evaluation and in the Visual report but we'll make sure that there is a simulated view showing visual impact to the sign.
- Cameron: Is it possible to do a long span on the east side and a short span on the west side?
 - Steve: Yes, that's possible but it might remove some of the benefits of the long span. If the Long Span alternative is selected, hybrid solutions such as this will be considered during the Type Selection phase.
- Susan: When we weighted the criteria, we weighted visual & aesthetics pretty low. But at that time, we didn't know about the long span option with the tall risers. That could be a big impact.
 - Steve: We are only at a 5% level of design for all alternatives. Because of this, the current images are high level and consist of general design scale and proportions. The final bridge could look different. If the Long Span option is selected as the PA, much more work will go into the bridge layout and design during the Type Selection phase. For the purposes of the NEPA alternatives analysis, however, we are intentionally trying to

minimize the aesthetic details and focus more on the attributes and qualities of a long span.

- Art: One of the points of the Couch connection is to make that intersection safer. Isn't the current "S" curve already very safe because it forces cars to slow down?
 - Steve: You're right in that the crash data shows there haven't been crashes within the "S" curve. There are crashes immediately outside of the "S" curve. But there is a higher potential for future crashes because of how the Couch Plaza is intended to be developed to draw more pedestrians and bikes. Further, redevelopment in that area has increased over the last few years. For the Couch Extension, a vehicular barrier will be constructed between the vehicles and pedestrians and bikes. Due to the lack of space, this would not be constructed through the "S" curve for the other replacement alternatives.
- Paul Leitman: When you say an alternative is the most expensive, are you looking at the construction cost or does it include the long-term maintenance?
 - Steve: This graph shows the overall project cost which includes construction, design, mitigation, etc. It does not include maintenance cost. The maintenance costs were assessed as part of the NEPA alternatives evaluation, though.
- Ed: Why is the cost of the temporary bridge on the short span replacement cheaper than the rest?
 - Steve: I will need to look into that. It may just be a mathematical error. (Note: this was an error on the sheet and has been corrected. The temporary bridge cost is the same for all replacement bridge alternatives).
- Bill: Isn't there a lot of unknown costs associated with the geotechnical work? Meaning alternatives 1, 2, and 4 could actually be a lot higher.
 - Steve: We developed an engineering-based estimate to come up with a base cost. We then had a cost-risk session that established risks that could drive pricing. The long span replacement was very good at eliminating most of the geotechnical mitigation risk. We analyzed each alternative through a risk lens. The project costs are risk adjusted to account for questions like yours.

TEMPORARY BRIDGE AND FULL BRIDGE CLOSURE

Steve explained that the differentiators for traffic management options were color coded for each criterion just as before. Green boxes show positive key differentiators while red boxes show negative key differentiators. Steve and Jeff presented the key differentiators for each of the 13 criteria as they relate to the temporary bridge or full closure traffic options. Questions and comments were as follows:

- Cameron: Was there a differentiator for Business and Economics as it relates to river traffic?
 - Jeff: Yes, there would be more closures with a temporary bridge.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 27, 2020

- Art: What is the footprint impact of the temporary bridge on the west side?
 - Jeff: There would be temporary columns for the temporary bridge within Waterfront Park, and it would remove six mature trees south of the existing bridge. The supports for the temporary bridge would be removed after it is taken down.
 - Steve: The construction sequence and staging for the temporary bridge is complicated. There are four or five stages to build the temporary bridge and the new bridge at the same time. In some areas, the footprint of temporary bridge used the new bridge portion. It would also be complicated to maintain a temporary bridge and the Skatepark at the same time.
- Art: What is the capacity of the temporary bridge and does the temporary bridge have to come down or could it remain permanently?
 - Steve: It's about one half or one third of current capacity. However, travel time is a better indicator than sheer volume. The temporary structure has about a ten to 15-year design life so can't be left in place. It also wouldn't be designed for seismic loads.
- Howie Bierbaum: The temporary bridge would go right through the glass plinth structure at the Saturday Market. Does the construction duration time include time for removal and reinstallation of that feature?
 - Steve: Yes, that is included in the overall construction duration.
- Cameron: Across all options, are there differences in how long or how often the navigation channels would be closed to river traffic?
 - Jeff: The biggest differences are associated with the temporary bridge option. A temporary bridge would result in more short-term river closures. A bascule lift option would also result in longer temporary closures than a vertical lift span. Among the alternatives themselves, I believe they were all equal in terms of business impacts to river traffic.
 - Steve: To consider this, we included tug assists into the cost estimate as a necessary mitigation.
- Art: Seeing the durations of construction for each alternative overlaid with the cost estimate graph would be helpful.
 - Steve: We can do that.

NEXT STEPS

Heather told the committee that they will see the results of the alternatives evaluation at the next meeting.

Allison called for any final questions from the group.



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

April 27, 2020

- Bill: Art mentioned the height of the arch in the long span replacement. Is it possible to have two smaller arches instead of one large one?
 - Steve: It could be, yes, but there are tradeoffs. More arches would reduce the span length on the east side and require more supports in an area that is challenging because of how little space there is between the highway, the railroad, and in the geotechnical hazard zone.
- Marie Dodds: How will the project be impacted by COVID-19?
 - Mike Pullen, Multnomah County: Sometimes recessions create infrastructure funds and end up putting people back to work through infrastructure projects. This could be a silver lining. The project is currently funded through design with the vehicle registration fee. Since it's funded that way as opposed to a gas tax, we hopefully won't be as impacted. There is also talk of the Metro ballot coming up, but we don't know which way that will go.
- Ed: How will this project be coordinating with the I-5 Rose Quarter Project?
 - Megan: We have existing relationships with consultants on that project and have started regular coordination meetings. We are coordinating traffic impacts and seeking opportunities to leverage the geographic proximity between both projects. In general, all agencies are attempting to work together to mitigate traffic impacts throughout the region with construction happening for several mega-projects at the same time.

Allison thanks participants for joining and adjourned the meeting.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

- Action 1: Project team will consider adding a more neutral color to the key differentiator tables for differentiators that are neither good nor bad.
- Action 2: Project team will adjust graphics to reflect changes in shadows and light under the bridge.
- Action 3: Project team to include a graphic rendering of the view of the Portland sign for the long span replacement alternative.
- Action 4: Steve to review temporary bridge cost estimates for the short span replacement alternative.
- Action 5: Project team to consider overlaying construction durations over project cost estimates.