DRAFT Evaluation Criteria

1. Urban Context and Experience
2. **On-bridge Experience:** How well does the bridge option provide public benefits from its deck surface, including:
* Views from the bridge deck towards:
	+ The cityscape, including downtown and the Eastside
	+ Distant landscapes and natural environment (West hills, Willamette River, Mt Hood, Mt St Helens, and open skies)
	+ Adjacent bridges in the up-river and down-river directions
	+ Other key viewpoints (e.g., Portland Oregon sign, Oregon Convention Center towers, Moda Center, Waterfront Park, US Bank Tower)
* Bridge type that provides opportunities for programming and public events (such as the Rose Festival Parade) and civic gatherings
* (Note: Likely common to all options; Not expected to be differentiating) Pedestrian and bicycle safety: sight lines, lighting and physical separation of modes
* (Note: Likely common to all options; Not expected to be differentiating) Ability to provide river overlooks for pedestrians to stop and enjoy
1. **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:
* Old Town/Chinatown and Downtown neighborhoods, including the Skidmore / Old Town Historic District (75 ft. height limit)
* Tom McCall Waterfront Park and its existing trees
* West bridgehead buildings and physical infrastructure shapes, scale, textures, and colors
* Kerns and Buckman neighborhoods and Central Eastside Industrial District (250 ft. height limit)
* East bridgehead buildings and physical infrastructure shapes, scale, textures, and colors
1. **Public Use and Context:** How well does the bridge option fit within park and river environments under and adjacent to the bridge, including:
* 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 (e.g., Portland Saturday Market, Bridgetown Nightstrike, etc)
* 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, 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
1. (Note: Likely common to all options; Not expected to be differentiating) Pedestrian and Cyclist Connectivity: How well does the bridge ensure that safe and accessible pedestrian and bike connections will be made down to grade, considering:
* Americans with Disabilities Act
* West bridge deck to Waterfront Park, Naito Parkway, SW 1st and SW 2nd Avenues
* East bridge deck to surrounding local streets and pedestrian open spaces
1. Visual and Aesthetics
2. **Visual Coherence:** How well does the bridge option’s composition provide the perception of visual symmetry, balance, unity, and flow from key viewpoints, including:
* Willamette River
* Waterfront Park
* Eastbank Esplanade
* I-5 / I-84 users
* Bridgehead buildings
* High-rise buildings
* Surrounding bridges
1. **Bridge Form and Style:** How well does the bridge option:
* 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 qualities of overall composition, openness and transparency (i.e., minimizing the massing) 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
* (Note: Likely common to all options; Not expected to be differentiating) Reflect Portland’s transportation values in bicycle and pedestrian safety and accessibility
1. **Bridge Aspirations:** How well does the bridge option enable opportunities for:
* 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 potentials for exposing the movable bridge mechanisms
* Tactile, human/pedestrian-scale features within its public spaces, including overlooks
* Adaptability for future needs and purposes
* A wide range of complementary secondary design features (e.g., Operator’s House, Multi-use path Connections, Streetcar elements, public art, overlooks, etc.) to be selected during the Final Design phase
* (Note: Likely common to all options; Not expected to be differentiating) A reduction in bridge noise and as generated by the freeway
* (Note: Likely common to all options; Not expected to be differentiating) Additional sustainable and equitable design principles to be incorporated during the Final Design phase
1. Cost
2. **Total Project Cost:** How well does the bridge option minimize the total direct Project Cost, including:
* 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
1. **Long Term Costs:** How well does the bridge option support future inspection operations, minimize long-term maintenance costs, and support future adaptability costs, including:
* 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, fires, 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)