Meeting Minutes

Project:	Multnomah County | Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge
Subject:	Senior Agency Staff Group Meeting #4
Date:	Wednesday, April 11, 2018
Location:	HDR - 1050 SW 6th Ave, Suite 1800, Portland; 17 Downing Conf Rm

Attendees:

Ian Cannon, MultCo	Hillary Adam, BDS
Megan Neill, MultCo	Art Graves, BDS
Emily Miletech, MultCo	Steve Witter, TriMet
Chris Fick, MultCo	Mike Morrow, FHWA
Joanna Valencia, MultCo	Dan Bower, Portland Streetcar
Jamie Waltz, MultCo	Greg Theisen, Port of Portland
Jeston Black, MultCo	Heather Catron, HDR
Chris Warner, City of Portland	Steve Drahota, HDR
Christina Deffebach, Washington County	Cassie Davis, HDR
	Christina Tomaselli, HDR
Malu Wilkinson, Metro	Jeff Heilman, Parametrix
Shelly Haack, Prosper Portland	Josh Ahmann, Parametrix
Mark Lear, PBOT	Andre Baugh, AGB Group
Sam Hunaidi, ODOT	Alex Cousins, EnviroIssues
Thomas McConnell, ODOT	Jessica Pickul, JLA

Welcome and Introductions

- Heather Catron welcomed evreyone and walked the committee through the meeting agenda. Ian Cannon and Megan Neill thanked the committee members for their continued interest in the project.

Project Update

Public Outreach:

- Heather Catron provided an overview of outreach efforts since the last Senior Agency Staff Group (SASG) meeting including:
    - Launched online public briefing utilizing StoryMaps tool – Spring 2018
    - Community input from online briefing and survey reflected comments about bike/pedestrian connections, safety, emergency response, project need, costs, questions of design and aesthetics, and economic impacts. A handout containing all the survey responses was provided.
    - ***COMMITTEE ACTION*** Please share these survey results with your organization.

Project Milestones

- Anticipating an early start for National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) phase.
- Issuance of 'the Notice of Intent' (NOI) is needed to begin NEPA phase; hoping to receive approval from FHWA to publish the NOI in the Federal Register in May 2018.

- Possible three to four year timeframe for NEPA phase.
- NEPA phase includes agency and public outreach, scoping, draft and final Environmental Impact Statements (EIS), and Record of Decision (ROD). Bridge type selection, final design, and construction follow the NEPA phase.
- The draft Purpose and Need statement will be available to the public during scoping. The draft Purpose and Need statement is based off the project problem statement previously reviewed by this committee.

Comment

- **Comment: When does the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) need a preferred alternative?**
- *Response: A preferred alternative can be identified in either the draft or final EIS.*
- **Comment: What is the project committed to do after NEPA? What is the shelf life of the environmental impact statement (EIS)?**
- *Response: There is not necessarily a regulatory 'shelf life' but typically if a project has not made progress three years after the ROD it may be necessary to revisit information in the EIS that has substantially changed.*
- **Comment: Does the EIS assess both temporary and permanent construction impacts?**
- *Response: Yes. The range of possible short-term and long-term impacts will be identified along with mitigation measures in the draft EIS.*
- **Comment: Will there be any updates to the Purpose and Need?**
- *Response: The public, along with the SASG and other committees, are encouraged to review the draft Purpose and Need statement and provide input. After the scoping process, the Purpose and Need statement may be updated based on public and agency comments or other new information.*

Options Evaluation

Process:

- Heather Catron provided an overview of the evaluation step of the screening process.
- Steve Drahota provided project context (adjacent infrastructure and buildings) and reviewed the various options.
    - Elevations vary (97', 120', 64' existing, 100' below for tunnel).
    - Formal navigation study to occur in NEPA phase.
    - Tunnel depth determined by need to avoid impacts to the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) pipe while maintaining 5% max slope for streetcar.

Comment

- **Comment: Were other tunnel locations considered?**
- *Response: No, but other tunnel arrangements (twin tunnels versus a single double-decker; a shallower depth tunnel; and a wider tunnel with the bike/ped facility within it) were explored. The larger the diameter, the farther out it extended because of its depth. Cost factored into why the project team did not explore other tunnel alignment options further (the tunnel on Burnside St would be the shortest route).*

- **Comment: How do longer bridge options impact adjacent buildings more than the shorter bridge options?**
- *Response: The longer bridge options impact buildings more because as the streets reduce in width as one moves away from the Willamette River. In so doing, and since the bridges maintaining the same cross section from end to end, the 120' high options impacts the adjacent buildings much more than the shorter ones (they terminate before the street width reduces).*

Criteria:

- Heather Catron reviewed the guiding principles for the evaluation criteria.
- Jeff Heilman reviewed the Proposed Evaluation Criteria which are:
    - Criteria 1 – Seismic Resiliency
    - Criteria 2 – Non-motorized Transportation
    - Criteria 3 – Connectivity
    - Criteria 4 – Equity (low-income housing, social services)
    - Criteria 5 – Built Environment (visual, commercial, historic, and parks)
    - Criteria 6 – Financial Stewardship
- Steve Drahota described the preliminary costs graphic.
    - Enhanced seismic retrofit (without a widening) is the least expensive option, but it does not provide the same bike/ped functionality as all other options.
    - Similar costs for 97' and low movable options.
    - Costs are escalated to the construction dates.
    - Bridge aesthetics are considered in the cost.
    - Double wishbone option does not have a premium for a detour bridge.
    - All options (except the double wishbone) have costs for detouring all traffic away from the site during construction, and for maintaining traffic on the bridge during construction via a temporary movable bridge.
- Jeff Heilman discussed what a "reasonable range of alternatives" means for the environmental study.
- Jeff Heilman discussed trends and findings from applying the evaluation criteria.

Comment

- **Comment: Will traffic be kept on site during construction or detoured?**
- *Response: The decision for whether traffic will be detoured or maintained on site during construction will be assessed during NEPA.*
- **Comment: Issue of unreinforced masonry structures debris falling on Burnside Street remains even with shorter bridge options. Debris management would be greater with other options.**
- *Response: Yes; with the shorter bridge options the debris will fall on the street, but it will be much easier to clear from a street that can be accessed at every cross street than from a bridge or tunnel that can only be accessed from either end. Debris on the street can also be pushed onto a cross street to make way for emergency access whereas that option is not possible in a tunnel or on a bridge.*
- **Comment: Presentation is easy to follow, graphics help.**
- ***COMMITTEE ACTION*** SASG to share details with PG members prior to next meeting.

- **Comment: Be sure to consider how other planned regional projects might impact this project or be impacted by it.**
- **Comment: Were bridge maintenance and operating costs considered?**
- *Response: Maintenance costs were considered as a stand-alone criteria within the evaluation process. Bridge operation costs were found to be very low in comparison to the maintenance costs and, therefore, not considered in the evaluation process.*
- **Comment: Recommend adding a map legend to presentation slides or provide as handout.**
- *Response: Project team will create a legend to help understand icons on map.*
- **Comment: Health impacts are not assessed at this phase. Noted that PG members might be interested in when health impacts will be assessed.**
- *Response: A health impact assessment will be conducted during the NEPA phase. Some of the issues already included in the screening and evaluation to-date relate to some of the issues included in a health impact assessment.*
- **Comment: Since the Low Double Wishbone has no added costs for keeping the bridge open during construction, it might be worth further consideration because the evaluation process does not fully consider the costs and impacts of detouring traffic from Burnside St during construction.**
- *Response: While this option keeps traffic on-site during construction without the same premium cost as most other alternatives, its overall evaluation score is low because of the change to the street network on the west side (similar to the other multi-modal twin bridge options). As such, it has been discarded. During the NEPA phase, construction staging refinements will be explored to determine to what extent traffic can be maintained on the bridge during construction.*
- **Comment: Did you include escalation in the cost estimates?**
- *Response: Yes, a 3% annual escalation was assumed to the mid-point of construction in every cost estimates.*
- **Comment: Please look closer at Couch landing impacts for the Double wishbone option. The west leg of the option on Couch St. seems more excessive than it should be (i.e. why does it land further on than the Burnside St leg?)**
- ***PROJECT TEAM ACTION*** *Steve Drahota will verify the profile- done.*
- *Response: The west Couch St leg lands further than the Burnside St leg because clearance over 2nd Ave is being maintained. Maintaining this clearance resulted in a vertical profile higher than that for Burnside St and results in a longer bridge.*
- **Comment: Cost differential needs more weight and on-the-ground impacts to connectivity.**
- *Response: The Project team will consider this request.*
- **Comment: Consider accounting for some of the City planning efforts as they relate to regional transportation planning initiatives. For instance, the future east 7th Avenue bike/ped connection over I-84 and the planned Green Loop have implications for connectivity of a given option. Consider a follow up discussion with PBOT.**
- *Response: The Project team will consider this request.*
- **Comment: The westside s-curve on the Double Wishbone option crosses through a historic area, however one block further to the west would have less impacts on the historic area.**
- *Response: For consistency between all twin, multi-modal options (including the Double Wishbone), the design places an s-curve that ties into Burnside St. at the nearest*

intersection from their at-grade landing points. Design refinements will be made during the NEPA process to minimize such impacts.

Next Steps

Upcoming Meetings:

- Next Stakeholder Representative Group (SRG) meeting will be held April 16, 2018
- Next Policy Group meeting will be held April 26, 2018
- Public outreach the summer of 2018
- Final recommendations in fall of 2018
- NEPA future phases discussion
    - Possible committee(s) will continue through the NEPA phase.

Closing Comments

- Good job; thorough approach
- Share results of SRG with SASG members prior to PG
- FHWA noted that fewer rather than more options moving into the NEPA phase is preferred. Preferably three or less. Usually too many options advancing forward can cause more problems. Have good and clear documentation about which options move forward and which do not.
- Project is in position to trigger earthquake preparedness regional discussion

Action Items

- Items indicated with ***ACTION*** throughout this document.
- Committee to share this information with their organization and provide feedback about today's meeting in coming weeks to Megan Neill and Heather Catron. Also if standalone meetings requested.
- Committee to provide feedback on how to share with the public during upcoming events
- Steve Drahota will verify the Double Wishbone profile.