

Meeting Minutes

Project:	Multnomah County Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge	
Subject:	Senior Agency Staff Group Meeting #1	
Date:	Tuesday, April 04, 2017	
Location:	Multnomah County Office – 380 Conference Room 501 SE Hawthorne Avenue, Portland, OR 97214	
Attendees:	Ian Cannon, MultCo	Mike Bezner, Clackamas County
	Megan Neill, MultCo	Brian Monberg, City of Gresham
	Christian Gaston, MultCo	Jamie Snook, Metro
	Chris Fick, MultCo	Dave Unsworth, TriMet
	Kim Peoples, MultCo	Jeff Graham, FHWA
	Karyne Kieta, MultCo	Sam Hunaidi, ODOT
	Joanna Valencia, MultCo	Shelly Haack, PDC
	Chris Warner, City of Portland	Jeff Heilman, Parametrix
	Heather Catron, HDR	Steve Drahota, HDR
	Cassie Davis, HDR	Christina Tomaselli, HDR

Welcome and Introductions

Charter

- **Purpose:** input on Feasibility Study, identify agency interests, and provide informed feedback
- **Role:** attend four SASG meetings and act as liaison to Policy Group and agency

Project Overview

- **Purpose:** To create a seismically resilient river crossing for the Burnside lifeline route.
- **Goal:** To recommend rehabilitation and/or replacement alternatives for further NEPA-phase analysis.
- **Timing:** Feasibility study to be completed in fall 2018.
- **Funding:** Needed for future phases
- **Background:**
 - Downtown bridges are vulnerable to major earthquakes.
 - Board of County Commissioners adopted the Bridge Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) in 2015.
 - CIP identified the Burnside Bridge as its number one priority for seismic resiliency.

Comment

- The project team will also meet with UPRR.
- Suggest adding Carmen Merlo (PBEM) to this SASG committee (and/or Seismic Resiliency Committee).
- Seismic Resiliency Committee (SRC) is supporting the development of technical criteria.
- There will be some crossover between the SRC criteria and the screening criteria.
- Will be considering constructability options later in this process.

Seismic Animation

- The group watched an animation of how the bridge would behave during a major earthquake. The group discussed initial impressions and thoughts of the animation.

Comment

- Helpful to understand North-South connection.
- ODOT has prioritized seismic resiliency for I-205 over I-5.
- Multnomah County Capital Improvement Plan included work on some of the other structures.
- Think about regional resiliency; it's a large issue. This project is what we can do to help address this issue. (There are many impacts to the regional area that are not addressed with the project.)

Agency Interests

- What are your agency interests in the project?

Comment

- Light rail maintenance protection (1st Ave is critical area).
- Wrapping columns.
- Frequent service routes on the bridge and potential reroutes (buses).
- Lifeline for buses.
- Portland Development Commission invested millions in redevelopment.
- Preserve redevelopment investment and economic development.
- Better position for economic development of import/exports.
- Life safety issues (users and businesses).
- Transportation system continuity/mobility (ongoing/all modes).
- Regional connectivity.
- Importance of safety and rescue.
- Regional transport plan feedback included safety.
- Freight mobility and connectivity to local streets and back into the system (local to state).
- Good to have a bridge available for connectivity.
- Duration when river traffic is unavailable (hard to believe river traffic soon after seismic event).
- FHWA interested in the feasibility study process; doesn't want to eliminate options too early.
- River navigation, railroad, system operations.

Comment

- Burnside doesn't have highways that would fall onto it like others in CIP.
- Federal mandate to not restrict river traffic. Duration window after an event to reestablish route will impact cost.
- Is the Seismic Resiliency Committee considering and vetting with other agencies the criteria costing options? Would be good to see more information.
- Avoiding cost options in technical criteria assessment. Following ODOT criteria for Cascadia subduction zone event. Can provide additional information.
- Does this include river traffic?
- Currently considering a 2 week window in which the moveable span needs to operate after the event.
- Moveable spans fully operational option
- Entire Willamette River may move up after event.

Development

- Multi-step process
 - Pass/Fail
 - Screening
 - Alternatives Evaluation
 - NEPA Documentation
- Problem Statement
 - Core drivers and intent of project
 - Screening criteria based on the problem statement
 - **ACTION** SASG to review over next couple weeks and let project team know any additional feedback.
- Alternative Development Options
 - What groupings create an earthquake-ready crossing?
 - Preserve
 - Seismic retrofit
 - Replacement
 - Hybrid (retrofit/replace combo)
 - Enhance another bridge
 - What alternatives are being considered within each grouping?
 - How are we approaching alternative development and options?
 - Are we missing any alternatives?
 - **ACTION** SASG to review over next couple weeks and let project team know any additional feedback.
 - **ACTION** HDR to provide updated Concepts List (completed).
- Technical Pass/Fail Criteria
 - Example (#3 on Page 31 of Presentation): If option impacts City of Portland Combined Sewer Overflow, it is not feasible.

Comment

- If Burnside Bridge is lifeline route, is #5 (City of Portland – OR99E: MLK & Grand) consistent with this premise?
- TriMet is currently considering options for Steel Bridge TriMet seismic resiliency route.
- Fixed span vertical clearance requirement currently under consideration.
- Vertical clearance over freeways will be considered.
- Preserve options (without major retrofit) are on the table to help capture all possible options.
- Permanent solution (vs. temporary short-term impacts to facilities) assumed.
- Impacting Saturday Market isn't pass/fail, it will be considered in the evaluation criteria.

Screening Process

- Screening Criteria:
 - Reflects the project intent
 - Organized in five areas:
 1. Seismic resiliency
 2. Emergency response
 3. Multi-modal (post-earthquake)
 4. Plan consistency
 5. Long-term function (independent of earthquake)
 - **ACTION** SASG to review over next couple weeks and complete feedback form.

Comment

- Light rail excluded from Pass/Fail (#3) since it wasn't on bridge deck.
- Are emergency plans (#4) very specific?
- Are we looking at other available plans broader than emergency response plans?
- We are looking at other available plans which are broader than emergency response plans at later phases.
- Cost is not evaluated in the early screening.
- Environmental and social considerations will be considered in the evaluation criteria.
- Would like to try to keep cost and screening process separate during early screening.
- Number of options will not fall off the alternatives list at this phase.

Next Steps/Action Items

- Items indicated with **ACTION** throughout this document.
- Share feedback with your organizations and provide to Heather Catron (Heather.Catron@hdrinc.com) in next 2 weeks.
- If you need additional information or follow up meetings please let us know.