



## Stakeholder Representative Group Meeting #4

### Meeting Summary

April 16, 2018  
6:00–8:30 p.m.  
Mercy Corps  
45 SW Ankeny St., Portland

---

#### SRG Members Present

Jana Jarvis, *Oregon Trucking Association*  
Marie Dodds, *AAA Oregon*  
Arthur Graves, *Multnomah County Bike/Ped Advisory Committee*  
Dan Lenzen, *Old Town/Chinatown Community Association*  
Dan Yates, *Portland Spirit and Central Eastside Industrial Council*  
Gabe Rahe, *Burnside Skatepark*  
Kathy Pape, *Central City Concern*  
Chris Dorin, *Neighborhood Emergency Teams*

Ed Wortman, *Author of Bridge Stories*  
Sharon Wood Wortman, *Author of Bridge Stories*  
Mark Ginsberg, *The Street Trust*  
Howie Bierbaum, *Portland Saturday Market*  
Nathaniel Brown, *Portland Business Alliance*  
Susan Lindsay, *Buckman Community Association*  
Josh Mehrer, *Univ. of Oregon architecture student*

#### SRG Members Absent

Travis Williams, *Willamette Riverkeeper*

#### Staff and Consultants

Ian Cannon, *Multnomah County*  
Megan Neill, *Multnomah County*  
Mike Pullen, *Multnomah County*  
Chris Fick, *Multnomah County*  
Emily Miletich, *Multnomah County*  
Jamie Waltz, *Multnomah County*  
Heather Catron, *HDR*

Steve Drahota, *HDR*  
Cassie Davis, *HDR*  
Jeff Heilman, *Parametrix*  
Josh Ahmann, *Parametrix*  
Jessica Pickul, *JLA Public Involvement*  
Irene Kim, *JLA Public Involvement*

#### Members of the Public

Alice Busch  
Alicia Hines

Rob Fullmar, *City Club Earthquake Resiliency*  
Kelly Kenoyer, *Portland Mercury*

## Welcome and Introductions

Alex Cousins, Enviroissues, welcomed the committee and provided an overview of the meeting agenda. He thanked the committee for participating in the project for the past 18 months. Alex reminded attendants that public comments and questions during the presentation will be reserved for the end of the meeting, and asked members of the public if there were any questions before moving on. No members of the public had questions. Alex then led group introductions.

## Project Update

Heather Catron, HDR, provided an update on recent public outreach activities. She summarized the online briefing launched in March which provided an update on the project. The online briefing was developed through a platform called StoryMaps, and promoted through social media after launch. The online briefing has had almost 2,000 viewers. At the end, there was a brief survey asking the public what should be considered during the evaluation and if there is anything that the project team should know moving forward.

The major themes from the comments were bike and pedestrian access and connections, seismic resiliency and usability immediately after an earthquake, emergency management, bridge design, transit considerations, impacts to the homeless community and project cost. Participants also expressed an interest in the schedule and the overall expediency of the project itself. The project team will be providing another online project update as well as in person events this summer.

## Project Milestones

Heather Catron recapped the project schedule and walked through next steps. There are still many opportunities for feedback in the Feasibility Study phase of the project. The final round of committee meetings are being held in April, two public open house events and an online event will be held this summer along with several stakeholder briefings, and a presentation will be made to the County Board in early fall. The goal is to utilize the work done during the Feasibility Study as part of an Environmental Review process. To formally start the scoping and outreach process for Environmental Review, a Notice of Intent must be issued. Finally, the range of alternatives and the purpose and need will need to be approved by the Federal Highway Administration.

Jeff Heilman, Parametrix, highlighted what could be evaluated in a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review process. Public outreach will be included with every step in the next phase of evaluation. Scoping is the first step in a NEPA review. It involves soliciting input from the public and other stakeholders on the potential alternatives and issues to be considered in an environmental impact statement, on the purpose and need statement for the project, and other information to help determine the scope of the environmental document and process. The Purpose and Need Statement is the baseline for comparing alternatives in NEPA. Any

alternative that cannot adequately meet the Purpose and Need is deemed not reasonable and will not move forward in the process.

The next step after scoping is to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which involves collecting information on existing conditions, impacts, potential mitigation, and tradeoffs among the alternatives. The Draft EIS may also identify a preferred alternative and will be presented to the public for feedback during a formal comment period. The Final EIS will integrate public comments and will refine the Draft EIS as part of advancing the analysis and responding to public input. The final step in the NEPA process will be a Record of Decision (ROD), which is where the lead agencies document their formal decision on which alternative to carry forward for permitting, design and construction, as well as identify mitigation commitments and make findings regarding other regulatory compliance. Following the ROD would be a process to select a specific bridge type, conduct final design, permitting and construction.

- **Question: Does the project team have any concerns about litigation post-FEIS?**  
*That remains to be seen. NEPA decisions are typically not ripe for challenge until the ROD is signed. The default claims period is typically 6 years but FHWA has the ability to limit it to 150 days.*

## Options Evaluation

Heather recapped the screening process and the remaining options, which include:

- Replacement:
  - Low, moveable bridge
  - 97 feet high, fixed bridge
  - 120 feet high, fixed bridge
  - Tunnel
- Enhanced Seismic Retrofit:
  - Unwidened
  - Widened

Steve provided a recap of the Enhanced Seismic Retrofit and Replacement options that were evaluated. During the meeting, options were presented using a GIS tool that illustrated where they would land on either side of the river. Committee questions and comments included:

- **Question: Is there commitment from County that if the tunnel option is selected, there will be facilities for bikes and pedestrians?** *Yes, a separated bike / pedestrian bridge will be constructed outside of the tunnel if the tunnel option moves forward.*
- **Question: Have you looked at the tunnel option from a navigational channel perspective?** *TriMet dropped the height of the channel for the Tilikum Bridge at 78 feet. If the bridge height drops to 78 feet, you can create the same bridge landing as it is today. The marine community could probably support 78 feet or similar. The tunnel option was placed at a depth below the CSO "big pipes," unrelated to a navigational channel clearance. Further, the Project has not performed a navigational study to see exactly where the bridge will land at this point. That study will come in the*

*next phase. To bound the solutions, costs, and impacts of a variable navigational clearance, the project has developed and evaluated options for bridges with a 97' clearance and a 120' high clearance.*

Heather provided an overview of the screening criteria and the initial results (provided with a meeting material). The options are scored by high, medium and low, with a scale of 0 to 100.

Jeff summarized how the evaluation criteria were applied to the remaining options. The evaluation included 26 options that were evaluated against 17 measures, which fall within the six overarching criteria categories. The evaluation resulted in nine options that rose to the top. Those options include enhanced retrofit (widening and no widening options) and several replacement options (existing alignment low movable bridge, existing alignment high fixed bridge, two wishbone options, two mode separated options and a stacked option).

Jeff summarized what has been eliminated based on the evaluation results:

- Eight of the lowest scoring options were eliminated, which included the tunnel option and the 120 foot high bridge options.
- The highest score among those options was 32%, less than half of the best scoring options.
- The twin multimodal options were eliminated because they would impact existing buildings and the Old Town/ Chinatown Historic district, resulting in displacements and other impacts.
- The double wishbone option was eliminated due to similar issues. It is also not likely to be permissible due to large impacts to parks and historic districts.
- The 97 foot wishbone options were eliminated because the function that can be achieved with those options can be achieved with the low wishbone options with considerably less impact and cost.
- Of the four mode-separated options (options with a separate bike/ped bridge) that remained after the above options were removed, the low movable mode-separated options would provide greater convenience and safety for cyclists and pedestrians with less impact. The 97 foot high mode-separated would require a five-story bike and pedestrian spiral ramp on one or both ends of the bridge (requiring considerably more climbing and resulting in a more than half block square footprint, whereas the low mode-separated option could have a standard ramp structure requiring less climbing and lower impact.
- **Question: Do the wishbone options take into account the East Burnside/Couch couplet versus the proposed East Burnside/Ankeny couplet? The businesses around the East Burnside/Couch couplet do not like this couplet because it created an island that is hard for pedestrians to access due to heavy vehicle traffic. The Ankeny couplet option would add more car traffic to Ankeny St, which is a historic bike route or greenway, whereas the north Couch couplet would use the existing street network and be less disruptive. *Yes that is a notable difference.***

*The scoping process may indicate that there is little support for some of these options and insufficient support or reason to carry them into the environmental impact statement.*

Jeff provided an overview of how the options were evaluated against the screening criteria (seismic resiliency, non-motorized transportation, connectivity, equity, built environment, and financial stewardship) and the trends that resulted.

Seismic resiliency criteria were measured by the risk that evacuation and emergency response will be blocked by debris from unreinforced masonry (URM) buildings and vehicle crashes. Low replacement and enhanced retrofit options scored high. The 97 foot, 120 foot and twin bridge options scored poorly because they are the longest, and twin bridges are exposed to the most URM risk. The tunnel option scored poorly because of the high risk of vehicle crashes and only two access points for emergency vehicles at either end of a two-mile tunnel.

Non-motorized transportation performance was measured by the length and height of the grade, connectivity to both the existing and planned bike network, and personal security. The low bridges, enhanced retrofits, and mode-separated options scored the highest. The 97 and 120 foot bridges scored the lowest due to the longer length required for a higher bridge, and because the landings generally don't connect as well with the bike network.

Transportation connectivity criteria were measured by the number of streets that would be closed and bypassed, grade length and height, and non-traditional intersections and curves. The low existing and enhanced retrofit options performed the best, and the 97 foot, 120 foot, tunnel, twins, and the southeast wishbone options performed the poorest. This is because these options bypass and close more streets and the longer grades affect vehicle safety. The tunnel bypasses and closes the most streets.

- **Question: Did you look at doing a tunnel at 40 feet down instead of 100 feet? CSO tunnels do not extend as far out as this option. If the tunnel is less deep at a six percent incline, the tunnel could be shorter.** *The tunnel was placed at a depth that avoids impacting the channel and the CSO "big pipes." Further, it has a double-decker cross-section that carries vehicular traffic in both directions and the future streetcar. Given these parameters, it cannot be placed at a depth of 40' and the current depth is a reasonable representation of the conceptual design solution. Last, the profile grade criteria for the streetcar is a five percent grade. This grade sets the portal locations.*
- **Question: If we are considering streetcar with each option, then it seems like cost is not a consideration. If a tunnel is built, there is less impact from construction, such as shutting down businesses and closing Burnside. How do we do this with the least amount of impact to downtown Portland? Why are we considering a huge and costly tunnel and not considering other tunnel options, such as a tunnel along the riverbed?** *Streetcar is included in all crossing options, and cost is one of the evaluation criteria categories. A detailed evaluation of construction impacts will be assessed during the NEPA phase. The current tunnel option is a reasonable representation of all tunnel options with respect to cost and right of way impacts. A tunnel along the riverbed would be difficult to permit.*

- **Question: Part of the discussion should be focused on recovery efforts. Trucks and construction equipment, such as fuel, are prohibited from traveling through a tunnel without the declaration of a “state of emergency.” A tunnel will be very limiting if emergency resources are trying to connect to either side of the river through a tunnel in the aftermath of a seismic event.** *This is true. With the Burnside crossing anticipated to be the only Willamette River crossing available after the earthquake, it will be extremely difficult to simultaneously enable emergency responders, emergency equipment, and the general public to pass through a tunnel.*

Equity criteria measured existing low income housing displacements, a loss of potential future low income housing, and impacts to social service providers. Low bridge and enhanced retrofit options scored the highest. The 120 foot high bridge and tunnel options scored the lowest. Most 120 foot bridges would displace the Broadway Hotel, which has 105 low income (single room occupancy) units. The tunnel portals have the highest displacements of potential future low-income housing primarily because they have the highest total displacements (at the portals). The 120 foot bridge options performed the poorest for social services because they displace an existing overnight shelter and diminish access to existing social services.

Built environment criteria measured visual and access impacts, displacement of businesses, and historic district impacts. The 120 foot options, and to a lesser extent the 97 foot options, generally performed poorly because the length of the bridge would disrupt the fabric of the existing business districts. The twin bridge options performed poorly because they would add a new bridge on historic district streets and might not be permissible. The tunnel option performed poorly because the portals caused the highest commercial displacements, displacing more than 1,400 employees. Built environment criteria also measured impacts to the total area of park land and the impacts to circulation and access within a park. The low bridge and enhanced retrofit performed the best. The 120 foot bridges performed poorly because they block access to the park blocks. The 97 and 120 foot mode-separated options also performed poorly because the separate bike and pedestrian bridge would require a five to seven story high spiral ramp (over ½ block in footprint) in Waterfront Park.

Financial Stewardship criteria measured estimated capital and maintenance costs. The low bridges, enhanced retrofit, 97-foot-high fixed, and wishbone alignments scored the best. The tunnel, 120 foot options, and twin bridges scored the worst. The amount of construction, materials and footprint required to build these options are much higher than the other options.

- **Question: Why do the enhanced retrofits score well (referring to PPT) if the scoring chart shows that they received low scores?** *The following is a corrected response (6/7/2018): Enhanced retrofits are not one of the top performers in Financial Stewardship. Enhanced retrofits rate high for capital cost and low for long term maintenance, as the chart shows, giving them an average score.*

Steve provided an overview of the cost analysis for all the bridge options. Overall, the more bridge that needs to get constructed, the more expensive it will be to maintain over a 100-year period. Two assumptions were made to determine estimated cost for each option. The first

assumption considers detouring traffic away from the site during construction. The second assumption considers building a temporary bridge facility during construction to allow vehicles to cross the river at Burnside. The lowest cost option is the non-widened enhanced retrofit. The low moveable and 97 foot bridge options generally have the second lowest cost range. The cost analysis found that some replacement bridge options are cheaper than the widened enhanced retrofit option. The third lowest cost option range includes the twin alignment and double wishbone. The fourth lowest range is the 120 foot bridge options, and the tunnel options are the most expensive.

- **Question: A tunnel built over the riverbed could be shorter and have fewer impacts. However, if a tunnel doesn't allow for large trucks, fuel and vehicles to pass through during an emergency situation, the tunnel shouldn't be considered.** *The tunnel option has design conditions that do not permit a reduced length and depth. As such, shorter tunnel options are not feasible. It is true that simultaneous usages of a tunnel for large trucks, fuel, and vehicles will be very challenging.*

Alex asked the stakeholders if there were any questions for the project team.

- **Question: Sellwood Bridge had a shoefly option. Is that feasible for this project?** *A temporary shoefly alignment and bridge, which would maintain traffic at the site during construction, is being considered. At the Sellwood Bridge, the shoefly used the existing fixed bridge truss. With the movable spans on the Burnside Bridge, it is not feasible to use the same approach. Instead, the anticipated alternative would be to build a temporary movable bridge during construction as the shoefly.*
- **Question: What is the idea behind the East Burnside/Ankeny couplet? It seems counterintuitive to the goals of the Burnside/Couch couplet (decided on in 2010), which were to keep cars away from Ankeny Street and keep it bike-friendly. Was there any coordination with PBOT about this idea? It seems like there is a disconnect between the City and County on this option.** *This option scores relatively high because it provides a link to the Ankeny Street bicycle network. Additionally, the cost is not much more than the other options, even though it scores lower overall compared to the other high-scoring options. Follow up comment: The East Burnside/Couch couplet seems to make more sense because it is tying into the existing couplet traffic flow without any sharp curves.*
- **Question: Do we have traffic flows for each of the options? From an efficiency standpoint, it seems like the traffic flows for the couplet options would be problematic.** *We do not have traffic flow analysis for these alternatives at this time (these will be developed as part of the NEPA phase). We agree that traffic flow would not be as efficient.*
- **Question: What is the major benefit of the fixed bridges?** *It can be less expensive to maintain and it does not have to lift for marine traffic, avoiding any disruption to traffic flow on the bridge.*
- **Question: In terms of cost, how much weight was given to the necessity of having Burnside open during construction? Is it absolutely determined that Burnside has**

**to be open during construction?** *There has been no decision made on whether Burnside Street should be closed or open to traffic during construction. That decision will happen during the NEPA phase, but we want to present the options for further analysis.*

- **Comment: The mode-separated option could be a great opportunity for bikes and pedestrians, but it is important that this option is beneficial for every user. If the focus is resiliency, a separate bike/pedestrian facility might not be necessary because bikes and pedestrians will be able to get across anyway with a resilient bridge. A separate bridge for bikes and pedestrians might not be a huge priority for the City as a whole, unless it is something we can reasonably afford.**
- **Question: How many tunnel plans did you look at?** *Three, which included the current options with a separated bike/ pedestrian bridge, one with all traffic modes within the tunnel, and one with dual tunnels instead of a double-decker cross section. The current option has the least impacts and costs of the three.*

## Public Comment

Alex asked the audience if they had any comments or questions. The following summarizes those thoughts.

- **Question: With the “East Burnside/Couch Couplet Wishbone” option, have you considered having only bikes/pedestrians on Ankeny? It could be a way to keep the bicycle path usable without being an entirely separate bridge.** *No, we have not considered that, but it is an interesting idea. The City of Portland is the roadway authority and they would have to approve this change to the street network.*
- **Question: What are the cost impacts of the in-kind moveable bridge versus the 97 foot fixed bridge?** *The cost is about the same because moveable spans are expensive, especially including maintenance over time. There are indirect impacts associated with a longer bridge apart from direct cost, such as impacts to the built environment. Indirect impacts are not calculated into the cost, but are considered in the scoring criteria.*
- **Question: Does the existing mechanism for the lift span need to be replaced with the enhanced retrofit option?** *Yes, the movable bridge portions would need to be replaced as part of the enhanced retrofit option. The bridge will not look like what it does today because of how much of it would need to be retrofitted.*
- **Question: What if an earthquake happens while the lift is open and the lift is compromised? It seems like we should not even consider this option.** *As part of the conceptual design and cost analysis, the criteria accounts for seismic resiliency while the lift is open so that the bridge does not collapse during a major seismic event.*



## Closing Remarks

Alex summarized the next steps in the process and reminded stakeholders that there will be a need for committee members in the next phase of the project. Committee members added some final thoughts and questions before the meeting concluded:

- **Question: Is there any way to illustrate what these options might look like? Also, add street names to the graphics.** *As the project advances, graphical representations for some of the options will be developed. Street names and call-outs will be added.*
- **Question: There is a lack of minority representation in this committee. Can this be a priority for the next stakeholder group in the next phase?** *Yes. We've reached out to multiple groups and were not able to secure the minority representation we'd hoped for in this phase. This is a heightened priority moving forward.*
- **Question: Does the team believe that it is likely that properties will be affected with the new bridge? Should we notify property owners of any possible impacts?** *It is too early to say anything conclusive about where the footprint of the project is going to be. However, we are happy to hear from the public about any concerns.*
- **Comment: Please continue to engage with the marine community early and often as you have been doing as opposed to the process during the Tilikum Bridge project.** *This will occur in the future, especially as the navigation study commences.*
- **Comment: Be aware of the budget and how it is communicated to the public, especially if costs are expected to increase significantly.** *Agreed.*

Ian Cannon, Multnomah County, thanked the members for their involvement in the committee and valuable input.