Type Selection Evaluation Criteria – UDAWG Version

1 Urban / Site Context and Experience

A. On-bridge Experience: How well does the bridge option provide public benefits from its deck surface throughout the extents of the bridge?

- Clear views from the bridge deck of:
  - 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 deck as an open space for public events (such as the Rose Festival Grand Floral Parade) and civic gatherings
- Create a gateway and enhanced sense of arrival to and from each side of the river
- (Note: Likely common to all options; Not expected to be differentiating) Intuitive ability to understand wayfinding, mode split, location of overlooks and connections without excessive clutter that detracts from the bridge design
- (Note: Likely common to all options; Not expected to be differentiating) Pedestrian and bicycle safety: sight lines, noise, vibration, lighting and physical separation of modes
- (Note: Likely common to all options; Not expected to be differentiating) Ability to provide river overlooks for users to stop and enjoy the adjacent scenery

B. Below-bridge Experience: How well does the bridge option respond to public spaces, transportation, and land uses within parks and natural environments under or adjacent to the bridge?

- Column locations that improve personal safety by providing adequate sightlines and clearances below the bridge
- Ability to further activate and enhance the under-bridge space within Waterfront Park for community events and other activities (e.g., Portland Saturday Market, Bridgetown Nightstrike, etc), including lighting, materials, and detailing

- Maximize the open space and vertical clearance to create an "urban roof" that enhances the under-bridge experience
- Preserve the integrity of park features such as the Japanese American Historical Plaza, Ankeny Plaza, Bill Naito Legacy Fountain, Better Naito Forever, Vera Katz Eastbank Esplanade, Burnside Skatepark, and Tom McCall Waterfront Park and its existing trees
- Ability to enhance the under-bridge space at Skidmore Fountain Max Station, including lighting, materials, and detailing
- Visually open connectivity with the river in the space beneath the bridge

C. Urban Context with Surroundings: How well does the bridge option's scale and form respond to the scale and character of surrounding neighborhoods, buildings, parks, and historic districts while being distinctive?

- Surroundings include the:
  - Old Town/Chinatown and Downtown neighborhoods, including the Skidmore / Old Town Historic District (75 ft. height limit) and the west bridgehead buildings and physical infrastructure shapes, scale, textures, and colors
  - Kerns and Buckman neighborhoods and Central Eastside Industrial District (250 ft. height limit), including the east bridgehead buildings and physical infrastructure shapes, scale, textures, and colors
  - Other bridges up-river and down-river

D. (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?

- This considers the:
  - Americans with Disabilities Act and Universal Design concepts
  - West bridge deck to Waterfront Park, Naito Parkway, SW/NW 1st and 2nd Avenues
  - East bridge deck to surrounding local streets and pedestrian open spaces, and the Vera Katz Eastbank Esplanade

2 Visual and Aesthetics of the Bridge

A. Bridge Visual Coherence: How well does the bridge option's composition create visual balance, unity, and flow from key viewpoints above, along, under, and away from the bridge?

- This includes viewpoints from the:
  - Willamette River
  - Waterfront Park
  - Eastbank Esplanade
  - I-5 / I-84 users
  - Bridgehead buildings
  - High-rise buildings
  - Surrounding bridges

B. Bridge Form and Style: How well does the bridge option acknowledge the historic surroundings while presenting a seismically-resilient, contemporary design aesthetic that sets the tone for future urban development and growth throughout its 100-year design life?

- This includes the bridge's ability to:
  - Balance the qualities of openness and transparency (i.e., minimizing the massing) while conveying a sense of seismic stability and reliability
  - Ensure overall design coherence of fixed and movable bridge spans; reflecting proportions and scale that feel balanced amongst the various structural elements
  - Reflect the distinctive setting of each side of the river, considering buildings, parks and infrastructure
  - Reflect best practices in technologies, materials, engineering, and architectural design that represent the era in which the bridge is designed and constructed, including potentials for exposing/expressing the movable bridge mechanisms
  - Honor Portland's moniker as a "City of Bridges" and the bridge's unique location at the center of the City quadrants
  - Provide opportunity for memorable, distinctive lighting for nighttime viewing while adhering to "dark skies" principles
  - Ensure the bridge pier's massing and scale is proportional to the river; minimizing its overall "touch" and impact in light of its location in the bend of the river
  - (Note: Likely common to all options; Not expected to be differentiating) Reflect Portland's transportation values in bicycle and pedestrian safety and accessibility

C. **Bridge Aspirations and Design Flexibility:** How well does the bridge option allow flexibility for engineering and architectural features in the Final Design phase, as well as adaptability of the bridge for future user needs?

- This includes the bridge's potential to:
  - Express Portland values and aspirations for inclusiveness, resiliency, accessibility, creative expression, vitality, and sustainability
  - Become an identifiable beacon of safety; a landmark and destination within the city during the day and after dark
  - Ability to convey a sense of being in the center of the city, at the intersection of north and south, east and west quadrants
  - Provide tactile, human-scale features with close proximity of pedestrian views and touch, including overlooks
  - Enable a wide range of complementary secondary design features that are cohesive with the overall bridge design (e.g., operator's house, multi-use path connections, Streetcar elements, overlooks, etc.)
  - Accommodate varied river uses and water-level changes
  - Minimize effects on natural resources such as wildlife, fisheries, and shoreline / shallow-water habitat
  - (Note: Likely common to all options; Not expected to be differentiating) Reduce noise impacts to bridge users generated by on-bridge and adjacent freeway traffic
  - (Note: Likely common to all options; Not expected to be differentiating) Implement sustainable and equitable design principles during the Final Design phase

3 Cost and Construction Impacts to Users

A. Total Project Cost: How well does the bridge option minimize the Project's total direct cost?

- This includes:
  - Construction costs, including the influence of constructability over and around existing transportation infrastructure, the Willamette River, adjacent 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

B. Long Term Costs: How well does the bridge option support post-construction needs while minimizing long-term costs?

- This includes reducing the:
  - Direct cost of bridge operations and inspections
  - Direct cost for routine maintenance and rehabilitation improvements (e.g., movable bridge repairs, deck wearing surface rehabilitation, re-painting, lighting maintenance, structural upgrades, etc)
  - Direct costs for 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 equipment, systems, and armatures onto the bridge; adding more bicycle/pedestrian space; adjusting for future lane uses; etc)

C. Construction Impacts: How well does the bridge option minimize impacts to the traveling public and surrounding property owners and tenants during construction?

- This includes, during construction, minimizing:
  - Detour durations for bridge users
  - Detour durations for bicyclists and pedestrians using Waterfront Park and the Vera Katz Eastbank Esplanade
  - Temporary property impacts
  - Utility service disruptions