



Multnomah County is creating an earthquake-ready downtown river crossing.

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

May 6, 2019

# Community Task Force Meeting #5

## Meeting information

**Project:** Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge

**Subject:** Community Task Force, Meeting #5

**Date:** Monday, May 06, 2019

**Time:** 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.

**Location:** University of Oregon, White Stag Building – 70 NW Couch Street, Portland; White Box Room

**Attendees:** **CTF Members:**

Cameron Hunt, Portland Spirit  
Ed Wortman, Community Member  
Gabe Rahe, Burnside Skate Park  
Howie Bierbaum, Portland Saturday Market  
Jacqueline (Jackie) Tate, Community Member  
Kathy Pape, Central City Concern  
Matt Hoffman, Disability Rights Oregon  
Paul Leitman, Oregon Walks  
Rina Eleanor Jimmerson, Central Eastside Industrial Council  
Robert McDonald, American Medical Response  
Stella Funk Butler, Gresham Neighborhood Coalition  
Susan Lindsay, Buckman Community Association  
Tesia Eisenberg, Mercy Corps  
Timothy Desper, Portland Rescue Mission

**Project Team Members:**

Megan Neill, MultCo  
Ian Cannon, MultCo  
Heather Catron, HDR  
Steve Drahota, HDR  
Cassie Davis, HDR  
Jeff Heilman, Parametrix  
Alice Sherring, Enviroissues  
Aascot Bohlander, Enviroissues

**Apologies:**

*Art Graves, Dan Lenzen, Frederick Cooper, Kiley Wilson, Marie Dodds, Nathaniel Brown, Sharon Wood, William Burgel.*





Multnomah County is creating an earthquake-ready downtown river crossing.

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

May 6, 2019

## Summary Notes

The following meeting materials are appended to this meeting summary; please refer to the materials for more details and images:

- Community Task Force (CTF) Meeting Packet
- Appendix to CTF Meetings #4 & #5 – Interests and Values

### INTRODUCTION AND HOUSEKEEPING

Alice Sherring, facilitator, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone. She explained this meeting would once again take the form of a work session, in small group discussions led by facilitators. Alice then briefly reviewed the agenda for the evening, relating topics to meeting packet contents. She introduced the small group discussion facilitators and their discussion topics. She encouraged the CTF to review what they had discussed in meetings #3 and #4 to ensure all items were understood and accurately recorded. Alice noted that the interests and values from these small group discussions will be used by the project team to inform the development of preliminary-draft evaluation criteria. The outcomes of this work will come back to the CTF in the next meet as draft criteria for CTF review.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

Alice acknowledged that no registrations had been received for public comment.

### PROJECT UPDATE

Alice invited Steve Drahotka, HDR, to provide the progress update.

Steve shared that he took part in two meetings the previous week. The first was with the transportation working group. He stated that they are focusing on traffic modelling and this group is trying to determine how to best model that various modes Burnside bridge carries and which data to use in the next phase of the project. They reached a consensus and will be moving forward.

Steve's second meeting was with the seismic resiliency working group. Their current question is, "What is the right earthquake to design for?" It's a complicated question, because no earthquake is the same. This group has also reached a path forward regarding how to approach the level of design needed for this phase.

Alice outlined that another additional update for the CTF members was that project team members were starting a more specific outreach process with immediate and potentially impacted property owners near the bridge. She wanted to flag that for the group as these conversations would involve

property owners and tenant, some of whom were CTF members. These conversations were important for the project team to understand individual needs.

Alice outlined that some CTF members will be reached out to individually as part of that process. She noted that those conversations around a CTF member's individual impacts could not be part of the broader CTF's conversation as this would create a conflict of interest. Instead, she outlined that those CTF members will be engaged in the same way as other property owners and impacted stakeholders to prevent a conflict of interest arising in CTF discussion. The need to manage individual conflicts will come up again and the group can declare perceived conflicts of interest or recuse themselves due to an actual conflict at that time.

Alice noted that the outcomes from this specific outreach will be formally reported to the CTF.

Alice also reminded the group to attend the upcoming open house showcasing PSU student designs for a new Burnside bridge. Megan Neill, Multnomah County, confirmed the CTF is welcome to promote the event online.

## **COMMUNITY TASK FORCE WORK SESSIONS (PART ONE AND TWO)**

### **ONGOING DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY-DRAFT EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Alice invited the group to carry on their conversations from their last meeting. She asked the group to consider the following during their discussion:

- Refer to the list of interests and values from the feasibility phase.
- See the orange box at the end of the table for previous values and interests that need clarification.
- What other interests and values should be added?

See appendix for discussion outcomes.

Each of the facilitators reported out key points of interest from their small group discussions:

- Cost: The most interesting aspect to many groups was right-of-way acquisition and relocation.
- Emergency Vehicles: Finding space for emergency vehicles, either using shoulder space or sharing lanes with buses or bicycles.



- Personal safety and non-transportation safety: Folks are concerned about the activation of space and ensuring it's designed to keep traffic moving so people are comfortable and not rushed.
- Motor vehicles and freight: Folks are concerned about detours and the potential diversion bridge. The thinking behind detours without a diversion. What do traffic patterns look like without the Burnside bridge or a diversion bridge?

Regarding alternatives, there's concern about cutting off cross-streets and affecting current traffic flows and public transit routes.



## NEXT STEPS

Jeff Heilman, Parametrix, thanked everyone for their hard work. The input from tonight and the previous meetings will be used to develop alternatives evaluation criteria and the measures for those criteria. The next step is for the project team to prepare a preliminary draft of evaluation criteria for presentation to the CTF. What the CTF will not determine at this time is ranking which criteria matter more. Some criteria are required standards, like river navigation clearance. At some point, the criteria will be compared for helpfulness for this phase of the project. It's not that any criterion is not important, it's that some criteria will be more important as a helpful data point to differentiate alternatives.



## ADJOURN

Alice confirmed that the group will reconvene on May 20 to review a preliminary-draft version of the evaluation criteria pulled together by the project team with the help of the CTF's input from tonight and previous meetings.

Megan thanked everyone for working through three meetings in rapid succession.