



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

Community Task Force – Agenda Meeting #20

Project:	Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge
Subject:	Community Task Force Meeting #20
Date:	November 23, 2020
Time:	<i>Early Arrivals: 5:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.</i> Meeting Timing: 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Location:	WebEx Virtual Meeting

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Amy Rathfelder, Portland Business Alliance
 Art Graves, Multnomah County Bike and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee
 Dennis Corwin, Portland Spirit
 Ed Wortman, Community Member
 Frederick Cooper, Laurelhurst Neighborhood Emergency Team and Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association
 Gabe Rahe, Burnside Skate Park
 Howie Bierbaum, Portland Saturday Market
 Jackie Tate, Community Member
 Jane Gordon, University of Oregon
 Jennifer Stein, Central City Concern
 Marie Dodds, AAA of Oregon
 Neil Jensen, Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce
 Paul Leitman, Oregon Walks
 Peter Englander, Old Town Community Association
 Peter Finley Fry, Central Eastside Industrial Council
 Sharon Wood Wortman, Community Member

Stella Funk Butler, Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations
 Susan Lindsay, Buckman Community Association
 Tesia Eisenberg, Mercy Corps
 Timothy Desper, Portland Rescue Mission
 William Burgel, Portland Freight Advisory Committee

PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS

Megan Neill, Multnomah County
 Mike Pullen, Multnomah County
 Heather Catron, HDR
 Cassie Davis, HDR
 Steve Drahota, HDR
 Liz Stoppelmann, HDR
 Jeff Heilman, Parametrix
 Allison Brown, JLA
 Sarah Omlor, EnviroIssues

Meeting Purpose:

- Provide a project update on recent and upcoming working group meetings
- Review menu of bridge types
- Preview activities and materials for developing evaluation criteria and preparing for next meeting



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

BETTER – SAFER – CONNECTED

November 23, 2020

Agenda:

Time	Session	Lead
5:30 p.m.	<i>Early Arrivals</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WebEx meeting platform will be available for folks that want to join early and test computer functions before meeting start 	<i>Project Team</i>
6:00 p.m.	Welcome, Introductions and Housekeeping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting protocols Round table introductions 	Allison Brown
6:05 p.m.	Public Comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledge any public comments received 	Allison Brown
6:15 p.m.	Project Update – Working Groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban Design & Aesthetics 	Guest Presenter: Paddy Tillett
6:30 p.m.	Menu of Bridge Types Review	Steve Drahota
7:30 p.m.	Evaluation Criteria Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preview for next meeting 	Jeff Heilman
7:45 p.m.	Next Steps	Allison Brown
7:50 p.m.	Open Discussion	Allison Brown
8:00 p.m.	Adjourn	All

The purpose of the CTF is to serve as an advisory body to Multnomah County by:

- Considering the potential environmental impacts of the alternatives
- Providing informed insights and opinions on the impacts being evaluated
- Discussing technical recommendations, suggesting measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential impacts
- Representing the interests, needs and opinions of community, business organizations and groups
- Considering input and information from other community members, stakeholders and interested parties.

CTF members approached by interest groups other than their own constituencies are encouraged to share these conversations at CTF meetings. For information contact Mike Pullen, County Communications Office at mike.j.pullen@multco.us



Type Selection Evaluation Criteria Assessment Sheet

Status Date: November 15, 2020

Group	Criteria	Anticipated Level of Differentiation between Bridge Options						Notes
		Unknown	None or Very Small	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large	
Group 1: Seismic Resiliency	1a.1: Maximize confidence in post-earthquake crossing operability and reparability.		X					Same performance mechanisms
	1a.2: Maximize ability for all modes to use the crossing post-earthquake.		X					Same roadway cross section
	1a.3 Minimize risk that adjacent buildings could damage or block the bridge after a major earthquake, and minimize risk that crossing construction could lessen the seismic resiliency of adjacent buildings.		X					Same proximity to vulnerable buildings
	1b.1: Minimize delay in achieving a seismically resilient crossing.	X						Const duration differences TBD
Group 2: Community Quality of Life (includes Indirect Land Use Impacts and Community Resources)	2a.1: Minimize long-term noise and light/shadow impacts.			X				Slight bridge width change for structural members
	2a.2: Minimize long-term impacts to community facilities and events under and near the bridge (e.g., Skatepark, Saturday Market, park festivals, parades, organized runs, etc.).					X		Westside solution provides variability
	2b.1: Minimize temporary impacts to community facilities and events under and near the bridge.	X						Const duration differences TBD
Group 3: Equity and Environmental Justice (includes Social Services)	3a.1: Minimize displacements of emergency beds.		X					Same permanent impacts
	3a.2: Maintain social service providers' long-term ability to provide current level of service and potential for enhancement.		X					Same permanent impacts
	3a.3: Avoid disproportionate adverse impacts to vulnerable and Environmental Justice communities.		X					Same permanent impacts
	3b.1: Minimize temporary impacts to social service providers.		X					Same temporary impacts
	3b.2: Avoid temporary disproportionate adverse impacts to vulnerable and Environmental Justice communities.		X					Same temporary impacts
	3b.3: Ensure that design and construction approach allow ample opportunities for DBE firms to be involved in the construction/contracting process.	X						Final Design Issue
Group 4: Crime Reduction & Personal Safety	4a.1: Maximize personal safety and crime reduction by following principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).				X			Westside solution provides variability



Type Selection Evaluation Criteria Assessment Sheet

Status Date: November 15, 2020

Group	Criteria	Anticipated Level of Differentiation between Bridge Options						Notes
		Unknown	None or Very Small	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large	
Group 5: Business and Economics	5a.1: Minimize business displacements and permanent access impacts.				X			Eastside & westside solutions provides variability
	5a.2: Support redevelopment potential consistent with local plans.		X					Same impacts
	5b.1: Minimize temporary access impacts to businesses.		X					Same impacts
	5b.2: Minimize temporary regional economic impacts.		X					Same impacts
	5b.3: Minimize loss of economic benefits (includes businesses and charities) from temporary impacts to major community events under and near the bridge.		X					Same impacts
Group 6: Park and Recreation Resources	6a.1: Minimize park displacements and adverse functionality impacts, (include impacts to river recreation).						X	Westside & in-river solutions provides variability
	6b.1: Minimize temporary impacts to parks.			X				Small variations for westside construction method
Group 7: Historic Resources	7a.1: Minimize historic resource impacts.					X		Westside solution provides variability
	7b.1: Minimize temporary impacts to historic resources.		X					Same impacts
Group 8: Visual and Aesthetics	8a.1: Minimize adverse impacts to existing views and view corridors.						X	Total Composition provides variability
	8a.2: Maximize aesthetic experience for all users approaching, on, and under the bridge.						X	Total Composition provides variability
	8a.3: Create opportunity for a crossing that provides an iconic/demonstrative visual experience.						X	Total Composition provides variability



Type Selection Evaluation Criteria Assessment Sheet

Status Date: November 15, 2020

Group	Criteria	Anticipated Level of Differentiation between Bridge Options					Notes	
		Unknown	None or Very Small	Small	Moderate	Large		Very Large
Group 9: Natural Resources, Climate Change and Sustainability	9a.1: Minimize impacts to water quality and flooding.				X			Size of in-water piers affect hydraulics and dredging
	9a.2: Minimize impacts to fish and wildlife.			X				Size of in-water piers affecting hydraulic flow
	9b.1: Minimize temporary impacts to water quality and flooding.			X				Construction method impacts in-water work qtys
	9b.2: Minimize temporary impacts to air quality and green-house gas emissions.	X						Final Design Issue
	9b.3: Minimize temporary impacts to fish and wildlife.			X				Construction method impacts in-water work qtys
	9b.4: Minimize resource consumption and waste production during construction.	X						Final Design Issue
Group 10: Pedestrians, Bicyclists and People with Disabilities (ADA – Americans with Disabilities Act)	10a.1: Maximize City’s Vision Zero principles for safety and comfort for bicyclists, pedestrians, and other low-impact vehicles (e.g., scooters, skateboards).		X					Same permanent cross section, slopes, and protections
	10a.2: Maximize access/connectivity for bicyclists and other low-impact vehicles.		X					Same permanent access and connectivity
	10a.3: Maximize access/connectivity for pedestrians and ADA.		X					Same permanent access and connectivity
	10b.1: Minimize temporary travel time and access/connectivity impacts to bicyclists.		X					Same temp access / connectivity; Const duration differences TBD
	10b.2: Minimize temporary travel time and access/connectivity impacts to pedestrians.		X					Same temp access / connectivity; Const duration differences TBD
	10b.3: Maximize City’s Vision Zero principles for safety and comfort for bicyclists, pedestrians, and other low-impact vehicles (e.g., scooters, skateboards).		X					Same temporary features



Type Selection Evaluation Criteria Assessment Sheet

Status Date: November 15, 2020

Group	Criteria	Anticipated Level of Differentiation between Bridge Options						Notes
		Unknown	None or Very Small	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large	
Group 11: Motor Vehicles, Freight and Emergency Vehicles	11a.1: Maximize safety for motor vehicles and freight.		X					Same permanent cross section, slopes, and protections
	11a.2: Maximize emergency service operations and responsiveness.		X					Same permanent emergency service operation impacts
	11b.1: Minimize temporary access and travel time impacts to, freight and emergency vehicles.		X					Same detours and re-routing; Const duration differences TBD
	11b.2: Minimize temporary safety, impacts to motor vehicles, freight, and emergency vehicles.		X					Same detours and re-routing
	11b.3: Minimize temporary access and travel time impacts to motor vehicles.		X					Same detours an rerouting; Const duration differences TBD
Group 12: Transit	12a.1: Maximize streetcar readiness.			X				Minor differences for Streetcar amenities
	12a.2: Maximize bus accessibility.		X					Same detours and re-routing
	12a.3: Minimize transit collision vulnerability.		X					Same transit collision vulnerability
	12b.1: Minimize temporary impacts on transit access, safety, travel times and ridership.		X					Same detours and re-routing; Const duration differences TBD
Group 13: Fiscal Responsibility	13a.1: Minimize total project cost.					X		Differing Project costs
	13a.2: Minimize long-term maintenance needs/cost.					X		Differing Maintenance and Inspection costs