



City of Portland, Oregon
Bureau of Development Services
Land Use Services
FROM CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTION

Chloe Eudaly, Commissioner
Rebecca Esau, Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
Fax: (503) 823-5630
TTY: (503) 823-6868
www.portlandoregon.gov/bds

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 11, 2018
To: Portland Historic Landmarks Commission
From: Arthur Graves, Land Use Services | 503-823-7803
Re: Burnside Bridge: Earthquake Readiness
June 25, 2018 – Briefing by Mike Pullen (Multnomah County), Megan Neill (Multnomah County), Jeff Heilman (Parametrix)

The Burnside Bridge: Earthquake Readiness project previously came before the Portland Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) on September 11, 2018.

Below is a summary of comments and responses provided by the HLC in response to the project as presented on June 25, 2018.

- One commissioner asked about other bridge alternatives, in particular, seismically upgrading the approaches to the Tilikum Bridge.
 - Response: Multnomah County does not have jurisdiction over the Tilikum Bridge.
- One commissioner asked about other alignments.
 - Response: Other alignments looked at tying into streets that could not handle the anticipated traffic, primarily due to size or being located in historic districts/areas, which would significantly change the character of the street.
- One commissioner noted the importance of the Burnside Bridge and the signature moment of proposing to alter a defining feature of the city. In addition, it was mentioned that the taller bridge options, such as the 97-foot option, is dramatically different and not aesthetically consistent with the other downtown bridges. To this, it was asked if there was an intention to have a design competition or if a public participation app and/or way for the public to engage in the design/aesthetic and process.
 - Response: At this point in the process all bridge types have been considered. Once the process of the Environmental Impact Statement begins, bridge types will be further scrutinized and possibly eliminated.
- One commissioner was concerned that the process did not include a “no adverse effect” to historic resources option in particular regarding Section 4f of the National Transportation Act.
 - Response: Initial options in the first levels of screening were trying to include alternatives that would meet the fundamental purpose of the project without having significant impacts to anything – including 4f resources: i.e. the tunnel (which was eliminated). Also, the “enhanced retrofit” is still an option being considered, and while it may be an adverse effect, this will not be known until greater analysis has been done.
- One commissioner asked about separating lanes: maintaining the Burnside Bridge while building a new bridge with another travel lane.
 - Response: Some twin and multi-modal options were considered. This suggestion will be looked at during the feasibility study report.

- One commissioner asked that the HLC be a consulting party when the applicant begins the Section 106 (and NEPA) process(s), as this will include a map of the area of impact.
- Commissioners encouraged the applicant to look at alternatives to impacts rather than mitigation.
- The Commission suggested that the County return to the Commission during the DEIS phase of the project.

Please contact me with any questions or concerns. Thank you.