

## Public Workshop – Alternatives Development

---

DATE: April 4, 2007  
TIME: 7:00 TO 9:00 P.M.  
LOCATION: Sellwood Middle School



The second public forum for the Sellwood Bridge project (a public workshop) was held on Wednesday, April 4, 2007 from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. at the Sellwood Middle School in the Sellwood neighborhood. The meeting had a structured format featuring a large group presentation followed by three simultaneous, identical breakout sessions. 333 people signed in for the meeting, which had been publicized through a mass mailing to 23,000 households in the project vicinity. The public workshop was also announced through the local media, including newspapers, radio, and television news.

The purpose of the public workshop was to obtain community input on the range of alignment and interchange concepts developed by the project team, to discuss bridge widths and associated impacts, and to obtain other potential concepts and ideas that the project should consider. The meeting was staffed by members of the consulting team and staff members with Multnomah County, Metro, PDOT and ODOT – all of whom wore bright blue t-shirts to be identified easily in the large crowd.

The large group presentation was introduced by Mike Pullen, Multnomah County Public Affairs, and Multnomah County Commissioner Maria Rojo de Steffey, who welcomed the audience before introducing the main speaker, Ian Cannon, Multnomah County Bridge Section. Ian walked the audience through a 45-minute PowerPoint presentation that introduced the alignment options, interchange concepts, and potential bridge widths that were the focus of the night's meeting.

After the presentation, the audience was divided up equally (according to a pre-assigned symbol randomly distributed on the comment forms at the sign-in station) into three groups for concurrent breakout sessions staffed by seven people each. Each breakout room contained five stations for each of the alignment options presented (northerly alignments: orange, blue, and green; existing alignment: yellow; and southerly alignment: purple), as well as a station

featuring a range of potential cross-sections. Flip charts were located at every station and meeting participants were encouraged to record their comments. The comment forms featured the following questions:

- How would you improve any of the concepts presented tonight?
- Are there any other concepts you would like to suggest? (Draw your ideas on the map on the back)
- Anything else you'd like to tell us?

### **Workshop Overview**

The public workshop drew heavily from the Sellwood community. The vast majority of meeting participants signed in with a 97202 mailing address, so the input received largely reflected local neighborhood issues and concerns. Many participants expressed a desire to use the existing alignment or route a new bridge further north away from the river front condos. Most of the map drawings from the back of the comment forms featured variations of a more northerly alignment (*these drawings were forwarded to consultant CH2M HILL to be considered for new, additional alignment concepts*). Keeping the bridge two lanes only was strongly favored. Adding enough width to include future streetcar or light rail, was also mentioned.

Many suggested the County consider a double-deck bridge arrangement with vehicles on one level and non-motorized traffic on another (opinions were mixed about whether cyclists and pedestrians would be better off above or below the deck). Others preferred that bike/pedestrian paths be on the same level as vehicles. The vast majority preferred a non-signalized (trumpet) interchange on the west end for smoother traffic flow.

A common theme throughout the comments was the importance of preserving and enhancing neighborhood livability and concerns about impacts to Tacoma Street, which a wider bridge might bring. Concerns about neighborhood cut-through traffic from Clackamas County and the need for another river crossing to the south were also common.

157 comment forms were turned in or mailed to Multnomah County following the meeting. In general, using the existing alignment or northern alignments that least impact the river front condos on both sides of the bridge were most favored by meeting participants. There was strong support for a new, northerly alignment that was not presented at the meeting – routing a new bridge through or north of the River Park Center office building (or adjacent Sellwood Riverfront Park to the north) and connecting on the westside between Staff Jennings and Taylors Ferry Road.

### **Bridge Width Comments**

- Keep the bridge two lanes only (48 comments)
- Widen the bridge to four lanes (9 comments)
- Add a flex lane or room for emergency services/future transit (15 comments)
- Put a median between oncoming traffic lanes and/or cars and bike/pedestrians (7 comments)
- Widen Tacoma Street (1 comment)

- Make it 53' wide or less (11 comments)
- Make it 64-70' wide (10 comments)
- Make it 70' or wider (6 comments)

### **Interchange Comments**

- Put a non-signalized interchange on the west end of the bridge (30 comments)
- Preference for a signalized interchange in west end (4 comments)
- No eastside interchange (3 comments)

### **Bike/Pedestrian Comments**

- Double-decker bridge with vehicles above, bikes/ pedestrians below (46 comments)
- Keep cyclists and pedestrians at the same level as vehicles (29 comments)
- Retain existing bridge for bike/pedestrian-only use and build a new bridge to the north (8 comments)
- Use median barriers to separate vehicles/bicycles/pedestrians (7 comments)
- Cantilever bike/pedestrian paths below the bridge (6 comments)
- Make connections to Springwater Corridor (5 comments)

### **Bridge Aesthetic Comments**

- Make any new bridge resemble an old one (6 comments)
- Make any new bridge modern (2 comments)
- Light the new bridge like the Morrison (1 comment)
- Add viewpoint areas on any new bridge (1 comment)

### **Other Comments**

- Accommodate future streetcar (19 comments)
- Concerns for neighborhood livability (15 comments)
- Provide an impact analysis of all options showing costs, traffic flows, environmental impacts, right-of-way impacts, property values (13 comments)
- Close the bridge completely to speed construction (9 comments)
- Keep the bridge open throughout any construction (4 comments)
- Build a tunnel (5 comments)
- Add ferry service during construction (5 comments)
- Establish a toll to pay for the bridge (3 comments)
- Add traffic calming in neighborhood streets (2 comments)
- Make Spokane and Tacoma a couplet (2 comments)

## **Flip Chart Notes**

The flip chart comments collected at all three breakout sessions have been combined here and organized by comments generally in favor of each option, concerns about the option, and other (usually non-related) concerns and suggestions. For quicker reading, a paragraph following each heading summarizes the major points made for each option.

## Orange Alignment

*There were no comments specifically in support of the Orange Alignment. Concerns centered on how this option would negatively impact the Sellwood Riverfront Park (4 comments), concerns about impacts to the River Park Center office building (2 comments) and various other concerns about negative impacts to residences, traffic on Tacoma/side streets, and quality of life. Suggestions were made to move the alignment to the north to avoid the condos and office building on the east side of the river (3 comments).*

### Supportive

- None

### Concerns

- Cuts through Riverfront Park-ruins it
- Bad idea, preserve the tranquility of the park please!
- This idea also implies that the tranquility of the park and wildlife area is unimportant.
- Don't mess with Sellwood Riverfront Park!!!
- This makes the walk across the bridge much longer than it is now.
- Poor west side connection. Needs to be north of Staff Jennings
- This version makes no sense whatsoever. Common sense tells me this will cost more to build and take longer to cross.
- The "further north" solution implies that the waterfront condos are more valuable than the older homes that would be impacted on Spokane and Nehalem. We have improved our homes and value our quality of life as much as you do. Please stop coming in our yard and telling us to "just let development happen". We've been around since 1916 and have as much right to keep our home as you do.
- This plan impacts Spokane St. too much!
- Detracts from quality of life, property value of adjacent condos.
- This alignment would take out the best designed building in the area (the brick office building, River Park Center)
- Avoid impact to River Park Center
- Ok but my friend's house would be on a busy street!

### Other Suggestions

- Consider the noise of eastbound trucks and buses negotiating (braking) noisily on the curve leading to the east end of the bridge.
- Please avoid another traffic light - adds to air pollution (ex. cars idling waiting for the light) we don't another Weidler-like corridor
- No rail - too much crime!
- On all options, neighborhood needs renewed attention to traffic calming measures. Many streets are difficult to use for cut through but some still work and that is where people will flow off Tacoma and impact side streets
- Need to look at connection to Tacoma before considering the alignments

- Take bridge through north end of park to avoid impact on all homes, condos and businesses!
- What about a tunnel from 224 to L.O or south of bridge so we can keep/rehab a more modest bridge here.
- Take bridge over/through office complex, use current office property to expand park
- Consider alignment further north at parking lot. Seems reasonable-why wasn't this included tonight?
- Align north of office building over the Riverfront Park parking lot
- Non-signal interchange
- Locate as far north as possible-start north edge of bridge at north property line of Spokane St. office building and work southward! Much less adverse impact to condos on Spokane St! Thanks
- Consider the impact to the tavern at east end of bridge.
- Please don't remove the strip club. I am an exotic dancer and if you tear down the strip club I'll be forced to work at Wal-Mart and I consider that to be more degrading than working as a stripper.

## Green Alignment

*There were 5 comments in support of the Green Alignment. Concerns again centered on how this option would negatively impact the Sellwood Riverfront Park (3 comments). Suggestions were made to move the alignment to the north over the parking lot to avoid the condos and office building on the east side of the river (4 comments). Questions were also asked about impacts to the old ferry crossing site as well as how well the switchback ramps would work for cyclists (for all of the options).*

### Supportive

- Yes, north solution provides easy connection to park/bike path
- Yes again
- Like the trumpet for increased flow of traffic. Want to show a more northern alignment option
- I love the green option. They all stink in terms of me staring out of my front window at a bridge, but this one makes sense to me and the metro area needs the bridge
- Progress, safety, option, I'm in favor.

### Concerns

- NO! This would ruin the park
- Not through the parking lot or park
- North solutions affect the area between Sellwood Park, Springwater Corridor and Sellwood Waterfront Park.

### Other Suggestions

- What about the Tavern-can't you take it? Those who live close see the unfavorable presence on Sellwood

- On all options, are there mobility challenges for switchback configurations? Will it be difficult for heavy bike traffic projected to travel safely through switchbacks?
- No rail-brings too much crime to the neighborhood. Yes, bike path should be more navigable, not less!
- Send green more north, over the park. Avoids homes and businesses, west end more north also. Saves Staff Jennings.
- Orange/green option: start north edge of bridge at north property line of the office building and work back south - less adverse impact on condos?
- What is impact of destroying historic Sellwood Ferry Crossing, possible artifacts there and in water?
- Consider native protective path - under or near existing Sellwood bridge-county needs to research this historic site.
- Consider alternative to "green" option - go further north-alleviate residential impacts-only have to negotiate with owner of industrial park building.
- Sellwood Park starts (by Oaks Park Way) not as shown, area marks "Sellwood Park" is a parking lot...perfect spot for bridge to go. Cars could still park there...covered and no buildings or homes are displaced.

## Blue Alignment

*There were 5 comments in support of the Blue Alignment, mainly for the reason that it appears to have less impact. Concerns were raised about residential impact to the condos (1) and loss of trees (1).*

### Supportive

- Preserves the buildings that have been in the neighborhood the longest.
- This looks like the most economical choice, materials-wise, and has the least impact on the old neighborhood.
- Because it's shorter than orange/green
- This plan protects the peacefulness of the park by keeping the bridge noise away from it
- Most common sense

### Concerns

- Too much residential relocation/impact
- Poor choice - non functional - would still cause traffic flow problems, cause too much pollution in high density area, 91 trees over 20 feet will be removed.

### Other Suggestions

- No slip lanes
- Avoid multiple switchbacks on bike path
- No rail! Brings too much crime!
- Consider access to Powers Marine Park

- Has there been any discussion of a toll for Clackamas County users of the bridge?
- Tunnel is still a worthy option
- Yeah, tunnel! Why does Clackamas County get to say they won't help solve this problem?
- Please take the strip club too!!
- Save the existing bridge for the bikers - not vehicles, vehicles need a new bridge

## Yellow Alignment

*The Yellow Alignment (keep the existing alignment) appeared to be the most popular choice among meeting participants. There were 8 comments specifically in support of the Yellow Alignment, however there were many other suggestions made for ideas and considerations to go along with the Yellow option (40) which would indicate general support for the alignment itself. Only one concern about this option was mentioned. Top suggestions made included: Making a new or rehab bridge a double-decker option with cars above and bikes/peds below (or vice versa) (10 comments); Keeping the bridge 2-lanes only (5 comments); and other ideas to consider the addition of a tunnel or ferry service.*

### Supportive

- Yes!
- Yes with more direct bike connection
- Yes, less residential impact
- Yes
- Yes with bike lanes!
- Keep bridge-peds/bikes/tram
- Tear down/close current crossing and rebuild
- Progress, beauty, livability, and bridge option ok, why not take the tavern? What does it do for the neighborhood?

### Concerns

- Poor choice - street size does not support size of bridge. Use existing bridge for foot and bicycle traffic. Hwy 2% taxes can maintain bridge.

### Other Suggestions

- No rail-increase crime in neighborhoods, poor location-impacts too many residents.
- Switchbacks at west end difficult for cyclists. They add time to trips and make sharing safely with pedestrians much more difficult.
- Maintain only current 2 lanes of traffic on bridge and add ped/bike access only. Open discussion to SMILE residents re: Tacoma issues beyond the bridge that they think bridge changes will cause, including refusing unwanted changes to our community.
- Keep the "footprint" narrow to minimize right of way issues/costs. Use the narrower "stacked" cross section proposed for rehab. Keep it 2 lanes so it's compatible with Tacoma. Minimizes noise/pollution/neighborhood impact.

- On east end improve ramp to Oaks - make a new alignment not existing streets.
- Any widening make it to north - poorer quality housing
- Save Staff Jennings if you can. They provide an essential service...new ramp/gas source nearby? (Boat ramp)
- 2 lane only and lower deck.
- Yellow-how will we get to Lake Oswego for 3 years while it's being built?
- Non signalized does not solve problem of north and south traffic merging onto bridge at rush hour
- Keeping current alignment-signalization will create more backups on 43 headed south and east over to Tacoma into neighborhoods
- No 4 lane bridge
- May not be enough peds to justify a wide shared use path
- Physical barrier between cars and bikes/peds
- No two lanes in one direction for cars
- 2 lane bridge or you will have traffic jams on east end
- Aesthetics/neighborhood/height of bridge kept noise down
- Keep traffic going through construction (*2 checkmarks were beside this*)
- Double decker (new or rehab) (*5 checkmarks were beside this*)
- Double deck
  - Pedestrian/bike and mass transit (top?)
  - Cars (bottom)
  - No loops on east side-only light if waiting to cross; loop west side, ok to close bridge, finish Marquam Bridge exit to 99E to take extra commuter traffic.
- Build over the top of "impact buildings" and turn it into low income housing
- Consider a double decker bridge - peds, bikes, streetcar all below, cars above.
- What are relative costs of light rail, streetcar, and bus? I am assuming bus service is the least costly. So why don't we just have frequent, reliable bus service between Sellwood and downtown, including evenings and weekends, like the old # 40 bus? We would not need an extra lane for bus service! And so we should just have buses going across the new Sellwood Bridge-but they could run every 15 minutes like Light Rail does. (In the meantime we could have small buses across the Sellwood Bridge or regular size buses that go thru Sellwood but over another bridge to downtown. And that way we don't need special lanes on Tacoma or other streets for streetcars...
- # 1 priority: establish frequent cross-town bus service from Clackamas T.C to Washington Square-ferry buses, pedestrians and bicycles across Willamette River on a bridge from foot of Spokane St. to Staff Jennings ramps on west side and vice versa. #2: DO NOT BUILD TEMPORARY BRIDGE, save \$10-15 million! Keep existing bridge.
- Start new bridge at 7<sup>th</sup> St and build above old bridge. Use new for vehicles and old for peds and bikes. This minimizes impact.
- If rehab is done, cantilever bike paths off bottom sides of Truss.
- Dig tunnel for 2/3 lane vehicle access
- No tunnel
- Ferry access during construction

- Build 4 lane bridge but route 2 lanes to 99E/224 without using neighborhood streets. Maybe bury through lanes under Tacoma Street?
- Clover leaf on east side will increase cut-thru traffic on residential streets
- Add turning lane on Tacoma at 6<sup>th</sup> instead of up
- Keep bridge for bikes/peds and build new bridge
- New 3-D models or computer stimulation: would give better idea of proposal.
- Rehab with bike/ped below: covered good for commuters: drier and healthier (less exhaust)
- Streetcar/bikes/peds-lower deck, cars/trucks, etc upper deck, all on new bridge
- Consider lower level for bikes/peds on wider bridge concepts (like Steel Bridge)
- Trucks/buses/bikes/peds on one level, cars on separate level
- Consider reversible lane
- Flex lane concept - good

## Purple Alignment

*There were 5 comments in support of the Purple Alignment. Concerns were raised about residential impact to the condos (5), higher right-of-way costs (2), and the west end landslide hazard (2). Suggestions were made that there should be another bridge further south in Clackamas County (4 comments).*

### Supportive

- Has least impact on existing buildings and the park
- This option would allow existing bridge to remain open during most of construction
- Allows better development of waterfront area and new business north of bridge
- Go purple! Trumpet interchange and 92 feet width for buses, streetcars, the future.
- Once you have the width, you can use it however you need.

### Concerns

- What is benefit of this version over existing bridge? If no improvements, why displace residents?
- Residents that would be affected just went through a \$5 million remodel process in 2005 and have long term condo owners in Sellwood
- No rail!
- Why are there so many north options? We are north and also have gone through extensive remodels - your comments (above) imply that your remodels are more important than ours.
- Don't like this alignment-impacts condos very much, 6 or 7 different buildings.
- Don't take commuting traffic away from downtown...even incrementally
- Jug handle turns off bridge on east side, isolates houses-should acquire them and create a real traffic circle
- Signalized interchange - does not allow traffic flow

- Signals could be dangerous, stops flow, causes rear end collisions
- Bad alignment. Increases “right of way” costs by taking out expensive condos. Move alignment north of office building over Riverfront Park parking area.
- The impact on Tacoma St. and other neighborhood surface streets must be considered.
- Purple west side dumps in most slide-prone area... consider costs and possible future problems!
- Why do we want to invest in brand new bridge that hooks into unstable west-end land? Rehab existing
- Better to have no loop and a signal
- No signals! They simply hold up the flow...
- Bad alignment. High right-of-way costs.
- Do minimum necessary to keep the bridge viable - for next 75 years.
- Add concrete divider

### Other Suggestions

- Signals would help regulate traffic on Tacoma
- 2 more transit lanes best.
- Must address regional traffic needs and broader discussion to include other locations (e.g. Sellwood Bridge and additional bridge to south). It is not appropriate to put all needs onto single location (disproportionate impact).
- “No decisions have been made.” So why not discuss a 2<sup>nd</sup> bridge in Milwaukie? I agree with above comment.
- Must include 4+ turn lanes on Tacoma from Willamette to 99E
- “No decision” consider N connection at McLoughlin and Milwaukie Ave. N (east side connection) and Lower Taylors Ferry Rd. and Macadam (west side connection)
- Keep current Sellwood Bridge size and load and build supplementary bridge in Lake Oswego.
- Consider better access to Powers Marine Park.
- Revisit Willamette River Plan!
- Consider double deck bridge for motor vehicles, cars separate from bikes/peds is great
- Why won’t Clackamas County cooperate and build a bridge or tunnel off HWY 224 so we won’t have traffic cutting through our residential streets? Streets north and south of Tacoma already have rush hour traffic zooming through our side streets to avoid lights at 13<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>.
- Check out Riverview Cemetery Measure 37 claims to build homes?
- Move alignment north over Riverfront Park parking lot. Keep bridge 2 lanes. Use stacked concept proposed for rehab with new bridge also to minimize footprint

## Interchange Types

*Comments for all alignment concepts were almost universally in favor of a non-signalized interchange (trumpet) and against having a traffic signal out of concern that the signal would slow traffic unnecessarily, create backups, and cause safety problems with rear-end collisions.*

## Cross-Sections

Comments about the bridge cross-section possibilities are summarized in these top categories:

- 1) Don't include streetcar or light rail (20 comments/check marks)
- 2) Keep the bridge 2 lanes only/match Tacoma Street (13 comments)
- 3) Make the bridge narrow, ideally 53' (12 comments)
- 4) If adding a third lane, use it for HOV or transit only (9 comments)
- 5) Consider a double-deck bridge (9 comments)
- 6) Make the bike/ped paths as wide as possible (5 comments)

Comments against rail were also given for all of the alignment options, reflecting a local concern that rail transit or streetcar might bring crime into the neighborhood. There were quite a few comments in support of a double-deck bridge design, but opinions were mixed on whether the bike/ped use should be above or below the deck. Wider bike/ped paths were also requested, with some opinions in favor of mixed use and others in favor of dedicated facilities.

- Re: lane widths: scale needs to match Tacoma and Sellwood Neighborhood. Strive for smaller scale options that will limit traffic increase and thereby preserve walk-ability and peacefulness of neighborhood.
- How about a double decker with mass transit and bike/ped on lower level?
- But you would have to address noise level on lower deck
- Put B/P path under (or on top or share B/P with transit) to reduce bridge width, or double deck for all. Bicyclists up on sidewalks and separated
- No, 4 or 3 lane bridge!
- Keep bridge narrow
- Makes no sense to have 4 lanes on bridge with 2 on Tacoma and Macadam
- Make shared path in first figure (under) wider to avoid ped and bike conflict
- If we have good bus service over the bridge, we don't need an extra lane for a streetcar (*This comment was followed by 20 check marks*)
- Prefer narrower widths-no more than 64'
- Ditto but 53'
- 3<sup>rd</sup> lane should be reversible HOV/Bus lane (*This comment was followed by 6 check marks*)
- Reduce bridge width (*This comment was followed by 4 check marks*)
- Don't like the idea of B/P under-scary
- I like the bridge under-I walk across everyday and I think people in cars are scarier!
- Need emergency breakdown lanes!!! Bike lanes/breakdown lanes needed
- Keep bridge for B/P, add bridge to north for cars and busses (*This comment was followed by 4 check marks*)
- Don't keep existing bridge, environmentally not sound to keep
- 2 lanes for traffic-2 lanes for rail
- Think widest possible B/P
- Yes, streetcar added to sidewalk/bike area but not to 4 lanes
- 4 lanes will move more traffic into neighborhood
- Make design sensitive to context. Scaled down to neighborhood scale, e.g. St. Johns fits in North Portland but wouldn't fit here, e.g. Hawthorne fits with downtown
- No rail-Brings too much crime

- Why does no width include a light rail crossing? Give an option to leave the car home with a permanent public transportation option to downtown over the bridge and down Macadam.
- Connect B/P lanes to Springwater directly. If Tacoma is going to stay 2 lanes, you don't need 4. Separate bike and ped access on each side of bridge (min 8' wide)
- Great! Best idea yet!
- Stacked option presented as rehab option should be developed for "new bridge" option. Keep it 2 lanes=put ped/bike under to minimize the bridge "footprint"
- Building a significantly wider bridge feeding into 2 lane Tacoma will significantly increase traffic capacity and will significantly impact neighborhood livability.
- Stacked option-covered bike/ped path would become unusable like the underpass beneath the railroad tracks on Powell. It's clogged with vagrants and broken glass. Peds/cyclists avoid this underpass at all costs. Why duplicate the failure?
- Keeping the old bridge, build new bridge over old bridge from Macadam to McLoughlin Blvd for heavy traffic
- Stacked option worked well as a retrofit to similar bridge (Madison St) in Missoula, Mt. Particularly helped with connections to trails at either end.
- As a cyclist, I prefer raised shared paths that are wide (10ft). Equally sized paths on both sides are best (least confusing)
- As a cyclist I find the 10-foot shared sidewalks on the Hawthorne Bridge to be totally inadequate because of the volumes of cyclists, pedestrians and joggers, we need separate on-street lanes for bike commuters and shared multi-use paths for my young kids on their bikes and foot traffic.
- An option with 2 lanes of car traffic, 1 lane for transit/emergency use and separated bike and pedestrian use would be great!
- Why would we build a 4 lane bridge and have it merge into a 2 lane road (Tacoma)?
- 31 ft option would have least adverse impact to integrity of the neighborhood.
- I would like to see a narrower multi-level bridge which would accommodate pedestrians, cyclists and possibly rapid transit on a separate level.
- Concern re: air quality, safety for peds/bikes if lane below cars
- Multiple lanes (more than 2 car lanes) is not good because: not supported on Tacoma (only 2 lanes there), if more lanes go in inevitably some future planner will say "hey we could put 4 lanes on Tacoma", it would be better not to enable drivers to live and work in locations that are far apart. Trying to avoid this effect is a major goal of Metro.
- Bike lane is a no brainer of course do it. Maybe wide enough to allow emergency traffic. Keep bridge in same location (53' option) it's the devil we know.
- Ultimately it must be accepted that the traffic squeeze in this corridor is a fact of life and largely is unsolvable and that's ok, not ideal, but ok.
- 2 or 3 lanes and bikes or bikes underneath
- Consider rehab at 53' (keep it narrow) about 4 lanes but with b/p path under
- Use computer stimulation to demonstrate the options, esp cross-sections and west side interchanges
- 4 lanes makes no sense if Tacoma stays 2 lanes = bottleneck is Tacoma
- Prefer bike lane to be raised like in Copenhagen, or on sidewalk but separated/striped (mark separate b/p areas)
- Consider b/p path on lower elevation like on Steel Bridge

- Streetcar/bikes/peds-lower decks, cars/trucks, etc upper deck
- No 4 lane bridge
- Consider lower level for bikes/peds on wider bridge concepts (like Steel Bridge)
- Trucks/buses/bikes/peds on one level, cars on separate level
- May not be enough peds to justify a wide shared use path
- Consider reversible lane
- Flex lane concept=good
- Physical barrier between cars and bikes/peds
- No two lane in one direction for cars
- Two lane bridge or you'll have traffic jams on east end
- Need to provide for 4 travel lanes to allow potential future bypass around Sellwood
- Ditto that
- If 2 extra lanes, some form of metering/traffic control needed where the 2 lanes neck down to Tacoma
- Bikes on sidewalks/path with peds
- Do 4 travel lanes-otherwise 2 lane bridge is obsolete
- No flex lane
- Rehab option= low cost option
- 2 lane bridge to match Tacoma
- 10' shared use paths and 2 travel lanes
- Separate bikes/peds
- Striped median
- Bike lanes should be 8' wide
- New bridge...no rehab
- 3 lane option no sense
- No switchbacks on bridge access ramps
- No 5' bikes lanes-need wider