

## Public Open House – FEIS and Bridge Type Selection

---

DATE: July 21, 2010  
TIME: 5:00 to 7:30 P.M.  
LOCATION: Oaks Park Dance Pavilion

The seventh public open house for the Sellwood Bridge project was held on Wednesday, July 21, 2010 from 5:00 to 7:30 p.m. at the Oaks Park Dance Pavilion. The purpose of the meeting was to present the six bridge types under consideration for the replacement structure and to gather public feedback about them. Information about the availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement was also provided. The meeting was structured to encourage community members to visit a variety of informational stations staffed by members of the project team.



Approximately 130 people attended the meeting, which had been publicized through a newsletter mailing to 23,000 households in the project vicinity as well as an email to the 5,000+ address interested parties list. The open house was also announced through the project website, local media, bridge banner and interest group websites and blogs.

The meeting was staffed by members of the consulting team and staff members with Multnomah County, City of Portland, and Metro. Meeting participants were welcomed at a sign-in table by project staff. As people signed in they were encouraged to view the orientation presentations, visit the open house stations, view the displays and ask questions of project staff. The stations included:

- **Orientation** – Two looped presentations were shown concurrently at separate stations: The “Sellwood Bridge Tour” video with former Multnomah County Chair Ted Wheeler and a 10-minute project overview PowerPoint presentation.
- **Bridge Types** - Displays showing sketches of the six bridge types under consideration, including:
  - Girder
  - Tied Arch

- Deck Arch
  - Delta Frame
  - Extradosed
  - Through Arch
- Mitigation for Historic Resource, Parks & Natural Resource Impacts
  - Funding Plan
  - Project Schedule
  - Preferred Alternative
  - Westside Interchange and Access
  - Bicycle/Pedestrian
  - Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Alternatives Study
  - Feedback

### **Open House Overview**

Meeting participants provided feedback through comment forms (64 turned in), comments captured on flip charts and informal conversations with project team members. All of these comments are included in this summary. People were not asked to “vote” on their favorite bridge types, but rather were asked to provide their overall impressions of each one. Opinions varied on the types, pro and con. Many people preferred the simplicity of the deck structures, while others favored the iconic presence of the super structures. Overall, many people expressed the sentiment that they simply want to see a bridge replacement built sooner rather than later. Other comments provided referred to decisions that were made earlier in the study, such as the number of lanes to be constructed or how the bridge should be funded.

## **Comments Received**

### **Flip Chart Notes**

#### **BOX GRIDER**

##### *What do you think?*

- Not a favorite among the choices
- Whatever is lowest cost – all could work
- Steel box preferred – simple. Clean – cost effective.
- Not aesthetically acceptable for Portland in the 21<sup>st</sup> century
- More money for amenities to make a neighborhood bridge. Keep it simple, but must decorate the approaches artistically. Sculpture. Artwork.
- Forget the view points or bump-out’s – waste of money

- Keep bump-outs. This bridge type is least “reminiscent” of the old bridge. Needs more “trusses.”
- If we were already building the bridge, there’s no reason to not include viewpoints. Keep it simple, a good value and effective in keeping all modes of transportation safe!
- Ditto on removing the viewpoints. Also, narrow the sidewalks – too wide and save the taxpayers’ money on unnecessary expenditures
- The river channel should be open as possible for recreation and river traffic.
- Keep the bump-outs! This looks like a Sellwood bridge – a neighborhood bridge – hooray.
- Keep the viewpoints – Walk across and enjoy the view
- Use historic “old Portland” streetlights for aesthetics. This design saves money and has less obstruction in river channel.
- I like the simplicity and less obstruction in the river

### **TIED DECK ARCH**

#### *What do you think?*

- I like this one the best
- Steel, please.
- It’s less “busy” looking than the Deck Arch. I like the streamlined look.
- I can’t wait to ride my bike!
- Not crazy about huge lighting fixtures. Keep it simple, please. No blue lights! Yuck.
- This is the one deck arch bridge
- Less is best – simple and elegant
- This view should be complemented with the “true” cross-sectional view. The “half-arches” on each end have a “false” support pillars look.
- Portland’s contribution to the funding needs to come from fees directly assessed on bicyclists\* for their excessive share of the deck space – motorists are already paying more than their share through gas taxes and the extra \$19.00 reg fee
- Amen – license the bikers and make them obey the traffic laws!
- Replacing the most used two lane bridge with a two lane bridge is not smart, to say the least. Make four lanes for future growth.
- \*this assumes bicycles pay no taxes – not true

### **DECK ARCH**

#### *What do you think?*

- Very nice to have widened viewpoints, mid-span
- Looks natural, strong, and beautiful. Small. Blends in. My favorite.
- Reminds me of some Coast Bridges. Better on cost than extradosed and more Oregonian
- Elegant!
- Pleasant – fits the town
- Would like the deck arch but modified to incorporate the vertical structural approach as shown on the deck tied arch. Simpler and more elegant than the verticals shown above.

- Remove the viewpoint and narrow the excessively wide sidewalks saving taxpayers money. The bridge will function the same “similar” to removing a hwy lane
- Keep the viewpoints – not only to appreciate natural beauty but safe for bikers to have pullout
- Attractive but crowds the river channel

## **DELTA FRAME**

### *What do you think?*

- I like it! Low Cost. Lean. Nice look.
- Low maintenance for this one is nice.
- I like the little view spots.
- Love the view spots!
- The elegant simplicity of this design doesn’t rely upon any finishing touch.
- Seems too contemporary relative to reverie environment (natural;) and neighborhood (more historical elements)
- Looks clean, roomy for river traffic – not much to like.

## **THROUGH ARCH**

### *What do you think?*

- Natural and St. John’s ties north and south ends of the city
- Nice lines and curves – vote this #2
- No. Too imposing for location
- Costlier maintenance
- This area of PDX is so beautiful; we don’t need to improve on nature!
- Looks high maintenance
- Sellwood needs a simple design, too busy.
- Too much bridge
- Interstate style, not neighborhood like
- Too complex for this area. Blocks view of St. Helens with cables
- My favorite! Echoes Conde McCullough bridges
- Oversized for setting

## **EXTRADOSED**

### *What do you think?*

- In a city of beautiful bridges style is important –should be unique
- Very stylish and futuristic – I vote this one for the city of Roses
- Too much like the new Tri Met Bridge downstream
- Costlier maintenance
- Too expensive
- Not Sellwood Style
- Avoid “dual-post” Foundation
- Overdosed for our charming community
- Looks like a runt bridge!
- Looks cheap and ugly – like the cable barriers between directions on freeways
- Not suitable for our hood

- Too much maintenance
- Too many cables blocking view
- The bridge itself should not be the visual focus – the surroundings are
- Too modernistic – why not a historic design?

## Comment Forms

Comment forms were made available to all open house participants. The comment forms asked for feedback on each of the six bridge types. The following comments were provided:

### **Box Girder** *(45 people made comments on this option)*

- A concrete box girder would be my second choice.
- All of these designs should use the old-style Portland Streetlights (like downtown) to correspond to the quaint character of the Sellwood neighborhood. They are probably cheap and available too.
- Best value, as effective as any. Saves money for other human, natural and economic needs. Keeps with tradition. Unpretentious and responsible. Low maintenance, thus lower operational costs. Open air viewing. Saved money should be used to integrate raised bike lane "cycle track"
- Best view, least costly, most appropriate.
- Build box girder - supposedly it is cheapest. I care less about a good looking bridge. I want a safe bridge with room for bikes, peds, plus cars and a streetcar.
- Choice Number 3
- Clean, simple. A little too plain?
- Done in concrete it seems to be the best design for the price and lower cost to maintain down the line. Simple, clean, safe.
- Elegant, pedestrian friendly
- First choice. Looks unique for a very modest cost. The piers are similar to the St. John's Bridge, only in reverse. Fits the location. Modifications needed include removing the viewpoints as an unnecessary cost, and narrowing the excessively wide sidewalks which would be similar to removing a highway lane on the Columbia River Crossing. The bridge will function "similar" with narrower sidewalks at a substantial cost savings to taxpayers.
- Girder bridges. High enough that boats can go through. The railing high enough that people don't fall over.
- I could live with any of the bridge designs. As a matter of fact most of the designs are quite attractive. The one I really don't care for is the box girder, the others are nice in their own way.
- I don't think this is attractive.
- I like the simplicity. Sleek, less structure to look at. Looked at the pictures again so I changed my mind. I like this the best for the reasons above. Also like the 'turnouts' for walkers and bikers to stop and watch the water.
- I won't use the bump outs myself.

- I would like to select Box Girder type bridge for moderate cost and easy to maintain. Unless aesthetic is a real issue for this bridge. The rest of bridge types will have much higher construction costs (20%-80%) than Box Girder type bridge.
- Least expensive. Least obstructive - not flashy which is symbolic of the charm of Sellwood. Saving money on the bridge construction allows money for amenities such as bumpouts, artistic approach for enjoying the bridge by foot. Resembles the simplicity of our mostly one-story community center.
- Like the girder bridges because they look nice, less maintenance, strong, pleasing to the eye. Needs to last longer than 100 years. Needs to have lights for nighttime use.
- Looks dry as concrete. Ugh.
- Looks sturdy enough!
- Looks too much like a freeway bridge. Too sterile. Needs to fit into style of Sellwood, this does not. Love bumpouts - makes it more pleasant crossing bridge by bike or foot.
- My choice for type of bridge. Stay away from turn out viewpoints - a waste of taxpayer monies. More space for traffic on river. Keep it simple, and the cost will be down.
- Nice but not sure it fits architecturally.
- No (3 comments)
- Not very exciting. Some redeeming qualities including lookout opportunity but not sufficient to consider as a serious options.
- okay
- Okay, but no!
- One of my favorites. Low cost initially and long-term. Low impact on river, both navigation and ecology.
- Please don't go strictly low-budget in choosing a design.
- Simple, adequate
- Simple, clean design but has the capability of becoming ugly if not accompanied by artistic accoutrements.
- Somewhat industrial looking.
- The Box Girder looks cool. I think it looks strong.
- This bridge would be my third. Local work for local workers. More workers are impacted when you build with steel.
- This looks out of balance. No prettiness, too boxy and heavy, looks cheap.
- This one.
- Too chunky. Too spare.
- Too every other bridge in every other city in the world.
- Too futuristic, lines look unnatural.
- Too industrial and utilitarian, but the view points are very much appreciated.
- Too stiff. Light fixtures overpower the design.
- Very dull appearing from on top. I am sure that from the water it could be made to look appealing to the surrounding scenery.

### **Tied Deck Arch** (42 people made comments on this option)

- 2nd favorite.
- 4-year old Alan likes this because "it goes really faster than any other bridge." His mom likes this because of its simple look, low-seeming, fits into landscape, and the incredible reflection it makes.
- A concrete tied deck arch is my fourth choice. It looks a bit plain but the arches are visually pleasing and functional looking.
- Both of these designs crowd the river channel which is used by recreational and commercial traffic. There will be greater use of the Willamette River in coming years.
- Bumpouts area good idea, but this is a lame echo of the Ross Island design
- Choice number 2
- Do not like the half arch; looks unfinished
- Future driver Kate likes this the most. Beautiful, stately. Use steel!
- Good compromise. Vertical supports seem out of place
- I can't wait to ride my bike over it.
- I like the appearance of this option. Add as many amenities as you can.
- I like the simple elegance of this design best. #1 choice.
- I like this one best. And get rid of the fancy interchange we can't afford and don't need at the west approach.
- I love it. It looks beautiful. Steel is safer! I can't wait to ride my bike over it.
- I prefer the relative simplicity of the vertical deck supports compared with the deck arch. Bulb-out viewing areas are nice features.
- I won't use the bump outs myself. Might cramp some boat traffic.
- If not the Delta Frame (in Steel) then the Tied Deck.
- Lacks superstructure.
- Like the view points. Good-looking.
- Looks like a neighborhood bridge and fits Sellwood better than the others.
- Lovely style. This bridge would fit the area.
- More obstructive. Less money for amenities.
- Most aesthetically pleasing and complimentary to the area's spirit and environment. Less distraction of the natural beauty than the deck arch. No preference of concrete or steel. The top deck is straight across, which is appealing to anyone who appreciates the beautiful simplicity of our current bridge.
- No
- No, wait this one.
- No. Higher costs over long term. Could limit river navigation in 50-100 years.
- Not a chance.
- okay
- Second choice. But landing is not as graceful as the Deck Arch option.
- Seems too simplistic.
- Slightly more complex than the box design. Has the capability of being unattractive if not carefully finished.
- The design of both tied deck and deck arch are good fit for this stretch of river and the Sellwood community. The unobstructed views from the walkway and view points should be included in the final design.

- This is fine.
- This one is lovely. Keeps in the old decorative style of Portland. Fits with the neighborhood and city styles.
- This would be perfect if it were full arch rather than tied deck arch. No trucks please! Buses yes.
- Through Arch is the only one for me. This one is too much like Ross Island Bridge.
- Tied Deck Arch and Deck Arch are the best choices. Classic design and made from steel, could mean locally made.
- Tied for second choice. Very classic. Should remove the viewpoints as an unnecessary cost and narrow the sidewalks to save taxpayers money.
- Too many pieces or legs on the land. Although I like the simple arches.
- Very busy
- Very graceful, elegant solution, but the Deck Arch is even better. Think the interrupted arch on either end is a bit disturbing aesthetically but the vertical supports superior to the Deck Arch. Simple, less busy
- More appealing than the box girder bridge but only from a water viewpoint.

**Deck Arch** (43 people made comments on this option)

- Almost as nice as tied deck arch, not quite as ornamentally perfect.
- As illustrated, looks visually busy and confused (referring to the Tied Deck image). Put these beautiful arches (in Deck Arch photo) with the sweeping spans connecting land and river and you have a bridge that challenges the Delta Frame.
- Bike and ped safety is very important. The cross section is good - I look forward to working out details of the west side interchange.
- Both of these designs crowd the river channel which is used by recreational and commercial traffic. There will be greater use of the Willamette River in coming years.
- Bumpouts area good idea, but this is a lame echo of the Ross Island design
- Busy, distracting. Bulb-out viewing areas are nice features.
- Choice number 1
- Ditto.
- Excellent solution but could be improved by incorporating the vertical support design as shown on the Tied Deck Arch. It will enhance the busy appearance and simplify the view and aesthetic of the whole.
- Excellent!
- Favorite, best of all.
- Full arch is sturdier but I like the look of the Tied Deck Arch above. I want steel to withstand earthquakes.
- Good, but busier under the bridge, distracting from beautiful, natural views.
- I like the appearance of this option. Add as many amenities as you can.
- I like the bump outs, this might be a morbid question but have you considered suicide preventions in the bridge design? It would be a shame to have a beautiful bridge and have to add on something later to keep people safe.

- I like the deck arch with amenities, pop outs, etc, but would also go for the box girder with amenities. I want a bridge that says "welcome to our neighborhood." Hopefully it will increase business and also walking traffic.
- I like the turn outs and stops for people along the way.
- I like this one for the full arches. If all the amenities are the same for all three bridges, I like this one for the style. We have to have the amenities!  
Portland/Sellwood residents love to bike and walk everywhere. This will be such an improvement for commuting, we are excited!
- I like this one more maybe.
- Like this best; however, consider reducing the clutter of the extra columns
- Like this the most. Beautiful, stately. Use steel!
- Looks like a neighborhood bridge and fits Sellwood better than the others.
- Looks nice, my favorite.
- Lovely style. This bridge would fit the area.
- Might cramp some boat traffic.
- More obstructive. Less money for amenities.
- Most like the current bridge. Has historic feel. Graceful, good sense of proportion.
- My first choice. I like the openness of it and also the 3 arches that are the supports.
- My second favorite
- My second favorite. I like the larger arches and the "lookouts" for sightseers. However, the many pieces of the arches would add to future costs with painting and cleaning the bird stuff off.
- No I don't think so.
- No, higher costs. Could limit future river navigation. Looks too "busy" for my taste.
- No.
- OK. Structure is basically appealing.
- The Deck Arch looks very strong. I bet it will hold during a landslide.
- This is my favorite design as it is architecturally pleasing and suits the area quite nicely. This option looks strong, yet airy. I really like this option. It is sleek looking and would look wonderful in colored concrete.
- Tied Deck Arch and Deck Arch are the best choices. Classic design and made from steel, could mean locally made.
- Tied Deck Arch is better.
- Tied for second choice. Very classic like the bridges on the coast. Should remove the viewpoints as an unnecessary cost and narrow the sidewalks to save taxpayers money.
- Too complicated.
- Very busy
- Yes
- Same as tied deck arch; only good look is from the water.

**Delta Frame** (36 people made comments on this option)

- A bit too modern for Sellwood community.
- Best design, cost, looks and maintenance. The "loop" ramps for bikes are FAR better than the "switchback." Much smoother to maneuver. I only bicycle.
- Blah, utilitarian, no gracefulness.
- Bridge City needs a Delta Frame represented in the collection (in steel)
- Clunky. Does not meet my form and function criteria.
- Doesn't excite me.
- Elegant - beautiful piers. Widened viewing areas are a real plus. Looks good without any overhead structure. Wow! I think this is my favorite.
- First choice. For historical reasons, I would like to see the bridge built the same as the existing bridge.
- Functional.
- I don't like the appearance of this.
- I like the deck, flat and straight and simple, but the delta-shaped supports look more like a futuristic or modern vogue (trendy) which doesn't fit my opinion of Sellwood.
- I vote for this one. Low cost. Nice look. Less maintenance.
- Looks like 1960s - none of the City is this style, especially this neighborhood. The V-points of the overlooks are bad feng shui (not good energy)
- Looks like a slingshot.
- Looks twice as safe as the Tied Deck Arch.
- Lower cost to maintain? Sounds like an advantage, my third choice.
- My kids like this bridge. Portland 3rd graders study all the Portland bridges - have you considered involving 3rd graders in this project somehow?
- Nice, simple yet elegant design like the box girder. The beauty of the basic design relies on finishing touches.
- No (3 comments)
- No way.
- No, does not look right.
- OK. Kind of boxy. I like the arched deck better.
- One of my favorites. Low cost initially and long-term. Low impact on river, both navigation and ecology.
- Only boat owners or riverbank observers will enjoy the girder design.
- Seems nice.
- The concrete delta frame is my third choice. It looks too futuristic for the setting for which it will be placed, but much better than the through arch or extradosed. If this option is chosen, please use concrete for the girders and deck.
- This is my favorite, top choice. Concrete Delta Frame. It is not too costly and looks pretty decent.
- Too industrial looking compared to the other options.
- Too industrial looking for the community.
- Too modern looking. May impede river traffic in some manner.
- Too modern (2 comments).
- Too modern. Lack of continuity with surroundings. Sticks out.

- Same appeal as the box girder bridge - Very dull appearing from on top. Does absolutely nothing to make a statement, i.e. Marquam Bridge

**Through Arch** (39 people made comments on this option)

- #1 choice. Maybe the reason the Sellwood Bridge fell off the radar for funding is that it was a deck structure for a remote location and people forgot they were on a bridge (out of sight out of mind). I vote for a bridge that announces to everyone: BRIDGE -- a Through Arch leaves no doubt this is a bridge we are crossing. Since the 1925 steel structure and the bridges of the downtown Willamette are all steel structures, a steel bridge is a basic imperative.
- Arch is my choice.
- Clashes with the neighborhood and natural style.
- Expensive to maintain. Already have one like it.
- Extra maintenance with the cables. Looks okay. Pedestrians kept back from edge, won't be as nice to watch boats, etc.
- I like the way this looks, but if we won't have the amenities I vote this out. Higher maintenance with cables.
- I think the above deck span detracts from the beauty of the river and surrounding area. This option is too old-fashioned looking and I don't like looking at steel beams. If this option is chosen, I would hope concrete is chosen for the deck.
- Looks impressive. I don't think it is too much bridge for the area. Would be enjoyable to use. Looks expensive and high maintenance.
- Looks like an interstate or main highway bridge. Most costly.
- Looks too big for the area.
- My best choice. Safer for water traffic.
- Nice design but maybe a little too "big" for Sellwood.
- Nicer!
- No (2 comments)
- No time to be extravagant.
- No. The rising arch limits views. This design is similar to what crosses the 99E and as a biker/pedestrian I wish I had a better view running that bridge.
- Okay. Would be like Fremont and Sauvie Island Bridges, so a nice theme.
- Pretentious and blocks the view. Expensive to build and maintain.
- Probably too expensive. May obstruct views from walkway (cables, etc.)
- Same as Fremont, its ok but we only need one.
- Second choice. As a builder of bridges I would prefer the through arch span of steel. In Tigard we have one of the finest bridge fabricators in the world (Faught & Co). This would provide local jobs for local workers. Performed by people who shop, work, pay taxes, raise families, buy homes and send their children to college right here in Portland and Oregon which creates a win-win for everyone concerned.
- The other arch bridges fit the location much better. A design of this type would possibly work if only the very top of the arch was above the deck. But looks to be an expensive option.

- This design evokes the Conde McCulloch bridges on the coast and in Oregon City. If the Fremont was built to honor that design, this would be a fitting footnote - a glorious crossing that reflects Oregon's history, traditions and values.
- This is a very attractive bridge, my 2nd choice.
- This is similar to the Fremont Bridge. I like it. My favorite.
- This would be second choice.
- Through arch is beautiful in style. It would be a south bookend to the Fremont Bridge. With pedestrian and bike paths it would be beautiful and well-serve this area.
- Too 70s/modern
- Too big. Too much presence and obstruction of natural views.
- Too coastal.
- Too dramatic an arch for the area
- Too expensive
- Too imposing for the location.
- Too massive, too wide and too expensive.
- Too tall and complicated for the short river crossing.
- Very nice, romantic, elegant and structurally honest solution.
- Yes, this one.
- My favorite bridge design. Makes a statement both architecturally and aesthetically. Obviously like the Fremont Bridge. It is something very nice to look at and cross over.

**Extradosed** (37 people made comments on this option)

- Absolutely not. Too much like the TriMet Bridge to be built below the Ross Island Bridge.
- Choice #2, maybe made of steel.
- Clashes with the neighborhood and natural style.
- Design does not co-exist with the neighborhood which is old classic Portland.
- Doesn't seem to fit in the community.
- I like the traditional styles better.
- I really like this bridge idea because it's a new design to the Portland area and let alone the northwest. I really think that this option would be best.
- I think this would be the best because it is a nice new look and would be the first for Oregon. I think you should help save money and connect Powers Marine Park, Staff Jennings, and Macadam Bay with a road on the east side of 43 connecting them together. I also think that 43 Macadam needs to be 4 lanes all the way through due to increasing growth in the future. Riverview Cemetery should have an entrance on the west side with the same light so you can come straight out on to the Sellwood Bridge and they can make a nice dramatic entrance with the gate for when they are closed.
- Interesting and unique to Portland. Looks expensive, high maintenance, stunted. I like the piers.
- Looks like there is a future expense with maintenance fees with the cables. Too many "feet" in the river.
- Nicest!

- No (2 comments)
- No statement needs to be made for design.
- No, does not fit.
- No. I think this will look awful if maintenance costs can't be met. Looks too "busy."
- No. Too modern for Sellwood's character.
- Not the best solution for this low profile bridge. The suspension concept is so much more elegant and successful as employed in design like that of Redding, CA.
- Pretentious and blocks the view. Expensive to build and maintain.
- Probably too expensive. May obstruct views from walkway (cables, etc.)
- Slick, but not for Sellwood. High maintenance with cables.
- The above deck spans detract from the beauty of the area and river. This is a little too busy for my tastes. Much more suited for a larger bridge. However, if this option is chosen, please use concrete.
- The cables look/feel imposing for a small space.
- The extradosed seems to be the most attractive in a traditional manner and at the same time is more complex. Intuitively it seems the most stable. The structure lacks the amenities of the others.
- This is so modern and amazing looking. It would be great to have if it was in the plan.
- This is too futuristic, doesn't tie in with the historic feeling of Sellwood.
- This would be a different bridge type from all the other fantastic bridges over the Willamette. It would be nice because it is different.
- Too expensive
- Too extravagant.
- Too flashy for Sellwood. Most costly.
- Too grand.
- Too modern and European looking for Sellwood. Stick with something more traditional.
- Too modern, too busy
- Too much!
- Ugly looking. Does not fit the surroundings. Looks cheap at a high cost.
- Wrong place for this bridge. Rather have amenities than a super-structure.
- Too much like light rail bridge going in across Willamette in spring 2011.

**Other Comments** *(12 people made other or general comments)*

- [Note: The following comment was submitted by letter during the survey period, but focuses on a prior phase of the project]. For bridge alternatives: I prefer alternative 5, if the future traffic volume is justified. Since the planned bridge will be on a new location, the interruption of existing traffic can be minimized. Alternative 1, involved a separate pedestrian bridge. The construction cost of a pedestrian will be the same as a motor vehicle bridge. I don't see the separate pedestrian bridge is a good option. Also, it is not clear to me the existing bridge will be replaced or just rehabilitated. Alternative 2, 11' traffic lane does not make sense to me. I guess the existing bridge will not be replaced. Alternative 3, I have

a safety concern for double decking bridge and I cannot see any good reason for using double decking bridge for a new bridge. Alternative 4, this is my second pick, but I don't know why the proposed bridge narrows down to two lanes on east side. Need to know projected traffic volume (30 years).

- I don't think any of these are very inspired from a design standpoint. The "through arch" is the most graceful, but appears to be overkill given the fairly modest span. I would opt for the most simple design possible (that may cost the least) since we do not appear to be trying anything very creative - from an engineering and design standpoint - as can be seen in Europe and elsewhere in the world.
- I like the plan to have street car tracks. We need a street car that connects us to the MAX. Let's make the bridge feel like a celebration. An issue I would like to have addressed is noise pollution. Since I live by the bridge, a noisy bridge will have a negative impact on my quality of life. Let's stay within budget. This would make a big impression on all of us during the time of lost jobs, budget cuts, etc.
- I was born and raised here and would hate to see a small group of Sellwood activist car-haters destroy our transportation improvement opportunity. It is sad to see a two-lane bridge bottle neck replaced with the same. Change the design to four traffic lanes. Make Tacoma 4 lanes again. Traffic stays on the main roads when they are built to handle the traffic. Then they don't cut through side streets.
- Let's make sure Clackamas County also helps pay, or just keep it simple - put a toll on the bridge. If they use it all the time, they can buy a pass.
- Please integrate "soft curb" raised bike lanes into deck design!
- Please keep an underpass for peds and bikes to cross on the east side (Tacoma). Keep it safe!
- Putting a streetcar on a two-lane bridge that carries 30,000 cars and trucks a day will only add congestion and emissions. Keep the street car off the bridge. For all designs: Since motorists in Multnomah County will be paying increased motor vehicle registration whether or not they use the bridge, any funding that comes from the City of Portland must be from directly charging the non-motor vehicle user groups: bicyclists and the people of Sellwood who will "benefit" with a tax or fee instead of double dipping from the people who drive! Add motorist representation to the Citizen Advisory Committee!"
- Thanks for the opportunity to comment.
- The Sellwood Bridge has an extraordinary natural setting where a series of arches would frame the many views from the river and banks. The bridge structure should have a light and gossamer feeling connecting to substantial and well-crafted piers that are high enough for larger boats to clear. Continuity in structure, arch forms and piers extending from end to end is important to visually anchoring this structure to the place - a refinement that many of Portland's bridges lack. A fine rhythm of balustrade piers, pierced balustrade, low-level low-glare lighting on aesthetically integrated standards, and attention to paving patterns is important to the crossing experience especially for bikes and peds. The retaining wall on the west end terminus should be a terraced landscaped element using natural stone facing and integrate artwork. The east end gateway - the entry to Sellwood - should include a pair of substantial

ornamental pylons that extend up from the supporting pier or bulkhead structure below.

- The Sellwood Bridge is a neighborhood bridge - we need the bridge to: 1) intro our community, 2) have streetscape: benches, murals, sculptures, lighting, family friendly strolling. Remember the Seaside Turnaround for charm.
- With any design, please use CONCRETE. With concrete, aesthetically pleasing elements could be made and used in the girders and deckspans. Concrete is much more durable, economical, requires less maintenance and can be designed for 75-100 year life. Using colored concrete would really add to the beauty of this bridge. Also, maintenance costs could be lower than steel and asphalt. It can also be made from local materials, as opposed to steel which would most certainly be imported (making it less "green").

## Comments from Staff

Five members of the project team shared additional comments based on their conversations with open house participants.

1. Citizens were divided between liking the lowest cost bridge type (solely based on cost) and the mid-priced options with an arch below the deck. No one I talked to liked a bridge type with an above deck superstructure. A member of SMILE wants a cycle track in the shoulder/bike lane. We told him that detail will be decided during design. He is concerned that it may not happen. In general, people liked Ricardo's drawings compared to the photo simulations, which seemed "too realistic and decided." A Sellwood Harbor condo owner who will need to move due to project wants us to hurry up and buy her property.
2. Several people said that if all the displayed bridge types fit the criteria, then choose the cheapest and get on with the project. Overall atmosphere of the event was casual. Not much debate went on except for some discussion about having four lanes on the bridge. Many people were interested in how the project would proceed (staging). Some did not prefer the full arch design because they felt the structure would overwhelm the site. Deck arches seemed more appropriate.
3. I thought there was a general tone of "ready to move forward". Some still want more detail, but definitely ready to move forward. I suspect some tire of the process, but that's not our call. Interesting comment from the condo owners - wanted to know if the condos that the County will acquire could be reconfigured to be one-bedroom units and thus keep their overall condo association fees lower. An interesting thought and one that should be given some attention.
4. My station was pretty dry. Most people just asked about the timeline of the FEIS and to describe in more detail the proposed natural resource and historic mitigation. Most were supportive of the proposed mitigation, especially the park mitigation. The proposed bike/ped trail from the bridge to SW Miles Street was popular. Many didn't have much to say about the historic mitigation but those that did were supportive, same with the proposed natural resource mitigation

items (new culvert in Willamette Moorage Park and stream restoration and enhancement along two streams in Powers Marine Park). The general theme, of course, was just get it built. Again, my station was pretty dry so not much to report back on.

5. The people I spoke with generally seemed ready to move forward with a least-cost, attractive design. Many wanted additional lane capacity for vehicles. Opinions varied on the need for/cost effectiveness of the bump-outs/viewing platforms on the renderings. Seemed like we were talking to mostly neighborhood people in Sellwood.