

GIBBS PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE
October 24, 2006 Public Open House
Comment Card Responses

1. Only Option A offers a continuous path for all of the users, giving them the same experience.
2. It seems rather foolish to drive pedestrian traffic directly into speedy traffic on the corner of Kelly and Gibbs. The traffic needs to be addressed to prevent slowing of traffic or injury to pedestrians. The traffic should be stopped before this bridge gets built. My concern is that the Corbett-Terwilliger neighborhood will become a parking lot for people working at OHSU. Aside from the existing zoning laws what else will prevent our neighborhood from being swamped with cars?
3. Option A works best, but can't the intermediate supports be more elegantly considered?
4. Option C – prefer the Box Girder design as it is more iconic like the tram tower and being adjacent should be so. Due to the grade (extreme) very few users will be climbing to the bridge but using the elevator, thus a short structure should be designed. Would prefer a covered structure due to the distance that is required to cross. Incorporate LED lighting into the structure's design to make it playful and more inviting. LED could be powered by solar PVC incorporated in the design.
5. I think that A offers the most potential, but the elevator access at the lower level looks like a pit/or shot = not well resolved. Could have negative/not attractive qualities and raise questions about security. Do you need an elevator?
6. I like Option C – Box Girder best because it's the shortest ramp and has no girders overhead – just blue sky.
7. Option A: Ok, but too enclosed; ramp plus elevator is redundant. Option B: Are you kidding? Boring, boring, boring. This is a gateway to the city, not a train yard. Option C: Now you're talking! Innovative and elegant design that works with the tram tower. Openness a big plus. Captures the spirit of original Angelil/Graham design. Much better than other 2 options.
8. I prefer the light airy appearance of the box girder. I also prefer ramps to elevators.
9. It doesn't matter what kind of bridge you build; if pedestrians/bikers cannot safely cross Kelly Street it will be useless.
10. No elevators of any kind! Please answer the question: What's best for peds and bikes, none of these seem to do that, how do you get a bike there? Did not like any of them! Is it possible to continue over Moody so drop isn't so great?

11. I like Option C – it fits visually with the tram. I suspect that it doesn't matter, though, the budget will drive the design.
12. Like Design A – Continuous Truss. I am a bike rider and would appreciate anything that can be done to make getting a bike up and down the east side easier.
13. Should be covered; Do not like mesh sides, prefer clear sides; Prefer Continuous Truss; Need bike access east end – spiral; Need stairs on east end, incline & elevator. Do something we can be proud of.
14. Do it sooner than 4 years. Like # C.
15. They all look workable; guess I like 1 & 3 better than 2. We'll have to carry umbrellas much of the year!
16. Those stairs are intimidating. Why not make a companion piece to the tram – a sloping funicular. Should be cheaper. I could live with any of the three alternatives.
17. First choice B, like design and accessibility; Second choice C; Third choice A.
18. The Box Girder is the best looking design.
19. I like the Continuous Truss design, the way it seems to overshoot and hang out in mid-air. Also the stairway and ramp designs are the most pedestrian friendly.
20. I prefer Option A – the gray in the staircase echoes the tram tower in shape and color. The flow of the stairs with the switchback is much nicer and provides a staircase that is not as steep. The viewing platform is more integrated – with the other options it just seems to dangle in space. Bicycle access on both the steps and elevator is important to me.
21. Option C. I like the openness of this structure but would like the stairway from Option A. Option C used recycled product which is a plus. Wish it was going to be complete sooner than 2010. Thanks for all the work.
22. Option C.
23. I prefer the Box Girder Option best because the bridge appears more open and less obtrusive. I like the ramp/stairs descent option best in Option A, but will give up that feature for the visual.
24. Option A is most accessible for most people.
25. Box Girder.

26. Of all three designs, I like the aesthetics of the Continuous Truss; it seems to 'fit' the best with the design of the intermediate tram tower. I commend the City's attention to the neighborhood's design to be reconnected to the waterfront. I don't think that the Kelly-Gibbs intersection is at all pedestrian – friendly because of the traffic. I hope that the players in this project are talking with the group that is working on the Ross Island Bridge ramp design.
27. It's taking too long, can you speed it up? The Box Girder is the best looking and somewhat matches the intermediate tower. Stairs at east end are very long – redesign with partial ramp, maybe between flights do something significant. At Kelly traffic is very heavy at times.
28. Big concern: Crossing Kelly to access the bridge. Second concern: The steep stairs on options B and C, prefer the ramp/stair combo of Option A. Preference: Option A – if you have a way to keep the birds off the cross pieces.
29. I prefer the Box Girder design that complements the tram tower. It would be nice if the city could fast-track the bridge since they were clearly able to fast-track the tram. 2011 seems like a long time to wait!
30. Neighbor K. Root has great idea about material you use on bridge that absorbs carbon monoxide. Great idea – check it out.
31. Option C is my choice, but with a less steep stairway. Maybe a ramp like Option A and a stairway. Is that surface on Option C durable?
32. I like all the options but I think I like the Box Girder the best. I think it looks the best. I think it is important to make provisions for bicycles on the east end. I think it is very important to consider other pedestrian issues in Lair Hill. It is important to have a way to cross Kelly, Naito and Barbur. The bridge should not be so expensive that there is not enough money left over for the other pedestrian improvements. I am very excited about this whole process. Thank you very much.
33. Gibbs/Kelly ending and beginning of bridge...terrible traffic corner. How can you handle it? Looks scary! Building a big wall from Kelly to Hood as support is UGLY!!!
34. Stroller friendly for transporting very young children; make it bike friendly! Consider weather – rain and wind; visually able to see people on it; safety assist (even elevator); help phones.
35. Please post structure for pumice only no de-icing salts. Please opt for a low-life cycle maintenance cost. Maintenance dollars, especially for bridges are extremely hard to come by. Please minimize the steepness of the stairs. The less steep the more user friendly and attractive it may be. Please consider places for people to stop and sit along the stairs. Many people who walk for exercise are over 60 years.

36. Is there any way to get the walking bridge to be a ramp without stairs or an elevator?
Public would want to ride bikes and run down Gibbs to the waterfront.
37. Option A – best of 3 designs. Considerations: (1) Slope extension from elevator before walk back to maybe save steps; (2) Space for bicycles and use of elevator; (3) Possible double decker.
38. Think about how the bikes and people will interact. Elevator as the only option = bad idea. Think about the grade people will walk/ride up and down. Make it pleasant and welcoming. Green building – use it. Local builders not out-of-state.
39. These three designs are very interesting, but it would be extremely helpful to have cost estimates before choosing. Also I would like to see more passive way to exit the bridge at South Waterfront (ramps, spirals, switchbacks). Also look to more environmentally friendly materials, such as pollution absorbing tiles, etc.
40. Option A seems to be most bicycle friendly because the ramp (off-ramp at South Waterfront) has the most gentle slope. Hurry! We're ready to start using it!
41. Bike access important. Ramp should match design of the tram and tram car to create uniformity, which leans toward #1 (*Option A*) or #3 (*Option C*) design. Need another bridge across Naito as a throughway.
42. Option C: Box Girder is the only viable choice that matches the beauty of the lower tower (which is iconic). The entire project seems to carry the unifying element of “light and openness.” The bridge should also do this. If there is to be artistic input (which would be great!), it should be visionary and in the spirit of modern Japanese and Finnish architecture and landscape design. East/west connections for pedestrians must be strong through the neighborhood. The abutment on Gibbs above Hood could be more imaginative. Thanks very much.
43. I like the “perches” of 1 & 3 (A&C). I also like being able to take stairs down if in a hurry. Suggestion for A (and others?): have elevator stop at top, then bottom of ramp (beginning of stairs). Torn between A and C, probably C.
44. Basic Design: I really like Option C. It is innovative, and much more in keeping with the flowing shape of the intermediate tower. Elevators: I believe this (these) should be at the tower – big enough for bicycles. Stairways: (1) I would not extend the walkway east of the tower. It has to end before you get to the tower – better end it off at the tower instead of running it beyond the tower and then back to it at a lower level; (2) I would run the stairway from the bridge clear out to Moody Street to make less steep. Bicycles can take the elevator or be carried down. Finally: Where are the red aircraft warning lights for the cables. It would *be a* shame if a life flights helicopter hit the wires and crashed on I-5. Thanks for the chance to comment.

45. Thought that this would be done sooner than 2010? You will have to get off your bike to get down to South Waterfront? Make sure we don't go over the budget by millions.
46. The Simple Truss design fits with the Lair Hill area. The Box Girder could fit, but will become a short term design. The Continuous Truss looks like it should go between two buildings downtown. Maybe long term the Box could be the best.
47. Option A – Continuous Truss. By far the most delightful.
48. 1st choice Box Girder; 2nd Simple Truss, 3rd Continuous Truss
49. Like them all, need to get prices.
50. 1st choice – Option C. Are solar lights an option? What kind of lighting? Cost?
51. My husband and I live at SW Gibbs between SW Water and Naito Parkway. We want to know, what is this bridge really for? Just a connector for our neighborhood to the river? Is it meant to bring people into our neighborhood? Will there be an easy way to get to walk along the river if the terminus of the bridge is in the OHSU/Tram complex?
52. Initially I completely discounted Option C – Box Girder. But because by the end it is the Perfect choice for the Gibbs Bridge, it has merit. The problem was that the 3D model did not do it justice. The medium too thick to portray its nuance and purpose. It is upon consideration of the 2D presentation, perfectly reflective of the Tram Tower folding in upon itself in its ascension, only horizontal, more utilitarian for public egress and ingress, unlike structure 2 (Option B) does not require one to turn one's back on the water and interrupt their posture in order to descend, and is beautiful in its simplistic gesture toward the water. Its parallel in a way is the polished stone Vietnam Memorial – austere reverent, surprisingly impactful on account of its beautiful understatement whether opposed to or in favor of the war, it clearly posits the dignity of those whose lives it claimed, while at the same time eliciting stark memories not only of those who bravely perished, but of the precipice to which our country was taken polarized some said to the brink of civil war. The memorial too has a subtle shift tho ascends and leaves the memories as predominant, not itself as a grand blatant structure. The Box Girder similarly connects and evokes the feeling of the grace of that which it connects. Tho not blatant it is an elegant statement of connection. (For future presentation however, the 3D version should be redone. It in no way represents the beauty of Option C.)
53. Thanks for opening the plans to us. The Box Girder design is visually more appealing and the gentler stair system in Option A seems easier to traverse. All designs will be bike friendly?
54. Option B – Don't do it! Looks like an old old bridge! Option C – Box Girder is beautiful and respects the tram tower, the site at the base and the river. Option B – Nice concept but needs work – ignores the connection to the river so it doesn't work well. (*I think they mean Option A.*)

55. I prefer the Continuous Truss scheme – Option A. The Simple Truss seems too mundane. The Box Girder appears sculptural, but it seems to get too massive at certain points.
56. Area to sit on the bridge would be helpful. Also bike access up the stairs.
57. I think I like the Option A because of its overlook at the switchback – also the less steep incline is less intimidating than the other steep stairs. I would want to bring my bicycle over this. It would probably be easier to drag my bike up and down this type of slope. But maybe I would just end up going to Harrison like I do now because on Harrison I just have to stop at the light and I don't have to walk my bike at all. It might be nice to have street access from the bottom of the bridge before the stairs. Is that possible?
58. I like Option C: Box Girder, because the experience of walking through it looks more open and welcoming. The other options looked a bit prison-like.
59. I like Option C. I would like to see it wrap around the tram tower or maybe open up and create a “viewpoint” with benches so people can enjoy the view of the river and Mt. Hood, etc.
60. Option C is my first choice. The tram is unique to the Portland skyline. Keep the spirit of the tram structure by building Option C. Option A – second choice. No on Option B. Can it get built sooner?
61. Overall I like Option C. The only thing I would like to change is to incorporate the tram tower into the bridge structure (like in Option A).