

11-10-1922

City Club of Portland Bulletin vol. 03, no. 07 (1922-11-10)

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.)

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub



Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.), "City Club of Portland Bulletin vol. 03, no. 07 (1922-11-10)" (1922).
City Club of Portland. 23.
https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub/23

This Bulletin is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in City Club of Portland by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible:
pdxscholar@pdx.edu.



"Harmony in
Diversity"

PORTLAND CITY CLUB BULLETIN



"Active
Citizenship"

VOLUME III

PORTLAND, OREGON, NOVEMBER 10, 1922

NUMBER 7

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 10

Hotel Benson, 12:10

MUSIC WEEK PROGRAM

Women Invited

*Through the Courtesy of Portland's Best Known Musicians
This Entertainment is Given*

PROGRAM

EARL R. ABBETT, CHAIRMAN

Jeannette Boyer-Xanten *Soprano* Sheridan M. Delepine *Violin*
Margaret Laughton *Flute* Paul Petri *at the Piano*

SPEAKER

JUDGE JACOB KANZLER

"Music As a Moral Asset"

*This first social meeting of the season at the City Club will be a most enjoyable occasion.
Every recent member, especially, will want to attend. Come early. No reservations.*

FATHERS' AND SONS' NIGHT AT THE AUDITORIUM, FRIDAY

SATURDAY, NOV. 18 EXTRA SPECIAL! CITY CLUB HARBOR JAUNT

*The Port of Portland has Invited the Members of the City Club to
Make a Special Inspection tour of the Harbor and Terminals,
Saturday Afternoon, November 18 is the tentative date.*

Arrangements by City Club Port Committee

MAKE IT UNANIMOUS

REPORT ON TRANS-WILLAMETTE BRIDGES

While publication in the *Bulletin* of the following report by the City Planning Bureau is too late for pre-election information for those members who did not hear it discussed last Friday, its present value is not diminished.

Should the bridge measures be approved by the voters, it is expected that in view of this report, the City Club will follow up its recommendations to an extent necessary to attain the official adoption of only such plans as prove to be proper after a thorough investigation of the whole problem concerned with bridges and especially to promote a wise decision in type of treatment in improving the waterfront.

Should the bonds fail to be approved, the same program would naturally continue, because a

thorough survey of the City's bridge needs must be made, in any event.

The following report, adopted by the Governors, was approved by the Club by a vote of 87 to 4.

The City Planning Bureau members are: Henry M. Parks, chairman, Fred M. Henshaw, Jos. Jacobberger, Earl A. Marshall, Chas. McKinley, L. T. Merwin and J. P. Newell.

TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS:

Herewith is transmitted a report on the bridges proposed to be constructed to span the Willamette River.

The course by which the measures were put on the ballot authorizing funds for and sanctioning

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

PORTLAND CITY CLUB BULLETIN

Published Weekly By

THE CITY CLUB OF PORTLAND

Office of the Club 308 Henry Building
Telephone Broadway 8079

Subscription Price \$1.00 per year

Entered as Second Class Matter, October 29, 1920, at the
postoffice at Portland, Oregon, under act of March 3, 1879

Plan now to spend Saturday afternoon, November 25th, with the City Club in a fascinating tour of the Portland harbor and an inspection of the Municipal Terminals. The harbor is at its busiest time now. There will be a boat ride, entertainment features, and a jolly social time as well. Forget your golf for one afternoon.

A call is herewith issued for suggestions in regard to an evening meeting of the City Club soon. The first dinner meeting last year was in October. There have been several calls for another.

The first City Club Volley Ball Team in local history stepped out on the stage against the Ad Club last Thursday evening and gamely took a 15 to 2 defeat. If you want to play, phone the Office.

EXCHANGED—One overcoat, following the City Club meeting last Friday. Someone exchanged overcoats with H. M. Parks by mistake, but Mr. Parks says his does not fit. Notify the Office, please, if you have the extra coat.

The vote of the Exposition report at the City Club last week was 67 to 24 in favor of adopting the report. Members expressed considerable satisfaction with the new system of voting by ballot.

The Committee report on the Community Chest is on the press this week and will be distributed with the Bulletin next week. The report on Garbage Collection and Disposal is also being printed.

The Membership Committee would appreciate five minutes of your time to fill out the return postcard mailed recently for the names of prospective members.

NEEDS OF U. OF O. TOLD

The University of Oregon was decidedly the center of attraction at the City Club meeting last Friday. Through the courtesy of the Oregon Alumni, the U. of O. male quartet was present with a number of harmonious skits; a large bouquet of golden chrysanthemums was placed on the head table and an Oregon pennant was prominent behind the speakers.

The Club's guests of honor were President P. L. Campbell, speaker of the day, Dean E. C. Robbins, of the School of Business Administration, and Dean W. G. Hale, of the School of Law. Among the members present were Dean Ellis F. Lawrence, of the School of Architecture, Philip A. Parson, director Portland School of Social Work, and Earl Kilpatrick, director of the University of Oregon, Portland Center.

Members of the Oregon quartet were John Stuart Evans, of the School of Music, Roy Bryan, Glen Morrow and Maurice Eben.

President Campbell told of the extraordinary growth of the University and the need for additional buildings and instructional facilities which amounts to a real S. O. S. call. The University's "\$10,000,000 in ten years" endowment campaign, just started with initial gifts of \$30,000 for campaign purposes, is intended to relieve the situation.

Alfred F. Parker, vice-president of the Life Underwriter's Association, explained that life insurance policies made out for the U. of O., covering life or maturity of the policy, will be offered by the association to men who wish to donate other than in lump sums.

APPLICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following applications for membership have been received and will be presented for the approval of the City Club, Friday, November 24th:

LEONARD A. ANDRUS,
Industrial Engineer,
702 Spalding Bldg.
J. A. CONVERSE,
Adv. Mgr., Four L Bulletin.
L. K. HODGES,
Editorial Writer, Oregonian.
LEO R. LANGE,
VICTOR H. RENIEKING,
Engineers, 502 Spalding Bldg.
HAL A. WEBBER,
Prop., Webber Academy of Music.

BRIDGE REPORT
CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

the construction of the Burnside and Ross Island bridges was as follows:

BURNSIDE BRIDGE

About two years ago the county commission of Multnomah county and the city planning commission requested the bridge engineer of the State Highway Commission to prepare plans for a bridge to be constructed at Burnside street, the estimated cost of which at that time amounted to some five to six million dollars. In response to joint action of the county commission, the city commission, and the city planning commission, a meeting was held in September last in the office of the county commission at which were present the State Highway bridge engineer, county roadmaster, members of the city planning commission, city engineer and others. Arrangements were made at this meeting to revise and check the cost estimates previously made. At a later meeting of a committee of state, county, city planning, and city officials the revised figures were presented and a resolution adopted indicating that three million dollars would be sufficient to construct a high bridge with its approaches, and to acquire the necessary real estate and pay property damages.

The county commission then ordered the measure placed on the ballot as it now appears.

ROSS ISLAND BRIDGE

The movement for the Ross Island bridge was initiated by a popular voiced demand for additional crossing facilities up river. After a plan was prepared by the city engineer and submitted in September last, this bridge project underwent a course of review and progress similar to that applied to the Burnside structure. \$1,600,000 was the estimated cost of the Ross Island bridge and this amount was placed on the ballot. An additional contingent cost of \$250,000 for approaches is involved, which, it is understood, is to be assessed upon the districts affected.

AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

The county commission is the official body responsible for the Willamette river bridges. Final action on all questions of repair, replacement, or new construction devolves upon this commission. It may move on its own initiative or be prompted by representations made by individuals or organized bodies of citizens, city or other officials.

The municipality may participate in deliberations concerning bridge projects and in the

case of the Burnside and Ross Island bridges was represented by the city engineer and its advisory city planning commission.

Co-operation by the State of Oregon has consisted only in the design of the proposed Burnside bridge by the bridge engineer of the highway department some two years ago, and in the case of the Ross Island bridge in checking the estimates of cost of the proposed preliminary plans of the city engineer.

Federal authority is exerted only to the extent of insuring convenient and full use of navigable streams by water craft. The Government prescribes dimensions between piers, channel width, and height clearance. Its customary attitude is to allow local bodies the most liberal freedom within certain reasonable restrictions.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the investigation of the development of these two bridge projects your bureau has found first of all that the official body, the county commission of Multnomah county, has to date considered no plans of any sort looking to their adoption in either the Burnside or the Ross Island projects. The only consideration which has been given thus far has been for the purpose of arriving at a preliminary figure of cost. All discussion of specific plans is therefore unwarranted from the standpoint of the official body, as is clearly shown by the following statement to your Committee made by the three county commissioners:

Commission Makes Statement

"The only proposition now before the people is: shall the Board of County Commissioners be authorized to sell bonds for the purpose of financing the construction of the two bridges mentioned. If the voters grant this authorization for either or both projects, then naturally the Board of County Commissioners will undoubtedly make the most careful plans they are capable of to most properly, expeditiously, and economically furnish adequate bridge service to this city. This body is not committed formally or informally to any particular plan for either project."

Certain more or less detailed plans are being promoted for the bridges at the two locations but it must be evident to all that an insufficient amount of preliminary study has been given to properly determine a number of pertinent points concerning both these projects before any plans for their construction can be wisely adopted. Some of the points which should receive more searching study and contemplation for example, are: why is a steel skeleton structure

proposed in preference to masonry approach-steel channel span; what process of calculation has determined the proposal of a high span and what were the possible alternatives and the grounds for the elimination of arch over truss or deck over through arch; and what are the merits and costs of permanent construction versus lesser first-cost, shorter-lived structures. A most important further consideration is the relationship between the type of bridge and a policy for the permanent improvement of the entire water front.

Careful Study Advocated

The prospective expenditures of an amount so large as five millions of dollars warrants much more preliminary study before the adoption of any final plans. Positive knowledge should be allowed to control and snap judgment and unsupported assumption minimized. We think it quite reasonable that six months or even a year's time could profitably be expended in the preliminary study and development of these projects. The cost of such investigation would be comparatively small and obviously justified. When an expenditure of such an amount is contemplated, a complete record of the stages of progress should be made and evidence made available that some one has devoted careful attention to all essential factors.

The adoption of either of these measures should not be considered as a mandate to the County Commission that it should construct a bridge at each location within the amounts authorized. If such study as here recommended should disclose that a greater expenditure would be in the interest of true economy, the public should be so informed and the matter again submitted to them for approval.

Your Bureau has pointed out several times in the past that in major projects affecting the community a presentation of the whole subject should be made available to interested citizens in such a manner as to permit a review and check from the date offered. In a former report we called attention to the importance of determining bridge elevations and of the impossibility of separating this factor from a consideration of the permanent future improvement of a strip of land several blocks wide along the west-side water front of the Willamette river. The present plans which have been given to the public apparently assume the general community adoption of the water front improvement plan proposed by the city engineer.

Is Waterfront Policy Clear?

For the sake of emphasis we repeat the important fact of this report, namely, that the

adoption of any plan for the Burnside structure will carry with it the adoption of a definite future policy in the development of that area of the city situated near the water front. If the Community is prepared to adopt the City Engineer Scheme of treatment of this area, then the official approval of some such plan as the proposed Burnside structure is in order. On the other hand, if the deliberate judgment of the Community should require a radically different development treatment of this water front and vicinity, then the bridge plans should be carefully studied in relation to this broader development policy and be made to accord therewith.

The above comments in no way imply disapproval of bridges at either location nor should delay in construction be necessary in order to work out the proper solution in both cases.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the above, your Committee recommends as follows:

1. That bridges be constructed at both the Ross Island and Burnside sites, but that, before any plans are officially approved a careful study be made of the future policy to be adopted in the treatment of the area near the water-front, especially on the west side of the river. This is very essential since the type of bridge adopted will practically determine the future policy of the city in this regard.

2. That adequate study be given to both bridges to permit of a determination of the best structural appearance possible within the authorized grant provided on the ballot and an architect be retained to collaborate with the bridge engineer to that end.

3. That the merits and demerits of a high and a low level bridge at Ross Island be presented which will justify the selection of one.

4. That proper protective measures be instituted to obviate the later necessity of the community being required to pay the added cost of Ross Island resulting from the bridge making the island more accessible and valuable; such protection to extend until the acquisition of the property has been submitted to and expression thereon had by the electorate.

5. That in promoting bridges and previous to seeking public sanction therefor, advance study be made sufficient to make a comprehensive presentation of each project in its essential bearings, with accompanying data in complete and convenient form susceptible of verification and made available in sufficient time for deliberate public action.

Respectfully submitted,
CITY PLANNING BUREAU.