



SUMMARY

Bridge Aesthetics Committee Meeting on March 10, 2021

Cortez Road (SR 684) from SR 789 (Gulf Drive) to 123rd Street West
Bridge Replacement Design (Manatee County)
FPID Number: 430204-2-52-01

LOCATION Virtual Meeting (via GoToMeeting)

TIME 10:00 am – 11:30 am

ATTENDEES ***Committee Members***
Jeff Vey, Bridgeport Condos (Bradenton Beach)
Ann Marie Nicholas, Room with a Hue (Bradenton Beach)
Connie Morrow, Cortez resident and Bradenton Beach property owner

Others in Attendance
Kevin Van Ostenbridge Manatee County Commissioner – District 3

Project Team
Roxann Lake, Florida Department of Transportation (Project Manager)
Jesten Abraham, Florida Department of Transportation
Doug Hershey, Lochner (Consultant Project Manager)
Adrian Moon, WSP
Laura Turner, Laura Turner Planning Services

Unable to Attend ***Committee Members***
Joe Adorna, Cortez Park (Cortez)
Mayor John Chappie, Bradenton Beach
Joe Rodgers, Seafood Shack (Cortez)
Karen Bell, Tide Tables (Cortez)
Michael Bazzy, Bradenton Beach Marina

PREPARED BY: Laura Turner

Date: March 18, 2021

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is preparing design plans for the Cortez Road bridge replacement from SR 684 (Gulf Drive) in Bradenton Beach to 123rd Street West in Bradenton. The Bridge Aesthetics Committee (BAC) consists of community representatives from Cortez and Bradenton Beach, providing input on the bridge aesthetics. The group's fifth meeting was held on March 10, 2021. This summary provides the highlights of that meeting discussion, which followed a PowerPoint presentation (slides attached for reference). In addition, this meeting was recorded and the video may be viewed by using this link: <https://transcripts.gotomeeting.com/#!/s/97ffd23cfa58ba983c58ff1ed817fb91c1b59af617a48d695a4811cb055400b8>.

Roxann Lake, FDOT Project Manager, welcomed the group and noted that she is available for one-on-one conversations at any time.

Agenda

Following introductions, Adrian Moon reviewed the meeting agenda:

- Team introductions;
- Meeting #4 (February 10, 2021) Overview;
- Decorative railing discussion;
- Lighting alternatives for Concept H;
- Introduction to MSE wall options;
- Additional feedback from the community; and
- Next steps.

Decorative Railing Options (slides 3 through 13)

Adrian Moon reviewed the nine alternatives with the group.

- Review of Concepts
 - Concepts A – standard FDOT railing designs; “pre-designed”; sunshine pattern; same one being used for Anna Maria (SR 64/Manatee Avenue) bridge
 - Concept B – standard FDOT railing design; “pre-designed”; dense, not as simple
 - Concept C – standard FDOT railing design; “pre-designed”; simple, clean look
 - Concept D – variation of Concept C; circles pattern
 - Concepts E – Island Caribbean style
 - Concept F – more historic look; can add emblems or artwork within the rails; subtle
 - Concept G – Island Caribbean style
 - Concept H – horizontal wave pattern
 - Concept I – “cable rail”; more modern look with the least mass; able to see through the railings (cables)
- Colors were shown as samples; a palette of color is available that can be used for any of the railing concepts; need BAC input on whether you want colors to stand out (like white) or blend in (darker colors)

BAC Input on Railing Options

Based on the BAC input, the railing options were narrowed down to Concepts C and H. For the next meeting, a range of colors will be provided as well as views from different angles/vantage points.

- Connie Morrow
 - Likes Concepts, C, I, or H
 - Concept C – likes simplicity; doesn’t take away from views of the sky or water
 - Concept H – likes the linear simplicity with the waves
 - Concept I – likes simplicity
 - Color input
 - Sky and water are different shades of blue from light denim (Concept A) to turquoise
 - White has too much contrast
 - Blue – more likely to drop out, even with Concept I
- Jeff Vey
 - Concept C - 1st choice; Concept H – 2nd choice; Concept I – 3rd choice; noted that he has not talked to others at Bridgeport Condos
 - Concept C – likes open and simple design; bridge seems to disappear
 - Concept H – make sure wave pattern is not distracting to drivers [subtle and horizontal lines; not the entire railing design so should not be distracting]
 - Concept I – feels like the railing is almost not there

- Color input
 - Water is the blue color shown
 - White will show more dirt and contrast [noted that white will stand out; darker colors blend in; will look at more colors once narrowed down railing options]
- Ann Marie Nicholas
 - Likes Concepts A, F, and H
 - Concept A – likes the sun pattern; don't select for Cortez bridge since this is the pattern that will be used for the Anna Maria bridge (to the north)
 - Concept F – likes the “see through” element; not the opaqueness of the columns
 - Concept H – wave pattern
 - Concept I – do not select; too modern
 - Likes the lighter colors like white or steel, like the guard rails [noted that the white provides contrast so it would stand out rather than blend in]
 - Likes the blue color when looking at the bridge; however, need to make sure the bridge colors are all in the same palette/hue
 - Is stainless steel more durable? [yes]
- Joe Adorna (email before meeting)
 - Prefers Concepts A and H

Other Input

- Commissioner Kevin Van Ostenbridge
 - Confirm that Concept A is for the Anna Maria bridge [Yes]
 - Railing colors – would be helpful to have photos of existing bridges as examples
 - When looking at colors, consider durability; doesn't expect white to remain white for long; likely to need higher maintenance [Quality of the finish will determine durability and maintaining color; while white will look dirty over time, it also has natural cleansing from rain; this has not been an issue with other bridge projects]
 - Concept I – seems to be more durable with less wear and tear

Lighting Alternatives for Concept H (slides 14 through 19)

Lighting alternatives considered color and intensity as well as lighting of 3 faces (all sides), 2-faces (internal faces), and no faces. It was noted that all lighting systems are LED and on timers. Examples were shown from no light to varying degrees of intensity. Colors can vary throughout the day. Based on past discussion, the team looked at variable lighting (ability to change colors, tones, and intensity).

BAC Input on Lighting

- Jeff Vey
 - Color should be understated; doesn't like total darkness
 - Colors change throughout the day from sunrise (yellow/orange) to sunset (rose, salmon)
 - Likes the warmer color tones
- Ann Marie Nicholas
 - Likes the 3 faces option with medium, soft light; “not lit” is not good
 - Use a neutral color
 - Likes ability to change color as well as to dim or increase intensity (depending on time of day)

- Will there be street lamps on the bridge? [Yes, which will be discussed at a future meeting; there will be roadway lighting and pedestrian lighting – which can be combined or separate; if lower poles, more are needed; if higher poles, less frequent; no known Florida examples of lighting from barrier]
- Connie Morrow
 - Received lighting feedback from the community and they want a simple lighting design; consider having the cheek walls extend above the deck; Connie Morrow will email an image that a neighbor provided; if cheek walls are extended up, include a window or opening
 - Will email sketch that was provided with lighting coming from the cheek walls; don't want the lighting above the railing [noted that at the St. Petersburg/Clearwater Airport with guide path restrictions, light poles couldn't be over a certain height; if lighting in the barrier, more feasible to embed in the back side]
 - Prefers neutral rather than cool or warm colors
 - Prefers vertical (up and down) lighting; only east-west and not north-south; only along the piers and not on the arch
 - Likes the lighting of the Skyway and Sarasota bridges
 - Would like to have the lighting shine down [noted that is not possible due to environmental issues]
- Joe Adorna (emailed before meeting)
 - Prefers the 2-faces illumination

Introduction to MSE Wall Options (slides 21 through 25)

There are four locations for MSE walls: two at the west end of the bridge and two at the east end of the bridge. The walls are the transitions from where the bridge structure ends to the existing roadway. At the east end, the tallest MSE wall will be 20 feet and at the west end the tallest MSE wall will be 12. Typical MSE wall options were shared as well as “segmented block” (a new system). Segmented block has a less industrial feel and can allow for more landscaping around the base. Also texture and color options were reviewed.

BAC Input

- Jeff Vey
 - Interested in knowing what the MSE wall view will be from the Bridgeport Condos pool area/adjacent bike path (ground level in middle of complex, facing Cortez Road) [will be addressed at future BAC meeting; need to know existing elevations of spot and images taken]
 - Is precast possible? [yes]
 - Use pre-cast imagery if appropriate; not “cartoony” [noted that the group doesn't want to call attention to the structure; a lot of the wall can be hidden by landscaping; landscaping is good alternative to imagery]
- Connie Morrow
 - Would like to see views at each set of arrows (MSE locations); include landscaping options [noted that at the east end the MSE wall will be 20 feet, where the bridge ends and the roadway begins; it will gradually come down to the existing Cortez Road by time it reaches the jug handle road]
 - Confirm that each panel (in images) is 5 feet [yes]
 - Will ask neighbors about the MSE walls
 - Initial thoughts – make them decorative or hide them
 - Consider consistency in color and texture with the rest of the bridge

- Ann Marie Nicholas
 - Doesn't like the block
 - Would like to see palm trees/landscaping block the wall view
 - Like lighter color palette with landscaping

General Discussion

- Jeff Vey re-emphasized that the bridge should not be massive
- Important to have consistency in color and texture for all the bridge elements
- Use the semi-circular outlooks

Questions

- What is the railing material for Concept I? [stainless steel cables]
- The renderings show 3 columns on the right (east side of bridge); what is this? [This 3rd column allows for phased construction; on both sides, the bridge needs to tie back to the existing roadway; this 3rd column provides a stable substructure when the first half of the bridge is built; construction phasing will be northern and center columns first, then south column last when the remaining portion of the bridge superstructure is built.
- Will the bridge have a gradual incline to the middle (highest point) or will it be a “bump in the middle”? [gradual, smooth curve]

Summary

- Railing options narrowed down to Concepts C and H
- Items will be sent to the BAC before the meeting to allow time for reviews
- In between BAC meetings, email Roxann Lake with any comments or questions about the project

Project Contact

All questions and comments about this project should be directed to Roxann Lake (FDOT Project Manager).

FDOT – District One Project Manager
 Roxann Lake, CPM
 Phone: 863-519-2990
 Email: Roxann.Lake@dot.state.fl.us

Action Items

- Connie Morrow will email the cheek wall image (provided to her) to Roxann Lake for the project team's review
- The date for the next meeting will be March 31, 2021, The meeting will be held virtually from 10 am to 11 am. An information packet will be sent in advance of the meeting so the BAC members can review and share with their communities beforehand

Attachment: Meeting #5 presentation slides