

Meeting Minutes

Date	October 18, 2022	Meeting Date	October 18, 2022
Project Name	International Drive (I-Drive) Pedestrian Bridge Overpass Intersection Analysis and Overpass Conceptual Design Study	Project #:	
Subject	Project Advisory Group (PAG) Meeting #1		
Participants	See Below		
Location	Embassy Suites 8250 Jamaican Court Orlando, FL 32819	Prepared By	Rick Baldocchi, P.E. Christine Dellert
Distribution	Meeting Participants		

- Introduction of Participants**

Blanche Hardy, Orange County
 Clint Pletzer, AVCON
 Michael Chatham, HHCP
 Krista Barber, OCCC
 Marcos Bastian, Orange County
 Richard Bilbao, Orlando Business Journal
 Loreen Bobo, FDOT-District 5
 Lucas Boyce, I-Drive CRA
 James Bridge, OCSO
 Brian Brink, OCFR
 Luann Brooks, I-Drive District
 Kristen Darby, Visit Orlando
 Megan Dowdy, Dowdy Realty
 RJ Dowdy, Dowdy Realty
 Bradley Goeb, Universal Orlando

Stacy Huber, International Square
 Georgette LeMieux, Oerther Foods Second Gen.
 Marco Manzie, Paramount Hospitality Management
 Sgt. Gerald (David) McDaniels, OCSO
 Tabitha Moore, International Square
 Chris Mueller, Hilton Orlando
 Renzo Nastasi, Orange County
 Marc Reicher, I-Drive CRA
 Elizabeth Stone, OCFR
 Craig Swygert, Clear Channel Outdoor
 Alberto Vargas, Orange County
 Josh Wallack, Mango's Tropical Café
 Capt. Donald Woods, OCSO
 Scott Workman, OCFR Fire Marshal

Public Advisory Group (PAG) Meeting #3 provided further details on the International Drive Pedestrian Overpass Intersection Analysis and Overpass Conceptual Design Study, including a presentation of preliminary bridge concepts and a comparison of aesthetics for each concept. The meeting organizers also solicited comments from participants. A summary of the discussion is below.

Blanche Hardy introduced the purpose of the meeting and shared a PowerPoint presentation with information on preliminary bridge configuration concepts and a summary of findings. Items discussed included:

1. PAG

- a. The PAG consists of key study partners who will periodically meet (4-5 times) to provide strategic guidance and support to ensure the study meets its objectives.
- b. The project has the support of Orange County leadership, including Mayor Demings, who continues to look to this group to help provide the district with a vibrant pedestrian and bicyclist environment that enhances the entertainment and hospitality amenities of the area. The bridge is within Commissioner Siplin's District and adjacent to Commissioner Wilson's District.

2. Meeting Objectives

- a. The third meeting's purpose is to present preliminary bridge concepts and a comparison of aesthetics for each concept for a pedestrian overpass at the intersection of International Drive and Sand Lake Road. Comments and questions will be solicited from the group.
- b. Blanche offered a summary of the first two PAG meetings, which included:
 - i. Including a barrier at intersections to prevent on-grade crossing;
 - ii. Utilizing stairs and elevators at each intersection;
 - iii. Minimizing impacts to the existing utilities and the property owners;
 - iv. Creating an iconic gateway to the Convention and Entertainment District;
 - v. Considering potential bridge connections to adjacent properties (both elevated and on-grade);
 - vi. Considering the experience of those traveling under the bridge on foot or in vehicles, as well as those traveling on it;
 - vii. Accommodate pedestrians, strollers, and bicycles in the bridge design; and
 - viii. Ensuring ADA accessibility, as well as making sure the bridge is safe and accessible by area public safety officers and first responders.

3. Preliminary Bridge Concepts

- a. Blanche introduced Michael Chatham with HHCP to discuss six preliminary concepts.
- b. The team began reviewing the possible concepts based on bridge length. Every foot of the bridge could cost upward of \$1,000. The team also considered walking distance and convenience for pedestrians as they developed preliminary concepts.
- c. Michael reviewed six configurations and showed diagrams of what each could look like:
 - i. The square configuration has lengths of 126' and 166' bridge spans. If the destination is diagonal, you must travel the two segments of the bridge.
 - ii. The "X" configuration is a much shorter configuration with two 210' spans, and no matter which corner you are traveling to, the walking distance will be the same.
 - iii. The circular configuration is the longest of these options, however it provides a more dynamic experience for the pedestrian or traveler on the bridge. The distance between the points would be 171' and 237'.

- iv. The “C” configuration removes one of the legs of the circular configuration, but it offers a much longer walk distance from Intersection A to Intersection D.
 - v. The “Chanel logo”—or “Intersecting “C”—is less in bridge length and walking distance and offers some advantages.
 - vi. The “I” configuration could be confusing for pedestrians because of the 90-degree turns.
4. Selected Bridge Tower Configurations
- a. Michael shared an image of a vertical circulation option discussed at the last meeting, which involved a switch-back staircase and an elevator. This option would provide an on-grade connection directly to the businesses and has an option for an elevator connection for businesses on the corners. This is the option his team used in its examples of the bridge concepts for this meeting.
5. Preliminary Bridge Configuration Concepts
- a. Michael showed several conceptual renderings of what the square configuration would look like from various angles.
 - b. Michael shared an “X” configuration concept from various angles, with a small node in the center that provides extra space for travelers. This is the third shortest of the options studied.
 - c. **Josh Wallack:** Would the “X” configuration be considered less massive than the previous option?
 - i. Michael agreed that it would be because its bridge length is shorter.
 - d. Michael shared an image from the I-Drive 2040 Vision Plan, which included a circular bridge. This was the least efficient option and the longest bridge of all the designs the team studied. However, because of its long, curving form, it is a nice experience for the pedestrian or traveler.
 - e. Michael showed a series of conceptual renderings of the “C” configuration, which is an attempt to create a gateway coming from I-4 with different perspectives.
 - f. Michael then showed “I” configuration conceptual renderings. This bridge option has several 90-degree corners that pedestrians would have to navigate, and walking distances are long.
 - g. The team then showed a variation of the “I” that superimposed more curves into the “I” form.
 - h. Michael shared a new concept with an “Intersecting C,” which is the shortest walking distance of all the options concerned and all the lengths are curved so the experience is more dynamic for pedestrians, and it created a unique profile from all directions.
 - i. Michael provided a Bridge Configuration Evaluation Matrix that rated each of the options based on travel distances between the intersections, the average travel distance, and bridge length.
 - i. The Intersecting “C” configuration scored best, followed by the “I” configuration and “X” configuration tied.

- ii. **RJ Dowdy:** How is the “I” configuration shorter than the ‘X?’
 - 1. Michael said the “I” is shorter because the center section was only measured once.
 - iii. **Marc Reicher:** On the “Intersecting C” configuration, what would happen if you connected east and west I-Drive straight across?
 - 1. Michael said that is a possibility the team could look at as these are developed further.
 - iv. **Josh Wallack:** Would each of these options need the same footprint from adjacent properties to build?
 - 1. Michael said it could vary depending upon the structure and would have more information as the study continues. The team expects it can build it in the same/similar footprint.
 - j. Michael provided a second evaluation matrix that scored each configuration option based upon structural complexity, predicted relative cost factor, and design icon value. The “C” configuration scored the best, followed by the “Intersecting C” configuration.
6. Summary Discussion and Comments
- a. Blanche Hardy shared a summary for the PAG:
 - i. The curved bridge configurations create a more dynamic visual and a better experience for the bridge user.
 - ii. The elimination of the crosswalks will increase pedestrian safety and reduce traffic congestion.
 - iii. The corner wrapping seat wall/barrier will be required to prevent people from attempting to cross the intersection on grade.
 - iv. The bridge configuration has little impact on space required at intersection corners.
 - v. The Bridge Configuration Evaluation Matrix showed the “Intersecting C” configuration to be the highest-rated option (lowest score).
 - vi. We are seeking input from the PAG on the preferred configuration to meet the operational, aesthetic, budget, and iconic gateway criteria.
 - b. **RJ Dowdy:** Any of the bridges can be made iconic; the cost and ability to complete the project outweigh other considerations. The square configuration is the least attractive. Prefers the “X” for its simplicity. The pedestrians’ goal is to get back on the ground and arrive at their destination.
 - c. **Brian Brink:** Will the bridge be covered the entire way? Anything on the bridge or covering it could limit Fire Rescue’s ability to access it, including any structure over the middle of the intersection.
 - i. Blanche said there are several options and would bring those back next time and would like to have the option of installing solar. Blanche also asked for Fire Rescue’s truck clearances.
 - ii. Michael said that in the 2040 Vision plan there were 10-story buildings that could exist one day along Sand Lake Road.

- d. **Chris Mueller:** The “Intersecting C” design would keep people moving.
- e. **Josh Wallack:** The corners’ existing conditions have been well thought through, and the project looks more viable without a lot of displacement. The options have been thoughtfully designed to avoid massive changes at the four intersection properties.
- f. **Marc Reicher:** Why would the bridge be enclosed and covered? This could become a gathering space for people. Would rather spend project money on the project’s aesthetics and making it iconic.
 - i. Michael said he believes there is an FDOT requirement to prevent people from throwing items into the intersection below. Blanche said they had looked at some type of covering options that would allow for the installation of photovoltaics and would bring back more options at the next meeting.
- g. **Scott Workman:** The configurations do not matter as much as meeting the life safety protocol. For a non-sprinkled structure, would prefer a shorter travel distance.
- h. **Georgette LeMieux:** The “C” configuration does not provide us with the benefits of the properties on the other corners. Pedestrian safety is paramount.
- i. **Krista Barber:** In favor of the “Intersecting C” design so that people do not miss their turns while walking in a straight line and offering a nice view.
- j. **Sgt. Gerald McDaniels:** Concerned that all the renderings are showing barriers that are so short on grade that they will not stop people from trying to cross in traffic.
 - i. Michael said these will need to be extended and expanded.
- k. **Craig Swygert:** Would it be helpful to rank these based on the Fire Department’s protocol?
- l. **Clint Pletzer:** Asked about the clearance for the fire trucks in the middle of the intersection and requested the dimensions.
 - i. Brian provided details on how the trucks could be maneuvered in traffic. Orange County said it would discuss this issue in more detail.
- m. **Tabitha Moore:** Has the team considered the future FDOT project to widen Sand Lake Road?
 - i. Clint said they have the information on the project and are taking it into account.
- n. **RJ Dowdy:** Could the team provide a larger site plan or basic overlay to look at the project site? The team also needs to consider security and special patrolling.
- o. Blanche summarized that the team heard a favor for the “Intersecting C” and the need to meet with the Fire Department. The team will consider what was said at this meeting to propose modifications to that configuration.
- p. **Stacy Huber:** We are in favor of the “X” configuration.
- q. **RJ Dowdy:** Also in favor of the “X” configuration.
- r. **Josh Wallack:** Can we also say that the bridge right now is constructable without displacing any tenants?

- i. Blanche says it appears that way.
 - s. Orange County called for an informal vote from non-County PAG attendees on configuration preference:
 - i. Square—0
 - ii. Open C—0
 - iii. Circle—0
 - iv. I—0
 - v. X—7
 - vi. Intersecting C—5
 - t. The team will move forward with further exploration of the “X” and “Intersecting C” configurations.
- 7. Next Meeting
 - a. Will share more details on the bridge design at the next meeting.