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| **MEETING TITLE:** | City of Seguin – Cordova Rd Reconstruction  Kickoff | | **DATE:** | 09/16/2022 | |
| **PROJECT NUMBER:** | 12775-00  **Meeting discussions points are shown in bold text** | |  |  | |
| **AGENDA TOPICS:** | | | | |
| General Project | | 1. Intro and Team Members-**Brittney Davis is new POC with Raba Kistner’s ENV team as Sam Blanco is no longer with RKCI: bdavis@rkci.com** 2. Status of Administrative Documents    1. AFA- **Drafted AFA has been submitted to TxDOT. MPO call for projects [Oct] has been paused to due to recent letting overruns. Pause may allow additional funds for future funded projects. If AFA is signed/project is let, no additional funding will be provided. Pause on AFA may result in additional funds being available. AFA is critical path for TxDOT processes (DCC, ENV, etc.)**    2. Dual logos with County?- **Yes include Guadalupe County logo.**    3. County / Others?- **No project is 50/50 City/County**    4. Billing-**Keep format/process from 8th street invoices**       1. Status report preference items- **Typical PD status report is sufficient**       2. Invoice template or preference 3. Timeline    1. Survey – Aerial (09/17) 10/2022    2. DCC – 11/2022**\* based on TxDOT’s ability to participate due to AFA status. Aerial, alignment alternative and DSR presented at this conference.**    3. 30% DDRT / Schematic – 01/2023- **Full TxDOT schematic, Review process is min 6 weeks. DDRT process is 4 weeks from submission to receiving final TxDOT comments, this review period is sufficient for City of Seguin and Guadalupe County.**    4. 60% DDRT – 05/2023- **Following TxDOT procedures may require PDCC (pavement design review) and DSRT (safety review) at the 30% or 60% level.**    5. 90% DDRT – 08/2023 (Hold plans during ROW / Utility)- **Shown as 100% in contract, plans ready to let but there will be ~14 month period for ROW acquisition, utility relocations, etc. Certification will not be ready until utilities and ROW are clear.**    6. Final Plans – 12/2024- **4/25 letting, final plans5 months prior to being let.** 4. Funding and Commitments    1. Budget Presentation $31M    2. Prelim OPCC $33M - $37M w/escalation    3. How is ROW calculated | | |
| 110 Feasibility Studies | | 1. Field reconnaissance 2. Geotechnical    1. Pavement alternatives       1. Proposing only flexible options       2. Specific material preferences? – **City of Seguin has minimums, no standards**       3. General preferences required?       4. Will need to estimate ESALs / Counts    2. Pavement Report- **Standard TxDOT report**    3. Drilling and site investigations    4. Borings in 3-4wks; 3 wks for processing draft designs 3. Traffic Studies    1. Received counts    2. Planned analysis / TPP vs Option C vs ESALs- **Proceeding with Option C and requesting ESAL’s from Austin**    3. Summary Report       1. Any template preference? 4. **General Geotechnical Comments**    1. **If ground water is hit, monitoring wells needed**    2. **Due to drought conditions, ground water will likely be low during the time of borings. Geotechnical Engineer to include recommendation for encountering groundwater during traffic signal installation.**    3. **There are areas of high sulfate concentrations in the region but can be spotty. This may impact lime treatment abilities.** | | |
| 120 ENV / Public Involvement | | 1. ENV    1. TxDOT Coordination    2. Anticipating a CE- **Dependent on acreage of proposed ROW, displaced parcels etc.**    3. NEPA / ECOS       1. Workplan development / ENV Toolkit- **Project team develops workplan and TxDOT uses to upload to ECOS- requires AFA**       2. Determination of 404 Permitting       3. ENV Coordination 2. Environmental impacts etc.    1. What ENV considerations are presently known?- **Big Red Barn** 3. Optional Assessments and Schedule 4. Public Involvement    1. Planned Meetings- **City of Seguin to maintain website throughout**        1. Schematic phase       2. Design phase    2. Public meeting processes       1. ADA, location, etc- **Preferred location is Big Red Barn if they are willing to partner and cost is reasonable. Spanish and Spanish materials will be needed.**       2. Approval of outreach materials    3. ROW acquisition    4. Schedule and regulatory timelines | | |
| 130 ROW Data | | 1. ROW    1. Right of entry update       1. Could our team support with non-responders? **Pinnacle will can run TLO report for owner contact information. City of Seguin will start meeting with non-signers to help gain trust. Pinnacle and CD&P willing to participate.**       2. **Two known difficult owners- Continental homes, Charles Urban (previous utility issues).**    2. ROW mapping and deliverables    3. Schedule Update    4. **City of Seguin to share ROW tracking spreadsheet. Spreadsheet to be hosted on PD SharePoint site.**    5. **City of Seguin to order title commitments**    6. **General Title discussion: City of Seguin prefers local title company. Appraisal will have to follow TxDOT procedures.** 2. Utility Coordination    1. Utility layouts    2. Utility Conflict Matrix – TxDOT Standard    3. Major petroleum line    4. NOPC – Preferred template?    5. Scheduled meetings; need to begin soon    6. Seguin specific contacts | | |
| 131 ROW Acquisition | | 1. Uniform Act Requirements 2. TxDOT Forms? 3. Appraisal and Title require TxDOT Pre-Approved List Agent- **Appraisal will have to be from TxDOT pre-approved list. Pinnacle to send City of Seguin a list of a few appraiser/reviewers for selection.** 4. Preparation and starting? 5. Development of plan framework 6. Integrating with Connie Real’s Team 7. Suggested frequency for regular meetings and coordination- **ROW to have separate bi-weekly meetings** 8. Prioritization of problematic parcels 9. Property owner engagement / Public Involvement blending 10. Negotiations and timelines 11. Relocation assistance 12. **Known issue with developer activity- one known, possibility for multiple, developers installing sanitary sewer connections along Cordova Rd.** 13. **New developments will be required to dedicate for 120’ ROW per current throughfare plan.** 14. **City of Seguin to add all new development info to a folder on SharePoint** 15. **There was discussion of the possibility of parallel utility easement and the discussion was led to questions on if this would affect the ENV document type.** 16. **Spring Hill water line will need to be treated two ways: still Spring Hill owned, and City of Seguin owned.** 17. **Potential for water tower at SH 46- ROW acquisition a part of this project** | | |
| 150 Survey | | 1. No planned discussion points | | |
| 160 Roadway Design | | 1. Preliminary Geometric Layout    1. 2 – design alternatives (termini at intersections)- **One option to be realignment**    2. ROW constraints / developments    3. DCC 2. LG process, DDRT / DSRT: **Will met with TxDOT SME’s prior to DDRT** 3. Constraints mapping 4. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities 5. Regional expansion considerations 6. TxDOT RDM governed 7. **City of Seguin has access management guidance** 8. **Land owner at SH 123 owns all four quadrants- may open up the ability for realignment and or grade separate share use paths in ROW pinch point.** 9. **Guadalupe County stated East side of SH 123 realignment would have to be apart of this project if realignment option is selected. Not supportive of offset intersection.** 10. **When ready to let and produce project binder, City of Seguin and Guadalupe County need to provide input on Items 1-9.** | | |
| 161 Drainage | | 1. Data collection and field work 2. Design criteria and design storm 3. Hydrology studies and modeling requirements    1. Existing models 4. Hydraulic modeling and anticipated design- **two bridge class culverts within project limits** 5. HEC-RAS and complex modeling / Hydraulic Data Sheets 6. Storm drain design and outfalls 7. Detention requirements-**if needed, linear/adject to ROW is preferred** 8. **Check impacts 2000’ downstream** 9. **Potential for remapping of floodplain/LOMR** | | |
| 162 Traffic | | 1. TPP vs Option C-**Proceeding with Option C** 2. Signing – specifics? mounts?- **Wedge mounts** 3. Warrants and timing plans; specific templates requested?- **TxDOT signals**   **Huber Rd doesn’t meet warrant yet. Ground boxes/conduit to be installed for future signalization**   1. Traffic signal design – TxDOT Standards 2. Known problem locations- **There are TxDOT projects planned at each signal location (SH 46 & SH 123). SH 123 will occur in the near term and SH 46 is further into the future. May be able to install temp/span wire signal at SH 123 to avoid building a permanent signal that would be replaced by TxDOT. SH 46 will likely need to be permanent signal due to unknown/uncertain construction timeline** | | |
| 163 Misc Design | | 1. TCP    1. Likely quad-phased    2. Lessons learned    3. Public Involvement strategy    4. **Consideration needs to be made for school traffic.** 2. SW3P    1. Constraints and mitigation measures 3. Development of CPM schedule    1. Anything specific required from City | | |
| 164 SUE | | 1. No planned discussion points | | |
| Project Management | | 1. Bi-weekly status meetings (Transition to weekly once project initiates) 2. Invoicing 3. Communication protocols 4. Next steps | | |
| Open Discussion | |  | | |
| **ACTION ITEMS:**  **Description** | | | | |
|  | | | | |