

AGENDA

Cordova Rd - Seguin, TX

MEETING TITLE: GVEC Conflict Meeting Agenda

DATE: 12/5/2023

ATTENDEES: Steven Tate (PD), David Wilder (PD), Erica Keltner (PD), John Tyler (PD), Terri Ruckstuhl (City of Seguin), Pablo Martinez (City of Seguin), Clay Forister (Guadalupe County), Matthew Allen (GVEC), Travis Engler (GVEC), Clayton Hines (GVEC)

AGENDA TOPICS:	
1. Introduction and Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) GVEC – Matthew Allen, Travis Engler, Clayton Hines b) City of Seguin – Terri Ruckstuhl, Pablo Martinez c) Guadalupe County – Clay Forister d) Pape-Dawson - Steven Tate, John Tyler, Erica Keltner, David Wilder
2. Project Overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Location and Limits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Seguin, TX o Cordova Rd from SH 46 to SH 123 b) Scope: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Widening Cordova Rd from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with raised median o Realign Cordova Rd at SH 46 o Provide shared use path on both sides o Drainage improvements throughout the project area
3. Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 60% PS&E: 11/2023 b) 90% PS&E: 3/2024 c) 100% PS&E: 7/2025 d) Letting Date: 11/2025
4. ROW acquisitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) ROW is being acquired throughout project limits. Minimum ROW will be 120’.

AGENDA

Cordova Rd - Seguin, TX

Page 2 of 3

kmz, XS's

5. Springs Hill

- a) Texas Administrative Code (TAC) noted requirements:
 - i. TAC distance requirement from ROW is 3' or less.
 - ii. TAC sag height requirement for electric lines is 22' above roadway.
 - iii. TAC depth requirement for underground electrical lines is 48" longitudinally and 60" crossing (encased to within 5' of ROW).
- b) Overhead Conflicts
 - i. Proposed pavement
 - a. Conflict ID 11 (Sheets 5-10)
 - ii. Low sag height
 - a. Conflict ID 154 (Sheet 14)
 - 1. Existing sag height is 20.6' above proposed pavement
 - iii. Pole distance from ROW
 - a. Conflict ID 154 (Sheet 14)
 - iv. Proposed drainage improvements
 - a. Conflict ID 441 (Sheet 15)
 - 1. Conflicts with proposed ditch line (cross-section sheet 192)
 - v. Proposed shared-use-path
 - a. Conflict ID 60 (Sheet 9)
- c) Does GVEC anticipate relocating any poles that are not in conflict?

Utility	STA Begin	Offset (LT/RT)	STA End	Offset (LT/RT)	Sheet(s)
Pole	165+49	61' LT	180+14	60' LT	11-12
Pole	225+50	58' LT	227+93	59' LT	17

 - i.
- d) Potential Underground Conflicts
 - i. Previously discussed underground depths 7'-8'
 - ii. Electronic depths are 5'-7'
 - a. Discuss depth discrepancy
 - iii. Conflict ID 475 (Sheet 9)
 - a. UGE conflicts with TAC requirements and SUP.
 - b. UGE ED is 1'-1.5'.
 - c. Top of SUP is at existing grade. Ditch cut is 1' and SUP cut is 1' below existing grade and is 4" thick. Minimal to no clearance.
 - d. Will need to be relocated with power pole. UGE conflicts with TAC depth requirements.
 - iv. Conflict ID 77 (Sheet 9)
 - a. UGE conflicts with TAC requirements and drain pipe.
 - b. UGE ED is 3'-5'.
 - c. Drain pipe depth is 7' below existing grade. No clearance. UGE conflicts with TAC depth requirements.
 - v. Conflict ID 370 (Sheet 10)
 - a. UGE conflicts with TAC requirements and proposed pavement.
 - b. UGE ED is 3.5'-4' below existing grade.
 - c. Pavement cut is 1.3' below existing grade. Minimal to no clearance. UGE conflicts with TAC depth requirements.
 - vi. Conflict ID 408 (Sheet 22)
 - a. FOC conflicts with TAC requirements proposed SUP, and pavement.
 - b. FOC assumed depth is 2' below existing grade.
 - c. Proposed ditch cut is 1' and pavement cut is 2' below existing grade. No clearance. SUP ditch cut is 0.75' below existing grade. SUP is 0.25' thick. Minimal to no clearance.

AGENDA

Cordova Rd - Seguin, TX

Page 3 of 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. FOC conflicts with TAC depth requirements. vii. Conflict ID 446 (Sheet 25-26) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. FOC conflicts with TAC requirements, proposed SUP, culvert, and ditch line. b. FOC assumed depth is 2'. c. Proposed culvert ditch cut is 3' and culvert cut is 2' below existing grade. SUP ditch cut is 0.75' below existing grade. SUP is 0.25' thick. Minimal to no clearance. d. FOC conflicts with TAC depth requirements. viii. Conflict ID 306 (Sheet 26) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Underground electric line conflicts with proposed drainage culvert b. UGE ED is 4.5' below existing grade. c. The ditch line is 4.6' below existing grade. No clearance. UGE conflicts with TAC depth requirements ix. Conflict ID 330 (Sheet 26) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. UGE conflicts with TAC requirements, proposed pavement, and Culvert F-1. b. UGE ED is 8'-9' below existing grade under proposed pavement. c. Ditch cut is 1' and pavement cut is 2'. UGE ED at Culvert F-1 is 3' below existing grade. Culvert wing wall cut is 9.5' below existing grade. d. Culvert is 6.75' below existing grade. No clearance. x. Easement impacts and relocations
<p>6. Schedule: Design and Construction timelines</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Timeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Design/Permitting Timeline ii. Consultant for design? iii. Construction duration? iv. Any anticipated long lead times for materials?
<p>7. Questions and Open Discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Does GVEC concur with placement of existing lines?
<p>ACTION ITEMS: Description</p>	