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| **MEETING TITLE:** | Springs Hill Conflict Meeting Agenda | | **DATE:** | 12/7/2023 | |
| **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), Devan Montoya (Springs Hill), Jill Tarski (Malone & Wheeler), Dennis Lozano (Malone & Wheeler) | | | | |
| **AGENDA TOPICS:** | | | | |
| 1. Introduction and Project Team | | 1. Springs Hill – Devan Montoya 2. Malone & Wheeler (for Springs Hill) – Jill Tarski, Dennis Lozano 3. City of Seguin – Terri Ruckstuhl, Pablo Martinez 4. Guadalupe County – Clay Forister 5. Pape-Dawson - Steven Tate, John Tyler, Erica Keltner, David Wilder | | |
| 2. Project Overview | | 1. Location and Limits    * Seguin, TX    * Cordova Rd from SH 46 to SH 123 2. Scope:    * Widening Cordova Rd from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with raised median    * Realign Cordova Rd at SH 46    * Provide shared use path on both sides    * Drainage improvements throughout the project area | | |
| 3. Schedule | | 1. 60% PS&E: 11/2023 2. 90% PS&E: 3/2024 3. 100% PS&E: 7/2025 4. Letting Date: 11/2025 | | |
| 4. ROW acquisitions | | 1. ROW is being acquired throughout project limits. Minimum ROW will be 120’. | | |
| 5. Springs Hill | | 1. CCN transfer 2. Discuss infrastructure – Number and sizes of lines.    1. 4”, 8”, and 16” water lines shown in “Swenson Heights 16in” plans exhibit provided by Malone & Wheeler also shows an unidentified 2” water line near SH 46.    2. At 156+50 56’ RT, as-builts show the 2” water line stopping, but according to field data, there are water meters as far as 164+50 27’ RT. How are those water meters served? 3. Discuss easements – What percentage is documented?    1. Additional easement documentation received 11/28/2023    2. Easement documentation under review 4. Summary of conflict percentage breakdown of each water line:    1. 2” – 92.3% in conflict    2. 4” – 90.8% in conflict    3. 8” – 74% in conflict    4. 16” – 82.7% in conflict 5. Springs Hill facilities fall into the following categories:    1. Examples of lines that conflict because they run longitudinally under proposed pavement:    2. Examples of lines that have hard construction conflicts:    3. Examples of lines that have TAC depth conflicts: | | |
| 6. Schedule: Design and Construction timelines | | 1. Timeline 2. Design/Permitting Timeline 3. Consultant for design? 4. Construction duration? 5. Any anticipated long lead times for materials? 6. Relocate or consolidate facilities? | | |
| 7. Questions and Open Discussion | | 1. Does Springs Hill concur with placement of existing lines? | | |
| **ACTION ITEMS:**  **Description** | |  | | |
|  | |  | | |