

AGENDA

Cordova Rd - Seguin, TX

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	Springs Hill – Devan Montoya				
Project Team	Malone & Wheeler (for Springs Hill) – Jill Tarski, Dennis Lozano				
r roject ream	City of Seguin – Terri Ruckstuhl, Pablo Martinez				
	d) Guadalupe County – Clay Forister				
	e) Pape-Dawson - Steven Tate, John Tyler, Erica Keltner, David Wilder				
2. Project Overview	Location and Limits				
2. Project Overview	o Seguin, TX				
	 Cordova Rd from SH 46 to SH 123 				
	b) 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	a) 60% PS&E: 11/2023				
5. Scriedule	90% PS&E: 3/2024				
	c) 100% PS&E: 7/2025				
	d) Letting Date: 11/2025				
4. ROW acquisitions	a) ROW is being acquired throughout project limits. Minimum ROW will be 120'.				

Transportation | Water Resources | Land Development | Surveying | Environmental

5. Springs Hill

CCN transfer

Discuss infrastructure – Number and sizes of lines. b)

documented easements.

4", 8", 16" WL shown on "Sw

Discuss easements – What percentage is documented? c)

Exhibit provided by M&W that Approximately 55% of the of lines in the area from SH 46 to Huber Rd have

- All lines on the south side of Cordova Rd west of Huber Rd are in easements.
- iii. All lines are in easements on the north and south side of Cordova Rd west of Huber Rd are in conflict.
- iv. Easement documentation under review (From SH 46 to STA 186+70, 950' east of Barbarosa Rd).

Springs Hill facilities have conflicts with the following proposed design:

Examples of lines that may be able to remain in place pending depth

verification:

fall in catero

have TAC de

conflicts

- a ()	<u>ID</u>	Station Begin	Station End	<u>Sheet</u> <u>Number</u>	Cross- Section Sheet#
3 d R 5 -	- 508	129+31	137+56	6-7	30-47
	509	138+55	153+31	7-9	49-79
	510	161+00	167+27	9-11	94-107
	487	163+63	167+04	9-11	99-106
	357	174+14	177+11	11-12	120-127
	452	176+96	179+95	12	126-132
a.	454	223+50	229+45	16-17	219-231

Examples of lines that conflict because they run longitudinally under proposed pavement:

	<u>ID</u>	Station Begin	Station End	Sheet Number	Cross- Section Sheet #
	508	129+31	137+56	6-7	30-47
	509	138+55	153+31	7-9	49-79
	510	161+00	167+27	9-11	94-107
	487	163+63	167+04	9-11	99-106
	357	174+14	177+11	11-12	120-127
	452	176+96	179+95	12	126-132
	454	223+50	229+45	16-17	219-231
•					

ummary of conflicts breakdown of each nard conflicts

65% in conflict due eing under ement or directly flicts with struction

PAPE-DAWSON ENGINEERS

		iii. Exan	nples of lin	es that have	e hard con	struction c	onflicts:
			<u>ID</u>	Station Begin	Station End	Sheet Number	Cross- Section Sheet #
			512	199+13	212+07	14-15	170-197
			488	199+13	213+21	14-15	170-199
			490	234+10	242+11	17-18	240-257
		a.	456	238+84	247+17	18-19	249-267
6. Schedule: Design and Construction timelines	a) Timeline i. Design/Permitting Timeline ii. Consultant for design? iii. Construction duration? iv. Any anticipated long lead times for materials? v. Relocate or consolidate facilities?						
7. Questions and Open Discussion	a) Does Springs Hill concur with placement of existing lines?						
ACTION ITEMS:							
Description							