

AGENDA

Cordova Rd - Seguin, TX

MEETING TITLE: Lumen Conflict Meeting Agenda

DATE: 11/30/2023

ATTENDEES: Steven Tate (PD), David Wilder (PD), Erica Keltner (PD), John Tyler (PD), Luke Reed (PD), Terri Ruckstuhl (City of Seguin), Clay Forister (Guadalupe County), Marshall Hollingsworth (Lumen), Nathan Carter (Lumen), David Bryant (Byers, Lumen)

AGENDA TOPICS:	
1. Introduction and Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Lumen – Marshall Hollingsworth, Nathan Carter b) Byers (for Lumen) - David Bryant c) City of Seguin – Terri Ruckstuhl d) Guadalupe County – Clay Forister e) Pape-Dawson - Steven Tate, John Tyler, Luke Reed, 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

5. Lumen	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Underground conflicts:<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. All conflicts are underground fiber opticsii. Texas Administrative Code (TAC) depth requirement is 48" longitudinally and 60" crossing.iii. Conflict ID 175 (Sheet 16)<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. FOC potentially conflicts with TAC requirements and proposed pavement.b. Assumed depth is 2' below existing grade. Ditch cut is 0.5' and pavement section cut is 2' below existing grade. No clearance.c. Potential conflict with TAC line does not meet depth requirements and runs longitudinal under proposed Huber Rd pavement.iv. Conflict ID 338 (Sheet 26)<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. FOC conflicts with TAC requirements, Culverts F, F-1, and potentially conflicting with proposed pavement.b. FOC assumed depth is 2' below existing grade. Culvert F cut is 5.6' below existing grade. Culvert F-1 cut is 3.75' below existing grade. No clearance for either.c. Proposed pavement to match existing pavement grade at SH 123. FOC in potential conflict with pavement and TAC depth requirements.v. Conflict ID 541 (Sheet 27)<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. FOC conflicts with TAC and proposed pavement.b. Assumed depth is 2' below existing grade. Proposed pavement sections of 2'. No clearance.c. FOC runs longitudinally under proposed pavement in conflict with TAC.d. FOC in conflict with TAC depth requirements.vi. Conflict ID 539 (Sheet 27)<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. FOC conflicts with TAC and proposed pavement.b. Assumed depth is 2' below existing grade. Proposed pavement cuts of 1.3' with pavement sections of 2'. No clearance. Proposed ditch cuts up to 1.4'. Minimal clearance.c. FOC runs longitudinally under proposed pavement in conflict with TAC.d. FOC in conflict with TAC depth requirements.vii. Conflict ID 536 (Sheet 27)<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. FOC conflicts with proposed ditch cuts.b. Assumed depth is 2' below existing grade. Proposed ditch cuts up to 1.2'. Minimal clearance.viii. Conflict ID 540 (Sheet 27)<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. FOC conflicts with TAC and proposed pavement.b. Assumed depth is 2' below existing grade. Proposed pavement sections of 2'. No clearance.c. FOC runs longitudinally under proposed pavement in conflict with TAC.d. FOC in conflict with TAC depth requirements.
6. Schedule: Design and Construction timelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Timeline<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Design/Permitting Timelineii. Consultant for design?iii. Construction duration?iv. Any anticipated long lead times for materials?v. Relocate all utilities underground or aerial?

AGENDA

Cordova Rd - Seguin, TX

Page 3 of 3

7. Questions and Open Discussion	a) Does Lumen concur with placement of existing lines? b) Does Lumen concur that all Lumen facilities on Cordova Rd are within the existing ROW? c) Can Lumen verify if facilities on Huber Rd crossing Cordova Rd are in a private easement?
ACTION ITEMS: Description	