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McGill Smith Punshon, Inc.

**Architect’s Meeting Notes**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date: | 12/20/13 | | Time: | 9:00 am | Location: | BCEO |
| Project: | | **Butler Tech Bioscience Access Road** | | | | |
| Project #: | | 06398.02 | | | | |
| Attendance: | | Greg Wilkens, Matt Loeffler, Eric Pottenger, Steve Hartke, Kar Singh, BCEO; Jan Kesselring, Jim Reffitt, Butler Tech; Chris Wunnenberg, Schumacher, Dugan; Caroline Duffy, Barr Prevost; Rich Arnold, Craig Rambo, MSP. | | | | |

⚫ Meeting Notes:

Butler Tech / County Engineer Meeting

December 20, 2013

1. Phase I Traffic Count (32,000 SQ FT)
2. maximum 175 cars w/ 11 buses = max number.
3. opens 2015
4. Maximum within 5 years 300 max students by 2020 during the day
5. The present number of students arriving at Butler Tech Schools = 50% by bus and 50% by car.
6. 1:00-2:05 leaving same number
7. Evening 100 student = 120 cars at 5-6:30 arrival Departure at 9-10 at night
8. Horizon year for Traffic Impact Study (TIS) 2035 or 20 years after opening day
9. Phase 2 (add’l 20,000 SQ FT): 20 years out, not considered in TIS
10. 100 additional students (400 daytime students) during the day and the same # of adult students as in Phase 1 during the evening. (BCEO:What is total vehicle count in daytime?)
11. Total Phase 2(in evening): 121 vehicles for students and faculty plus the chamber of commerce (25 occupants)
12. Total Phase I & 2 = 296 vehicles (at the end of phase 2)
13. Definition of a Significant change: would be adding a large number of students or a major change to the plan like an office building.

(BCEO: It was mentioned that the plan is for 257 parking spaces yet almost 300 vehicles.)

1. Concern by everyone at BCEO, especially Matt:

An increase in the development would likely result in a roundabout and be very costly. Internal intersection, at Highland Green, may need to change from a “T” to a roundabout. Butler Tech needs to understand they and their partner will need to address traffic impacts in the future, and plan for this cost. Estimated cost to modify “T” into a roundabout is $500K - $600K.

1. Dedicated road:
   1. Design speed: 35 MPH vertical and 25 MPH horizontal
   2. Highland green profiles were submitted at the meeting and will need to show future profile of the extension.
   3. On the Butler Tech site will need the road designed as a dedicated street as well.
   4. Rich A provided the profiles for the roadway up to the project site line. However, they were not what the county expected to see.
   5. Email a copy of the overall plan - access road and the parking on site to Caroline Duffy.
   6. Need 3 – 11’ lanes even though there is a reduction in ROW (80’ down to 60’). A new typical is needed with utilities and wall shown. Roadway is to be 38’ back to back of curb.
2. TIF:
3. Engineer's office will have involvement with TIF funds.
4. Q. How does this need to be done?
5. Tiff funds via the commissioners needs to be identified.
6. It is believed only a portion of Highland Green improvements maybe paid for out of the TIF.
7. Greg indicated this is the most complex roadway they have dealt with County's issue is the front portion.
8. Questions:
   1. How this is going to be built??
9. Subordination: Existing easements, shown within the future ROW dedication, must be subordinate to the county. These utilities/owners must agree their easements or access rights come after the county ROW. This is similar to being first lien holder on a property.
10. Dedication of ROW: the issue is that the project will need to extend onto the apartment’s property when designed. What happens when roadwork extends outside of existing easement?
    1. Option: If needed, twp. will do Imminent Domain.
    2. Confirmed to the County: The roadway easement is owned by BT
    3. Easement: Need subordination and temporary access easement for UDF site.
    4. Issue: Maintain traffic to highland green apartments during construction
    5. Issue: construction traffic to the project site - Engineer will need to run a maintenance of traffic plan; Water Main issue has been in conversation UDF and Lakota Lakes will need to provide the temp easement.
11. Roadway Design Issues to Address:
12. Discussion of the Retaining Wall: Wall located outside the 60’ ROW leaving 20’ from the existing 80’ access easement. However, wall needs to be a couple feet from ROW. Good possibility a temporary work agreement/easement will be necessary for construction of the retaining wall. Owner is responsible for wall maintenance
13. Concrete sidewalks will be needed. Sidewalk both sides were shown as worst case situation for estimation. One side for walk can be supported by the County. WC Twp needs to approve sidewalk on one side of street. Both sides sidewalk may be needed along the TIF portion. Chris would like to maintain the walkway that exists outside the easement
14. Location of water in ROW is an issue.
15. Mrs Mefford‘s property has an option to purchase so they cannot discuss alterations to the site. Unless imminent domain is used.
16. Maintaining utilities during construction: Chris W has talked to Duke about this.
17. Bell, Duke Energy and possibly cable company will be in 18' in the private property for pole line. Payment may make them move faster but not certain. they can hold up the project and have done so in the past as the county cannot force them to do things. Bell has been primary offender.
18. Contract Note: Need to account for utility delays within road construction contract. Be sure it is in the notes so if there is a delay the contractor cannot get paid for the project not moving forward. BCEO usually waits until utilities have moved before awarding or authorizing start of construction. Butler Tech needs to determine what their policy will be if the oversee/manage road construction contract.
19. Issue of keeping water in service is an issue to address. There may be an alternate service to switch out temporarily. This needs to be verified with BC Water Department – Constance Kepner
20. One pole at Cinday will need to be relocated? The main line pole clears the project per Chris. Grading may impact it. The grading may cause it to move??? Need to account for future signal design.
21. Maintaining traffic will be an issue.
22. Detention & Water Quality will be provided on the project site for roadway & Butler Tech.
23. Plan prep:
    1. A county roadway set of plans for the access road will be required by the county.
    2. What level of survey has been done? Do not run it off the aerials - they want a good survey.
    3. Rich to let the engineers know the status of the survey
24. The County does not anticipate improvements to Cincinnati Dayton Road based on this project.
25. Traffic Study Phase I: Greg's assumption 3 lanes will carry it. Matt's concern is the intersection at the apartment complex due to future development of Mefford site and old hotel site. Greg Confirmed there will be no improvement to Cinday Rd during Phase I however, Phase II and/or additional development may require dual left turn lanes on Cincinnati-Dayton onto Highland Green.
26. Signal: relocation of signal control cabinet set it up for future expansion of Cinday.
27. Note: Signal poles are long lead time. Chris says they may be able to be relocated.
28. Q. They would need to handle the added lanes and how do you keep the signal operational? May need new ones and be aware of the long lead time.
29. Matt L believes new poles will be necessary.
30. Matt is ok with proceeding with the trip generation numbers provided by Butler Tech.
31. Next steps:
    1. Memorandum of understanding, drafted by Caroline Duffy, for TIS scope to include # of trips developed by Butler Tech. Caroline to send draft TIS scope to Butler Tech for review and then to Matt & Steve. Copies to go to Rich Arnold and Chris Wunnenberg.
    2. Rich will get the revised dwgs w/ typicals and critical sections - line grade typicals, preliminary cross sections through the total project even on the site. Cross-sections every 50' & Show a plan & profile sheet of the wall. Include critical cross sections.
    3. Analysis will take a couple of weeks once Matt approves the TIS MOU.
    4. TIS review will take up to 30 days to complete but should be closer to 2 weeks.
    5. Rich needs to call Steve today to go over what they need for drawings.
    6. Get soil borings (retaining wall) and utilities located asap.
    7. Need to get the wall designed asap. How much room for the wall needs to be identified, tie backs etc. Segmented wall is preferred.
32. Round about analysis: Matt noted to Caroline not to analyze in Phase I or Phase II.
33. Roadway Design:
34. Profile grade & cross slope: For this roadway, it can be different than a subdivision roadway. Steve will talk to Rich. It was also discussed by Steve to create less of a cut in the road by creating a high point in the middle then sloping down to the site.
35. County needs typical sections, plan, profile sheets and cross sections and then can review with them.
36. ROW is narrowed but the pavement is not narrowed. The need to see the critical sections with the 3 lanes. Greg Wilkens reasserted they need to see the sections.
37. Change the road design to reduce the wall.
38. Design speed covers site distance. Roadway profile, see 18A above, is too flat.
39. Next Meeting:
40. Butler Tech to assess the need for a meeting December 30.
41. January 6 meeting

**ITEMS TO VERIFY/FOLLOW UP WITH:** See Note 16

These notes state MSP’s understanding of items discussed/reviewed and decisions made. Please inform MSP in writing of any revisions required. If no written response is received within seven days of issuance of these notes, it shall be understood that all parties receiving these notes are in agreement with the contents.

**NOTES BY:** Craig Rambo McGill Smith Punshon, Inc.
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