# MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

The Leawood Public Works Committee met on Friday, January 18, 2008, at 7:30 A.M. in the Main Conference Room at Leawood City Hall.

Committee members present: Chair Louis C. Rasmussen, John Burge, Jon Grams, Carolyn Long, Greg Peppes, Sherman Titens.

Committee members absent: Michael DeMent, Mike Gill, Scott Gulledge, Marsha Monica.

#### **Staff in attendance:**

Traffic Sgt. Tom Hogard
Joe Johnson, P.E., Director of Public Works
Scott Lambers, City Administrator
David Ley, P.E., City Engineer
Mary Lumley, Contracts Administrator
Police Chief John Meier
Julie Stasi, Adm. Services Manager

Brian Shields, P.E., City Engineer, City of Overland Park, KS, 8500 Santa Fe Drive, OPKS 66212

Guests: (by order of sign in sheet-scanned image attached to meeting minutes)

Michael Zanders, 2802 W. 93<sup>rd</sup>, Leawood, KS, 66206

Joe Arri, 8125 Meadow Lane, Leawood, KS 66206

Lori Arri, 8125 Meadow Lane, Leawood, KS 66206

Bill Koehler, 4813 W. 144<sup>th</sup> Terrace, Leawood, KS 66224

Stan Cramer, 15453 Ironhorse Circle, Leawood, KS 66224

Father Bill Porter, 14201 Nall Avenue, Leawood, KS 66224

Katie Barber, 5419 W. 140<sup>th</sup> Street, Overland Park, KS 66224

Karen Dehais, 14614 Canterbury Street, Leawood, KS 66224

Mike Cullinan, Principal of St. Michaels School, 143 & Nall, 768-3609,

Terri Meyer, 4748 W. 138th Terrace, Leawood, KS 66224

Cheryl Naegler, 2023 W. 85th Terrace, Leawood, KS 66206

Jodie Seitzer, 4544 W. 141st Terrace, Leawood, KS 66224

Derron Gunderman, 14304 Reeds Street, Overland Park, 66224

Margie Morrison, 14607 Linden, Leawood, KS 66224

Janine Joslin, 12508 Catalina, Leawood, KS 66224

The meeting began at 7:35 A.M. Roll call was made and quorum of members was established.

- <u>Chair Rasmussen</u> requested that the meeting agenda order be revised in order to
  accommodate the guests in attendance. Requesting that New Business of St. Michaels
  Safety Zone Request be first, Old Business of North Leawood Islands second for
  discussion. <u>John Burge</u> made the motion to approve the revised agenda order. Motion
  second by <u>John Grams</u>. All were in favor. Motion passed.
- Member John Burge made a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting of October 11, 2007. Member Sherman Titens seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed.

Before the discussion was began, Chair Rasmussen advised those in attendance of the rules of the meeting. Advising that Leawood staff would first make a presentation for the committee members to discuss and then after that discussion, ask if any audience guests would like to contribute. This committee is to accommodate the City Council; a fact finding group that comes up with recommendations to the City Council.

### ST. MICHAELS SAFETY ZONE REQUEST.

<u>Joe Johnson</u> described the committee packet and handouts concerning school zones. In review of the information, Mr. Johnson said there was not a set standard for school zones, for speed of traffic, for the number of children crossing or special conditions. Most of what is out there are guidelines when cities have taken a look at the need to establish a school zone. The only standards are for the types of signage, locations of those signs and what they are to look like. Two cities were reviewed; Lawrence, KS and Charlotte, NC. Guidelines are given for establishing crossings and or speed zones for schools. Both policies are consistent with each other. They look at traffic, the ability to use sidewalks, the number of children crossing etc. in helping determine whether you should or should not establish a speed zone.

Once there is a need established, the next step is to look at what the best way is to do that. Is it done with signs only? With a reduction of speed or a speed zone? Do you create an intersection with four way stops? Is there an intersection that can be signalized with a crossing? Based on what is out there in the field, dictates the traffic control measurements that need to be established. In both policies these cities have established, their recommendation is that if you have a crossing, and you have either four way stop or a signalized intersection with pedestrian crossings, then there is no need to establish a reduced speed zone with flashing beacons. The reasoning for both policies was that from a drivers point of view the adding more flashing lights may create distractions for the driver coming up to the intersection.

A handout map was given to the committee members and guests showing the St. Michaels area at 143<sup>rd</sup> & Nall. <u>Joe Johnson</u> advised that Nall had been improved since the picture was taken and that there are sidewalks on both sides of Nall now. Joe Johnson introduced Brian Shields, City Traffic Engineer from the City of Overland Park, Leawood Chief John Meier and Sgt. Tom Hogard who are familiar with this issue.

Jon Grams-What is the problem with this? He sees examples every day of school zones along Mission Road. Corinth Elementary at 83<sup>rd</sup> & Mission even has posted a no right-turn on red at the corner to help them. Why wouldn't there be an established standard for schools? Whether there are 5 or 100 people that cross, it seems it would be more for safety that every school would have something established. Is there some reason why you wouldn't do it or establish a zone?

Joe Johnson advised that there is no standard and not every school establishes a zone. Chief Meier said not so much that he wouldn't say that he wouldn't do it, but thinks there is a problem when people perceive some type of traffic regulation or enforcement where it's not needed. Or a whole bunch of them that they are not needed and then what happens with the general public is sometimes there is a tendency to start ignoring them. Examples; some people request a stop sign at their corner to slow people down. That is not what they are for. We want to make sure that traffic regulatory devices are used for the purposes they are intended for. If you put signs in places where they are not needed there sometimes is a tendency to ignore them.

Sgt. Tom Hogard- The problem currently with St. Michaels Zone is that school zones are normally placed to facilitate children going to and from the school. That is normally done by a Safe School Routing Plan; which lays out the paths for children coming from areas to the school. The problem at St. Michaels is because the current status of the street on 143<sup>rd</sup> is there are no sidewalks. So there is no safe route for children to get to the school. The children have to go across some sidewalks, through ditches, across yards, through driveways and through parking lots in order to get to school. That is not a safe way to get kids to school. At St. Michaels itself there is not exclusive pedestrian route for those children to get there. They have sidewalks around the perimeter of the school but all the sidewalks dump into a driveway or a parking lot. The kids have to go through a vehicle area before they can get back onto a sidewalk to get into the school. On the south because of the construction of 143<sup>rd</sup> currently, you have deep ditches, a narrow roadway with irregular edges and there is no safe place for a child or a child with a bicycle to be able to get to the school. Once it is improved (whenever that happens) and there is sidewalks on both sides, then it may be justified and there maybe more children at that time that will walk to school once it's safe to do so. But to promote something that will let children basically walk in the ditch or walk up on the edge of that roadway even at its current speed of 30 mph is extremely dangerous. To promote that is an issue that this committee should really consider whether to promote that.

<u>Joe Johnson</u> advised that 143<sup>rd</sup> Improvements are in the Capital Improvement Program for construction in 2010. Those improvements include a 10' bike-hike trail on the north side of 143<sup>rd</sup> and 5' wide sidewalk on the south side.

Committee Member Peppes asked if this was something that we have to coordinate with Overland Park. Do we both have to agree if there is a type of signalization installed? And is it this job of this committee to determine if those guidelines exist. Is it up to the committee to say whether we agree with OP's guidelines or not?

Joe Johnson advised that there is a guideline used by Overland Park that they have set for establishing speed zones. If it is recommended to put a speed zone in with flashing lights, and if it does not meet Overland Park's guidelines, then the City of Overland Park most likely would not participate in the funding of it, but they would work with us to have them installed. However the expense would be the City of Leawood's. Their resolution indicates that they would be willing to pay and split the cost but only if it meets their guidelines as established by their ordinance. In answer to your other question, it is up to the Committee to determine if there is a need to have a speed zone set reducing the speed limit on Nall during the times of school.

<u>Carolyn Long</u> asked to describe the controls at Mission Road. Children are in their own world and do not always walk the path given to them.

<u>Joe Johnson</u> advised it was a crossing with a flashing light and reduction of speed. The reason for this speed zone is that it is mid-block. The crossing for the school is actually north of 143<sup>rd</sup> Street and also on 143<sup>rd</sup> it is at the intersection that goes into Steeplechase. The difference with this location is the traffic signal, to put flashing lights up. What a driver will see as you approach the signal from the south, is a flashing light along with the lights at the intersection. Going south on Nall as your approach 143<sup>rd</sup> would be less cumbersome since the flashing lights would be further away from the traffic signals. If flashing lights for a speed zone are installed they generally are placed about 100 feet from the property line of the school. If you are going southbound, then at

about 141<sup>st</sup>, just north of the north drive entrance of the church, you would have a flashing beacon (in Overland Park). As you are northbound approaching 143<sup>rd</sup> Street from the south, there would be a flashing light in close proximity to the traffic signal. Now there are lots of lights flashing at you. The concern is in the policies that have been adopted to guide this type of discussion is that you want it to be as clear as you can as to what the drivers should be paying attention to.

<u>Member Peppes</u>. In other words, by the lake on the Overland Park side, their policy at this time as it stands, does not warrant signalization for a school zone. <u>Joe Johnson</u>-The installation of a speed reduction zone. You can have that without a light or you can have it with a light. Where the crossing is at (which is at 143<sup>rd</sup> & Nall) is a signalized intersection with pedestrian crossing signals and that is the only crossing there. There is no other mid block crossing either on 143<sup>rd</sup> or Nall.

<u>Chair Rasmussen</u> gave a current example of that at Cure of Ars. You can get half way across Mission Road and then you hit a speed zone in Prairie Village. Lets say for the sake of discussion that we vote to have a speed zone. That would require having a flashing light on the south side of 143<sup>rd</sup> by the north bound lane of Nall. And at that point, we would have a sign that says between [7:30AM and 8:30AM] [11:30AM to 1:30 PM] [3PM to 4PM] the area is 20 mph from here through this intersection to the north end of the exit from the church parking lot. That situation (except for the fact that this is a traffic way) is no different than what exists exactly now at Brookwood Elementary at 103<sup>rd</sup> & Wenonga. We have a pedestrian crossing light there that is pedestrian activated. That signal is mid block, but it's only within a few hundred feet of the flashing light.

<u>Chair Rasmussen-</u> looking at 143<sup>rd</sup> Street; which is under design for construction. Where would we put the flashing light? At the end of the church property?

<u>Joe Johnson-</u>Yes and that would be for west bound traffic on 143<sup>rd</sup>. On east bound it would be right before Nall or right after you pull through the intersection.

<u>Chief Meier</u> has no objection from the Police Department to what was just described however right now they do not want to encourage kids to walk on 143<sup>rd</sup> Street.

<u>Chair Rasmussen-</u>Is there any other thoughts to solving this problem regarding solving this speed zone request? Also would request the school to help establish hours of the speed zone and would expect the school to cooperate with Leawood's Police Department. If the PD decides to have a patrol car in the parking lot of the school for enforcement, would there be objections from the constituents or management of the school. <u>Chief Meier</u> -People pay more attention to traffic signals more than any other warning. If they have a red light they are going to cross and that is when we want the kids to cross.

The guests were asked to make comments regarding this issue at St. Michaels.

<u>Father Bill Porter, Pastor at St. Michaels</u> Thinks the signage and lights suggested would be very agreeable to them. Would like to get Overland Park on board as there are students coming from Overland Park as well. Safety of children is the whole thrust of what we need to look at. Nall is 45mph and the speed going up and down Nall is what they are fearful of for the children. Father Porter is fine with the location of a flashing light, wherever the safest location would be for placement and would follow whatever recommendations the City has on that, they would just like to slow the traffic down so the children can get across.

Michael Cullinan-Principal at St. Michaels of the Arch Angels-As Father said, Nall is basically what worries him. The school did their own count from October 30<sup>th</sup> to November 9<sup>th</sup> and they had 162 students walking to and from school. They also had 51 of those coming from the south; which means they were either crossing from 143<sup>rd</sup> the west side or coming from the south through neighborhoods. Mr. Cullinan does not live in Leawood but has worked here for eleven years. Previously he was the principal at Nativity Parish School on 119<sup>th</sup> & Mission before he was the Principal at St. Michaels. Nativity Parish school has a school zone with flashing light and a stop light. As he was principal there, it didn't seem to matter how many kids were walking. On an average he could tell us it was five (if that) that crossed at that light. He had a teacher walk them down to the light. It is common sense to slow down the traffic when you go by a school and maybe that is why you do not have guidelines in the City of Leawood for that specifically, because the City leaders before you just said when you have a school, you slow down. Slowing down the traffic is the main thing they want the City to do. Principal Cullinan advised the school would have no objection to a police officer sitting in their driveway. They would welcome an officer.

Karen Dehais- Advised she is a parent of three girls who attend St. Michaels School and she represents the school advisory committee; which represents the school parents and parishioners at St. Michaels. You asked about where to place the school safety zone. Mrs. Dehais shared a letter from a parent who crosses at the intersection of 143<sup>rd</sup> & Nall. Kelly Cotter (a mother of a 4<sup>th</sup> grader and 2<sup>nd</sup> grader) who stated in a letter that on several occasions she had personally witnessed the dangers presented at the intersection as she walks to take her children or meet them after school. Drivers speed up to make a turn right. They come to a stop inside the crosswalk. On a number of occasions, they surprised the driver that was turning right on red and not paying attention when they had the right of way to cross. The letter went on to say that children crossing Nall on the north side of the intersection are in danger of the south bound drivers on Nall who turn right. These drivers automatically go out into the crosswalk to make their right turn without noticing the children are crossing in the northbound lane just to their left and will soon be in front of their cars. The intersection itself seems to do nothing to make the drivers slow up a little and be aware that children may be crossing the street. On every occasion when she was at the intersection, it seems the drivers are going as fast as they can to get through the intersection or turning right without paying much attention to the possibility that someone could be crossing. Also, several drivers are talking on the phone. For that reason, Mrs. Dehais asked that the speed zone include the entire intersection.

<u>Bill Koehler</u>-A resident living in Highlands Creek with three children who attend St. Michaels. Walking to school is a big attraction for his family however it is not safe at this time. Mr. Koehlers kids usually have a big group that cross at 143<sup>rd</sup> and the speed still worries them on Nall. Mr. Koehler would like equal protection at this school with a speed zone similar to the speed zone protection his children had in earlier years at the Nativity location.

Brian Shields-Commented that he was the City Traffic Engineer for Overland Park and that they had studied the issue at 143<sup>rd</sup> & Nall. Overland Park had performed some traffic counts. The guidelines in the City are always to make school zones, install beacons if needed when there is a level of pedestrian crossing activity that would necessitate that. Having just a few kids crossing a couple of times a day, does not meet their criteria in O.P. If that were they case, they would be all over the place. However if there is

consistent activity then they would go ahead and establish a school zone as described. Schools have changed over the years, for many years Shawnee Mission was the main district. When the city moved south we started seeing Blue Valley and they added some school zones. Over the last few years OP has started taking out school zones as the level of consistent kids decreased. District boundaries can change and neighborhoods change from high usage to no usage years later. Example last year at 127th & Antioch, the speed used to be reduced from 45 to 35 mph. But we only had four or five kids that crossed there (which was spurattic) so OP removed the crossing. last year. Pedestrian signals have been removed as well and they have tried to make some consistent policies so that as times change they can adopt and adapt and make changes to that. Speed reduction zones in general are not intended for kids that are walking along the side of the road. They are really intended for kids that are crossing the road; so that cars will slow down and have more of an opportunity to allow those kids to get across safely. It is less likely that a car is going to leave the road and hit someone as opposed to a car or a person that is crossing the road to be hit.

Brian Shields-Overland Park's statistics for accidents are about 6,000 per year. Out of the 6,000 accidents, we only have about 20 that actually involve pedestrians and bicyclists. The ones that involve schools and school aged kids is less than 5 per year. Usually those accidents are right at a school where there are a lot of kids crossing and someone is turning right and not paying attention. Recently we had one where a crossing guard went out and stopped the kids and the person's mother was on the other side with a new puppy and the kids just ran across the road before all the traffic stopped. The accidents are not typical of kids walking back and forth where a car runs off the road and runs them over. Overland Park's policy is that if the City of Leawood decides to go ahead and establish a speed zone and Leawood decides to pay for the flashing beacons, the speed zones in Overland Park would only be reduced by 10 miles per hour. A 20 mph zone in a 45 mph would never fly in Overland Park.

Greg Peppes-A couple questions. What we need to decide is what streets do we want it on and if there is a reduction in speed is it just on Nall or both Nall and 143<sup>rd</sup>. Also, if it's on Nall, Leawood will be paying the entire bill (in Leawood and Overland Park).

Joe Johnson-Overland Park will work with us to allow us to install it as long as we pay for it. Generally when you look at speed zones, they generally go down about 10 mph. The reason ours are so low is because our speed limits are already at 35mph. You do not want to come in and drop the speed because it will be violated regularly.

Carolyn Long-It is violated now. They go over 40mph. So if we can get them to go 40 by putting something in that says 20, then we're still ahead.

Sherman Titens made the motion to recommend an established speed zone on 143<sup>rd</sup> Street from the east property line of St. Michaels to Nall and from roughly 100 + feet south of 143<sup>rd</sup> Street on the north bound lane of Nall to the north property line of St. Michaels (roughly). Motion was seconded by Jon Grams.

<u>Scott Lambers-</u>asked at what speed? And if 20 mph is the case then we will have one side with 20 mph and one at 45 mph.

<u>Chair Rasmussen</u> advised 20 m.p.h. and with all due respect, Leawood has the exact same situation is in our Prairie Village/Leawood area.

All committee members were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

<u>Chair Rasmussen</u> offered a suggestion that with the Capital Improvement Projects for These Minutes were approved by the Public Works Committee on April 4, 2008. Leawood, funding will be a battle to get into the 2009 budget; which is in process now. Chair Rasmussen suggested that at the public hearing with the CIP Program on February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2008, that at that time guests or someone representing this school zone request be there advocating this project to be installed in 2009.

Part of the contract on 143<sup>rd</sup> should also include the traffic signal part in the 2010 work. Your desires need to be brought to the right hearings in order to get your voice to the City Council and have this addressed.

### North Leawood Stone Islands

Chair Rasmussen advised he had not received any written comment about the draft resolution the committee sent out last meeting from any other members or association. Chair Rasmussen asked the guests to comment on the draft resolution. Michael Zanders- speaking to the notes from their association that was included in the Committee packet. Mr. Zanders is President of the Leawood Homes Association spoke to the committee and said he was on the Leawood Estate Association in years past. Mr. Zanders said they would like to partner with the City for maintenance on the islands. Leawood has 49 islands in their association. They have a 9 member board with an annual budget and collect dues every year. Included in the budget is an island committee with a maintenance budget for cutting the grass and tree trimming. They would like to create and commit a line item in their budget for infrastructure maintenance that will help keep the stone in proper repair. The association is willing to do whatever it takes to assure that their islands keep the old world culture that it has today. The islands do help mold the character of what they would like to live in north Leawood. The stone feature is a key element to the islands. Mr. Zanders advised the association would like to help Leawood figure out a way to partner with them to keep stone islands in their association and neighborhoods. The association is asking the City to help them maintain their character by keeping the stone as stone on the islands. They understand that curbing is an important part of today's streets and need help figuring out how to incorporate the concrete curbing with the stone design.

Mr. Zanders advised that the board had just accepted a long term five-year contract to beautify all 49 of the islands in the Leawood Homes Association. This is something they are intent on doing, they are proud of it. Their goal is to have commonality and they hope to be able to identify the pride of Leawood homes though their islands. The timing of this project with Leawood is significant as they have not spent a lot of money on the project yet. If they can move forward with this project, they would be most appreciative.

Lori Arri-spoke about the islands. Only 13 are stone. Two islands were lost this summer. Some cannot have curbs due to the size of the street. Personally, she would like them to be consistent in appearance. Prefers islands be kept as original as possible. Mrs. Arri presented the draft proposal to the committee that the firm they hired has put together. Their project is \$150,000 and they have to stretch it out for 5 years. This has never been done before in their association where they sat down and made a master plan. Invited the committee members to look at it. The association would like to begin their project in March. They understand how expensive it gets and they do not have that kind of money as an association. They can make yearly repairs, but need help.

# **DISCUSSION**

<u>Chair Rasmussen</u>-The curbing found around many islands is part of the street structure. The curbing is the City's. Inside the curbing, the planting, brick work, fountains, everything seen inside that area belongs to the homes associations. How do we protect *These Minutes were approved by the Public Works Committee on April 4*, 2008.

those islands from the destruction that is happening?

<u>Lori Arri-</u>If we kept up yearly maintenance on the islands; it has always been the structure is the City's. The association plants the flowers and the shrubs. The stone islands that Kroh Brothers built, has no curbing.

<u>Chair Rasmussen</u>-Those islands are essentially homes association facilities. That is not the City's responsibility. With street repair we would replace it like we do irrigation systems we run into.

Greg Peppes asked if the City should spend money on islands. If so we need to have something in writing. Do we reconstruct and then give back to the associations?

Joe Johnson advised that the islands are all within the street right of way, they are not private. Generally when we reconstruct the streets, there are many times that we remove the stone islands because we have to completely rip the street out. What we do is we put back curbs and then they landscape inside the curbs. Or if there was a statue there, we remove the statue, rip the road up construct it.

<u>David Ley-</u>We haven't reconstructed the stone and we don't put landscaping back in, we sod that island.

<u>Michael Zanders</u>-What we are asking for is if you need under your construction projects to tear out an island and then replace it, we are suggesting that you somehow protect the stone piece of it. When the island is placed back in with the curbing that the City budget stone to replace what was removed.

Joe Johnson-What we are saying is when we do a street construction project, we rip out a stone island, we're going to replace it with curb. In addition to that, what the homes association wants us to do is to budget money for reconstruction and reconstruct a new stone structure within the curb that we just put in. Currently, we do not do that. Lori Arri-There is no way in some instances that curbing will fit due to the narrow width of the street. Joe Johnson has told her this.

Joe Johnson-The islands that the City has done in the past have been cul-de-sacs. There are issues with the islands that are on 84<sup>th</sup>, 84<sup>th</sup> Terrace, 85<sup>th</sup> Street off of Lee that to construct curb around them today, you would have to rip the street out and drop the street. The curb is twelve inches high. If you kept the street where it's at and put the curb in to match the street, the back of the curb would be twelve inches up on the stone and you would bury the bottom twelve inches of the stone. Plus the fact that you would narrow the roadway in doing that. The intersections were note made to accommodate adding another two feet (which is what you get with a curb) and that narrows up the street by two feet. You would have to rip everything out, drop the street to put the curb in so that the top of the curb matched the existing bottom of the stones.

Chair Rasmussen-We're trying to protect the islands.

<u>Lori Arri</u>-Yes, but our resolution also says that it's our responsibility to put the stone wall in and we cannot afford that. Your draft resolution is saying if you have to tear out the island you'll put in the curb and then if we the association want a stone wall the way it was originally, the HA has to pay for it.

Chair Rasmussen-We then need to look at the language.

<u>Greg Peppes</u>-We need to change the language so that if we go in there and we tear up the street and they want to still have that island, that we will rebuild that stone wall for them because we had to take it out (along with the curb).

<u>Lori Arri-Not</u> every stone island is crumbling. The islands that the City did back in the 1990's are crumbling. The islands that Kroh put in years ago are still good. There is *These Minutes were approved by the Public Works Committee on April 4*, 2008.

nothing in writing. But the associations have always done the grass and plantings. The City has come out and worked and repaired the structures.

Joe Johnson advised that since he has been here, if someone runs into the islands and damages it, the City has either done the repair ourselves or hired a stone masonry to make minor maintenance repairs to the stones. There are no private easements and there is no distinction in the right of way. His assumption has always been that it is in public right of way and make it safe. There are some stone islands that are 20' in diameter. We're going to have to narrow it up for turning movements' and we will reconstruct a stone structure within the curbing once it's replaced.

<u>Chair Rasmussen</u>-Thinks we are all on the same principal and that is that the associations do the maintenance of the inside curbing area. Whether it's stone or anything else, if it's there and we tear it out, the City should not destroy the associations property even though it may be laying on the easement. Similar to sprinkler systems that are in the easements. <u>The Committee</u> revised Section Five of the Draft 2 Resolution was reworded to say: "The City may, if necessary, remove the island entirely for the street reconstruction or the City will install curbs for the Island and reconstruct or replace the facilities inside the new curb with like materials." [see revision "Draft 3" attached to these minutes].

<u>Chair Rasmussen</u>-If the City is contemplating reconstructing a street, it should contact the Homes Association if there is no curb there and if they want to tear out the island. They should give the homes association an opportunity to get before the council if they disagree and say that they want the island. What this says is that if you want the island, then the City pays for that curbing to protect it and we'll replace the facilities inside.

<u>Lori Arri</u>-The other concern is that some of the islands are in such poor condition now that they ought to be totally torn out. The ones along Lee Boulevard should be torn out and totally rebuilt.

<u>Chair Rasmussen</u>-Suggested that if that is a consideration, that is beyond the assignment of this committee. The direction was to say if we are going to take on the responsibility for protecting that face, what is the City's and what is the associations responsibility? To come in and just tear them all out, that is another project.

<u>Joe Johnson</u>-the price we received was to repair one island and replace four or five. There was a cul-de-sac that we were going to repair and about four others.

Member Peppes-that is why it became an assignment. The Council was not in agreement in spending that kind of money to just do repair and replace a few. What we need to decide is at what point are we going to do any type of maintenance to any of these islands. In the Lee example, the street has already been done, should the City spend money for part of maintenance for these islands that have been recently had it's streets done? Or should we not spend funds? If we continue to do what we have done in the past, we should put it down and write what we are going to spend.

<u>Joe Johnson</u>-The option also would be on these islands, does the City come in and reconstruct these four or five and then after that the association would be responsible for the on-going maintenance after the City does the work?

<u>Chair Rasmussen</u>-We had a proposed contract and the Councils concern was that in the rest of Leawood, the maintenance of islands or facilities on the islands is a homes associations responsibility and not a city's. So we asked what is the physical situation on the ground? Some islands in Leawood have curbing that not only protects but delineates

the responsibility. Inside this curbing is the association and if the City damages it, they fix it. This resolution definitively says that if the City comes along and tears it out, we will put curbing back and if there is no curbing, we will replace the facilities inside. Now I'm hearing that you want the City to come in and maintain these islands that are homes associations facilities.

<u>Lori Arri</u>-Their association has never repaired the stone on the islands. The City has come out and made notes of minor repairs and the City has done it in the past. All the islands are in the right-of-way area.

<u>Joe Johnson</u>-in areas north, the stone is there in place of the curb. We have sent our crews out and do the best repair we can on items that have been requested. This is not on a huge basis, but on direction of the Council or City Administrator, he has gone out to inspect and repair the best that can be done.

<u>Chair Rasmussen</u>-In trying to be consistent from 151<sup>st</sup> to 83<sup>rd</sup>., the assignment was to look at the request to approve a repairs to stone islands in Leawood. So that is why it was asked, because we are not in the repair business. Why is Leawood paying for this? In Leawood Estates, the homes association does the stuff in side unless it's torn out by the City on a project. The Resolution we have will help make it clear to who is responsible for what.

Janine Joslin-Is on and is the Chair of the Leawood Historic Commission. She is not representing the people from the Associations, but is more representing the historic preservation. Historically, what has happened is that the City has maintained and repaired the stone islands. It is not done anywhere else, but that is why the Leawood Homes Association has never taken over ownership of repair and maintenance because the City has always done that. The resolution is trying to give the home owners that responsibility but she does not know that financially they are ready to accept it.

<u>Lori Arri</u>-It is a partnership. We maintain the inside with plantings, but the curbing historically, the City has always made the repairs.

Chair Rasmussen-Is not disputing what may have happened in the past but we need to all come to a way to determine why this is before the City Council when ¾ of it's citizens are paying for the maintenance and repair of islands in their own subdivisions. We are trying to come up with a resolution that can define it and say what each will do. If you come up with a plan for your islands, then the City better get involved in that plan and figure out if you're going to be on the right of way, what is the responsibility of the parties.

<u>Chair Rasmussen</u> asks that the Homes Associations come up with something in writing and get it to him as input. The information can be distributed and the Committee can then have it for the next committee meeting so it can be voted on and then sent to the City Council.

A motion to continue this subject until we hear something in writing from the associations and their input was made by <u>Greg Peppes</u>. Motion was seconded by <u>John Burge</u>. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

## Parking Lot Standards Status Report

<u>Chair Rasmussen</u>-found out during the holiday break that some of the developers are cutting two to three feet out of their parking lots and redoing them where the front end of *These Minutes were approved by the Public Works Committee on April 4, 2008*.

the cars pulled in and they were sinking. So what we have observed is something that they are looking at.

<u>Joe Johnson</u> advised that the item went to the Planning Commission and had a work session to talk about all the LDO (Leawood Development Ordinance) changes. They had questions and our City Engineer responded back to their questions making some changes and including additional information. This will now go to their March 2008 meeting. To the Planning Commission for adoption with the other items. This is an update only. This has to go through the Planning Commission/Council.

<u>Chair Rasmussen</u>-If the thickness of the asphalt is staying the same, then why are the developers literally cutting out 2 to 3 feet?

<u>David Ley</u>-The current requirements is 5 ½ inches of asphalt and we are going to 8 inches of asphalt. What we changed last week, the Planning commissioners were concerned about leaving the testing of the subgrade up to the geo-tech. So we provided a chart that is similar to what we use on our streets for specific testing of frequency.

# • Right turn Lane West Bound, 119th to Tomahawk Creek Parkway

<u>Joe Johnson</u> advised the location meets traffic warrants to construct a right turn lane. The earliest we could get this in the CIP for construction would be 2010. We would design in 2009 and construct in 2010. We have major improvements to that intersection that have to be done with the construction of the City's Justice Center; (also scheduled 2009-2010).

<u>John Burge</u> motions that the right turn lane, west bound 119<sup>th</sup> Street to north bound Tomahawk Creek Parkway be constructed in the same time frame as the Justice Center. <u>Sherman Titens</u> seconds the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

#### • Ad-Hoc Contract Review Committee.

<u>Joe Johnson</u> advised that several years ago the City had an Ad-Hoc Committee that established the City's Standard Design and Construction Contract. In the past couple of years we have had the need to do a smaller, more condensed contract for work for things such as HVAC, small design work. Our two standard contacts are good for larger projects but go way overboard for our smaller contracts.

The Council wanted the Public Works Committee to create an Ad-Hoc committee to come up with a smaller standard contract for the smaller jobs in Public Works, Buildings, and for Parks Department-City Wide.

<u>Committee member Greg Peppes as Chair</u> along with <u>Committee member Sherman</u> <u>Titens</u> and staff members <u>Mary Lumley</u>, and <u>Joe Johnson will make up the Ad-Hoc Contract Review Committee</u>. The group will then return to the Committee with their examples of a smaller contract. All were in favor.

# • Roe Consultant, south of 140<sup>th</sup> Street.

Joe Johnson advised that since the Committee had recently gone through a selection process for the improvement of  $143^{\rm rd}$  and was very happy with the number 2 consultant for  $143^{\rm rd}$  Street, that they would possibly want to forego another selection process and select HNTB for the second project of Roe Improvements, south of  $140^{\rm th}$  Street.

<u>Carolyn Long</u> and <u>John Burge</u> both made the motion to approve the selection of HNTB for the design consultant for the Roe Improvements south of 140<sup>th</sup>. Member Sherman

<u>Titens</u> seconded the motion. All were in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 A.M.

Minutes prepared by Julie Stasi, Leawood Public Works Department.

attachments
Scanned- sign in sheet
Resolution Draft No. 3