

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MINUTES

The Leawood Public Works Committee met on Tuesday, September 16, 2008, at 7:30 AM in the Main Conference Room at Leawood City Hall.

Committee Members in attendance:

Julie Cain (Ward 4 Councilmember)
Ken Conrad
Michael DeMent
Chair Mike Gill (Ward 3 Councilmember)
Jon Grams
Marsha Monica
Gregory Peppes (Ward 1 Councilmember)
Kip Strauss

Committee Members absent:

John Burge (prior commitment)
Sherman Titens

Guests in attendance:

Ron Schikevitz, Burns & McDonnell
Joel Buffington, Burns & McDonnell

Staff members in attendance:

Scott Lambers, City Administrator
Joe Johnson, P.E., Director of Public Works
David Ley, P.E., City Engineer
Julie Stasi, Administrative Services Manager

Chair Gill called the meeting Public Works Committee Meeting to order at 7:31 A.M.

Chair Gill advised he would need to leave the meeting early thereby appointing Councilmember Cain and Councilmember Peppes to complete the meeting after his departure.

- **The first item of business was to approve past meeting minutes.**

Jon Grams motioned to approve the minutes of the August 19, 2008, Public Works Committee Meeting. The motion was seconded by Michael DeMent. All members were in favor of the motion, motion passed unanimously.

- Chair Gill advised we had a fairly short meeting scheduled with two (2) agenda items. Before going to them, he advised the group has had three back to back to back meetings in a row where they have had a fair amount of assignments and we plan to take to the Council October 6th, the recommendation on the curbs. There will probably be more action coming out of that topic. As a reminder, the action item was a recommendation to approve up to a Mill to fund the curb improvements. Timing if the Council moves forward on this would be our next budget session; which would be during the summer when we place it into the budget, so it will not happen overnight-but this will get the ball rolling on that.

Our next meeting right now, is uncertain. When we have an assignment then we meet. If there are no assignments, we will not meet.

Joe Johnson-There are no assignments at this time, so it does not look like there will be an October meeting. It will always be for the same day (as selected-3rd Tuesday).

Next Order of Business: Update on 143rd Improvements, Nall to Mission

Joe Johnson introduced Ron and Joel; Project Manager and Project Engineer from Burns & McDonnell. We had spoken when we started this project, that when we got to this point, we would come back to the committee with an update.

We have met with the Blue Valley School District and we've had our first public meeting. The plans will be going to KDOT in the next couple of weeks for their field check review. Once KDOT does that, things progress pretty quickly after that. We wanted to update the committee on what is being done and some of the issues brought up during the public comment.

Burns & McDonnell rolled out a map of the project on the table for the committee members to see the areas of the improvements.

Joe Johnson advised this was going to be a concrete road, no bid alternate for asphalt. Four-lane, undivided roadway. On the north side there is a ten foot wide bike/hike trail. On the south side we'll have a five foot wide concrete sidewalk. There will be a signalized intersection at 143rd & Mission Road and we will stub in the underground conduit for a signal at 143rd and Roe. We are going to build Roe next year and then we'll extend down to 143rd and tie into Roe.

One thing we have not done yet is figure out the phasing of how we are going to segment the work. One issue we have is that there are so many single family properties that have to have access to 143rd. We cannot completely shut the road down like we did on Nall. We will have to keep it open to traffic and phase it in sections.

Joe Johnson said 143rd & Mission again will be signalized with left turn lanes in all four directions.

Chair Gill-Mentioned that we have a fire station close by, with a lot of north/south traffic on Mission. Asked if we were going to keep Mission Road open at all times?

Joe Johnson-We met with the school. The school's preference is to shut the entire intersection down, start construction when school is done and have the construction done before school starts again. The schools concern is that with as much construction that is planned, if we are in construction during school, it will make their operations a nightmare.

Chair Gill-What about the residents concerns? Losing Mission Road as a north/south corridor is a major thing. Understanding that is the schools preference, but we have a Fire Station just south of it that services many.

Joe Johnson-My guess would be when school started and if we're under construction, because most of the kids that go there are dropped off and if you haven't been out there in the mornings or afternoons. The parents on 143rd Street-they stack up right down the middle of the road for drop-off and pick-up. Based on the school's volume of traffic for picking up and dropping off the kids, it makes their operation a lot easier if we get in and construct it and get out. That was their preference.

We do have a fire station at 127th & Mission that can service the area too that can get to the calls. And the area south of 143rd Street, the Fire Department can access quickly; as we are not impacting anything south of 143rd Street. North of 143rd, they have Station No. 2. Residents will also have 148th Street that they can take over to Nall and then come up Nall if they have to.

Joe Johnson-The public meeting that was held, the biggest issue that came up was from the folks from Steeple Chase in the section between Mission Road and Windsor.

If you can see on the map, there is a hedge row that runs all along this area, which is about where the sidewalk is going to sit. We have told them the hedge is coming out. They asked us if we could push the road north. We would have to push it north about 12 to 13 feet and I have responded back to them that we cannot do that. The problem is if we shift the road north, we start transitioning onto other property owners and we then encroach on the school, the ball fields, the Magellan Pipeline and then it shifts the whole intersection north and then we have a curve to get the back to it right alignment.

Shifting the road north creates a lot of design issues and encroaches on many others. Generally, what we try to do is place the road on the section line so that if you are a property owner, we do not encroach anymore on one property over another. We are not going to shift the road north or south because that encroaches on other properties and the other impact is that if we shift one intersection north, then we end up having to transition to tie back. We are not impacting any trees on their landscape easement so the trees that are being taken out are all within existing right-of-way. That is really the one big area where we have trees that have to come out.

Marsha Monica-Are there any landscape plans, for replacement?

Joe Johnson-The big problem we have with 143rd are all the utilities. We have Magellan Pipeline on the north side and they are very particular about their gas lines. They have 50 foot of right of way. Half of our road is in their right of way. Generally their policy is if they have to fix their main and they dig up our road, we will have to fix it after they leave. We have Time Warner Cable and AT&T on the north side as well. On the south, we have Gas, Water and KCPL. If KCP&L goes underground it will have to be on the south side.

Marsha Monica-Does the plan include maybe some replacement or is the whole tree line going to be replaced?

Joe Johnson-Very little. We will look to see if we have gaps within the existing landscaping and see if we can add to the existing landscape. This is a very tight corridor in that there is not a lot of room within our right of way. That doesn't mean we can't plant trees, but we would have to go back on private property and then buy more easements to do that. This is a federal aid project and we will hire an appraiser. We will pay an estimated \$600,000 for easements. There is a lot of right of way that we are purchasing in addition to utility easements that help with utility relocations. We have not planned in this area getting any additional easements. The right of way and utility easements that are out there are sufficient for us to build a road. If we add trees, we would be looking at planting at the end of our right of way where feasible or within the existing utility easements where feasible.

Ken Conrad asked-Is there a reason why the project doesn't go to Kenneth Road?

Joe Johnson-This is a two phase project. This is Phase 1, which has Federal Aid, scheduled for 2010. The next Phase will go from Windsor all the way to Kenneth Road in 2012. Then we will be done with 143rd across the City of Leawood. The road will be designed for 45 and posted at 35. It is 30 mph right now. And generally, the reason we do not put it higher is because we have so many single family driveways. There will also be a school zone on the road so the speed limit will go down to 20mph. A similar street would be 119th.

Greg Peppes-Asked if there was some sort of action needed by the committee at this time.

Joe Johnson-Advised, no. This was information only and that staff had told the committee awhile back that we would keep them updated with design and feedback. We were wanting to let them know the school has a preference to do the work all in one summer. We will speak with our Fire Department, but do not think this will be an issue, as they have a station at 127th & Mission that can serve the north side and the station at 148th & Mission that can handle the south side of the project.

Joe Johnson advised that with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) develops and cities now have to look at water quality and we are looking at different initiatives to treat the storm water.

Ron Schikevitz and Joel Buffington advised that this project may be a place to install modular wetland curb inlet structures. These structures are designed for water to build up in the inlet and then disburse to plantings. Burns & McDonnell has done many applications to their own campus (9400 Ward Parkway) and in several places around the Kansas City area. Pictures of modular wetlands were shown to the committee.

This type of structure will probably run about four times the cost of a typical unit. A typical storm inlet will run about 3 to 4 thousand dollars. By the time we put in the wetlands, the plantings and extra structure we are probably in the 15 to 20 thousand dollar range for each of these. The area near the school may be the best place to apply this type of structure.

Greg Peppes-Could this be something we could place on the south side in lieu of the hedges we are removing? Is concerned that if we are taking something out, that we put something back in its place.

Joe Johnson-Yes, we could take a look at it.

Ron Schikevitz-We could have an educational sign there as well. If we did this on the south side, that actually would have 2 benefits. We would have to go with the offset structure for the trunk line/stormsewer that is parallel. If we offset the wetlands, that will allow our trucks to go in sideways to the outer structure. We have done a similar structure for Kansas City Missouri on Choteau Parkway.

We do have to be selective on where we place these structures, so that we do not have a lot of pipes coming in together.

Julie Cain-This could be a Green Initiative Goal that the Council is looking for.

Joe Johnson-Advised that he is looking at SMAC Funds, under a demonstration project. This would be the first type of structure for Leawood. SMAC may participate up to 50%. We do not have a lot of right of way to work with. The City only has 100', so we are limited to what we can do to improve water quality.

Joe Johnson-Handed out a copy of the budget for the project. As far as the budget goes, we are doing really well. We estimated construction at about 7.1 million dollars. We are right at 7. If you add the landscaping in, we have about 7.4 million dollars. We have a meeting with KCPL tomorrow. We have done borings to locate rock; that has been a big topic. The rock is about 6 feet deep. There are one or two locations where the rock is about 4 feet. Generally KCP&L can bury within 48" just below grade. The concern was that there was lots of rock out there that might affect the price. Originally KCPL estimated about 1.7 million dollars for their relocation, I estimated about 800 thousand. I think they are now down to about 800 thousand. We will report back to the committee on the outcome of that meeting. If we do bury power lines, we would have an Interlocal agreement with KCPL that would come back to the Governing Body to approve. So the Governing Body can say yes or no. We still will have expenses as a lot of their facility is

within their own easement. We will have the expense to relocate overhead lines and an additional increase if we want to bury them, but I think the cost will be more where we estimated the cost of when we did the budget on this.

Joe Johnson-The next big piece is easement costs. We estimated that at about \$700 thousand and we have a lot of right of way to purchase.

Greg Peppes-Chair Gill has left, are there any other questions or comments?

Moving on to the next item of discussion; Pending business-Traffic Warrant Analysis at 133rd and Roe.

David Ley-The City hired Olsson Associates, an engineering firm to do the warrant analysis at 133rd & Roe. We gave them the traffic counts and the accident data. There were four warrants that they looked at. There are a total of eight warrants for traffic signals, but only four of those were applicable to this intersection. Three of them are on volume counts and one is on accident data. When they originally went through it, it did not meet any of the warrants; based on the posted 35mph speed limit. They went back out and collected 85th percentile speed along Roe (range of 44-45mph). That reduced some of the requirements to warrant traffic signals, they actually ended up meeting three of the warrants. They met the warrants for accidents and two of the traffic volume warrants. They met the warrants because people are going faster than the 35mph posted speed limit.

Joe Johnson-That's why when we do 143rd Street, we will design it for a higher speed limit. Generally you design it for a case of 40 and post it at 35. We are actually going to design it for 45 and post it at 35.

David Ley-That is a perfect example right here. I think they said 85th Percentile is 44 to 47mph, which is approximately 10 miles over the posted speed limit. So on south bound there is an advance warning sign of 30mph placard, but obviously people are not paying attention to that.

Marica Monica-Was there any consideration given to the sight problem?

David Ley-That is not a warrant, and would come more into play on accident data. You would think they would have a warrant based on site distance, but they do not. It is more based on accidents. So the signal does meet the warrant. Typically we try to meet more than one warrant and this location did meet three of the eight warrants. The three out of the four looked at for this location, they met.

Greg Peppes-So if there are no warrants, it is difficult for us to justify going in and now out of eight, we have three that this actually meet.

Marsha Monica-Made a motion that the Public Works Committee recommend to the City Council that the intersection of 133rd & Roe be signalized.

Jon Grams-Seconded the motion.

Julie Cain-Now eventually, the developers would have had to put in this signal? And Leawood is baring the cost if we put it in now? I am all for it, but isn't that the case?

David Ley-Right. If the development on the east side were to come in...if they hadn't approved their final, but if they had have started their construction on that, we would have required them to install that traffic signal.

Michael DeMent-Best guess on when the development would be in place to when they would be required or a time frame, do you think?

David Ley-They would have to come back in. Their preliminary plan expired. So they would have to come back in for a new preliminary plan and get that approved through Council, Planning Commission and then City Council again for a final plan, so that we are probably talking about two years out at least; for the development on the east side.

Marsha Monica-The builder would not be required to pay for the entire light, just a quarter of it, right?

David Ley-We had on the signalization for Sailors Development, four of the corners, it's actually east and west because on the west side there is Parkway Plaza, they own north and south. Actually they own the north part of 133rd Street is on their property too. It's in a landscape easement. So the developer on the west would have been required 50%, the developer on the east would have been required 50% of the...

Marsha Monica-But the developer on the west is already in. Was he charged anything?

David Ley-Actually it was a stipulation that he pay 50% of \$160,000 (signal construction cost at that time) of the traffic signals when they are warranted..

Marsha Monica-so we can get 50% from him because they are warranted.

Michael DeMent-And the cost for the signal is?

David Ley-Estimated at \$300,000.00; \$250 to \$300 thousand for engineering and construction.

Michael DeMent-So \$150,000 if Leawood does it and this developer pays 50%. The earliest we could do it would be?

David Ley-the process would be about a nine months.

Michael DeMent-So \$150,000 to have the signal up in June verses \$0 approximately best guess back through and get to a point where the developers are paying for the whole thing. So two to three years.

David Ley-They have not made contract with us to come back in. At a minimum two years. They are not even talking.

Marsha Monica-Can't you make a stipulation when they do come in that says that they will reimburse the City and say, we're giving you a good deal, because we got it at this years prices.

Jon Grams-Question, if you know that this is warranted and that a light should be there, and you do not do anything, then is the City liable?

David Ley-The City is not liable just because it meets the warrants.

Michael DeMent-The severity of the accidents recorded has been, do we have a sense of are they basically fender benders?

David Ley-Mostly property damage and I do not think there were any serious ones.

Julie Cain-There was one that she knows of where the car was totaled in the last few months.

David Ley-One option they did mention, the recommendation was to install traffic signal and obviously we would have to try to get that into the budget. If that is not a possibility, they did mention they could put a beacon for south bound traffic. A school zone beacon which is a flashing yellow and you could put sensors up on 133rd so when a vehicle approaches 133rd, the light flashes for south bound. Which would kind of help warrant south bound traffic. Beacons price would be estimated around \$20,000 to put a beacon up with detection. That could probably be done within a couple months.

Jon Grams-You do not have in the slush fund in the City's budget for a fund for lights such as situations like this?

David Ley-Public Works does not have a fund available like that.

Greg Peppes-No, it would have to come out of contingency, out of the General Fund.

Unidentified member-This wasn't in the CIP even though a traffic signal was planned here?

David Ley-No, it was anticipated that the developers were going to install it.

Michael DeMent-The question this poses for me is, on a cost benefit ratio, are we gaining anything if we wait or if we feel some compulsion to do something? Does a beacon provide us a cheaper more immediate gain at most?

Marsha Monica-I don't know that a beacon is going to do it.

David Ley- In Olsson's very last sentence they say "This could have an impact of travel speeds along the corridor, although it can be assumed that the beacons would have a limited or short-term impact without additional enforcement."

Greg Peppes-What we have to identify is, number one-we do not have the money budgeted for it, but we're looking at a safety issue here. This is totally different. This isn't something that we want to fix a curb and what we want to do is protect the public. I think what this committee has got to send a message to the Council is that this is important enough, we feel that the public's safety coming out of 133rd is enough that we need to dip into the funds and buck up. We would have to do it for the full \$300,000 and have to collect from one of the developers for it. The other \$150 we'll have to take from ourselves until we can get someone else.

Jon Grams-I would be in favor of doing it as soon as possible, because you do not know if the developer on that corner is going to have money a year from now to pay his share.

David Ley-It was a stipulation that they agreed to.

Kip Strauss-If you do a benefit cost analysis it doesn't take very long to be over \$150,000.

Marsha Monica-I'm finding that that corridor is becoming more of an exercise area. We see people running, bicycling and the concern of kids trying to bicycle across four lanes and people trying to run across four lanes.

Marsha Monica-Again, she made the Motion to recommend to the City Council to signalize 133rd & Roe.

All in favor: Monica, Cain, Peppes, Grams, Strauss. (5)

Opposed: DeMent (1)

Motion passes.

Joe Johnson-We are getting ready to fill out the forms for the Capital Improvement Program, so we will fill out the sheet and program it and it will be up to the Council on whether it is this year or first part of 2009 when they look at prioritizing the Capital Improvement Program; what year they want to do this. It will be discussion for the Council on prioritization on where it gets slotted.

Marsha Monica-Can't we put a stipulation on the east side developers; if there are any in the future that they reimburse the City for those costs?

Joe Johnson-That would be up to the Legal Department in how we would do that.

I would assume that if we already have the west side doing part, we would more than likely have a benefit district and then that assessment would go on a property owner; it was agreed to.

David Ley-They would have to agree to it, otherwise you'd have to force it; because it is 50/50. This is Chuck Peters.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:35 AM

Minutes transcribed by: Julie Stasi (OLYMPUS FILE DS300022)



SCHEDULE REMINDER: If assignment given, the group has chosen to meet regularly on the 3rd Tuesday of every month at 7:30 AM at Leawood City Hall.