

**MINUTES of the  
PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

Meeting held: Wednesday, November 11, 2020  
Staff at Leawood City Hall-Main Conference Room, 7:30 AM  
Attendees present via ZOOM media format

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT via Zoom:**

Andrew Osman, Chair, Councilmember Ward 1 (listening via phone)  
Julie Cain, Vice Chair, Councilmember Ward 4  
Lori Ames  
Ken Conrad  
Abbas Haideri  
Marsha Monica  
Jim Rawlings, Councilmember Ward 2  
Chuck Sipple, Councilmember Ward 3  
Chris White

**ABSENT:**

Todd Harris

**STAFF PRESENT:**

David Ley, P.E., Director of Public Works  
Brian Scovill, P.E., City Engineer  
Kerry Kanatzar, P.E., Engineer Supervisor  
Julie Stasi, Public Works Admin. Services Manager, Sr.  
Shelly Rexrode, Administrative Assistant

**Vice Chair Cain called the meeting to order at 7:30 AM and welcomed everyone for attending.** Vice Chair Cain recognizing that it is Veterans Day and a shout out to all the Veterans and what they have done for us! (Some technical difficulties noted: Chair Osman advised he was driving so will be listening to the meeting. Jim Rawlings lost video connection and was going to reboot/rejoin.

Julie Stasi read a statement and took Roll Call: To reduce the likelihood of the spread of COVID-19 the meeting of the Leawood Public Works Committee is being conducted remotely using the Zoom Media Format and some of the members of the board may appear remotely. Public comments will not be accepted during this meeting. City Hall is closed to public access during this meeting, however, the meeting will be live streamed on YouTube and the public can access the livestream by going to the link posted on the City's website at [www.leawood.org](http://www.leawood.org). All votes will be by roll call of the committee members.

Brian Scovill-Had a staff announcement introducing a new staff member Kerry Kanatzar. Kerry will be acting as a supervisor over our engineering section in Public Works. Kerry comes to us from Kansas City, Missouri. Kerry will be joining us at these meetings in the future.

**FIRST ITEM OF BUSINESS: Review/approve the previous meeting Minutes.**

**ACTION:** Marsha Monica- Motioned to approve the Minutes of the Public Works Meeting held July 29, 2020.

Chris White-Seconded the motion to approve the Minutes. Roll Call vote of members was taken.

In favor were: Cain, Sipple, Monica, Conrad, White, Haideri and Ames. Motion passed. Minutes Approved.

**SECOND ITEM OF BUSINESS: Review the Design Consultant Selection Process for two future projects: 2022 Mission Road Improvements, 127<sup>th</sup> to 133<sup>rd</sup> and Lee Boulevard, Somerset to 83<sup>rd</sup> Street.**

David Ley-We requested this meeting for consultant selection for two projects coming up. The construction on these projects will occur in 2022, however we need to get started with the engineering work on those projects. Staff will give a brief introduction of each project. The larger of the two projects is Mission Road, 127<sup>th</sup> to 133<sup>rd</sup>.

**Mission Road, 127<sup>th</sup> to 133<sup>rd</sup>:**

This is a \$2.3 million estimated construction cost and includes the following: undergrounding the utilities, metal pipe replacements, storm sewer extension from in front of Mission Trail Elementary School and then take a storm sewer pipe and go east into Gezer Park for several hundred feet (approved by the Stormwater Committee last year and included with this project). With that we will collect water that flows north out of Gezer and into the residential areas that have some drainage issues. We are replacing the sidewalks between 132<sup>nd</sup> and 133<sup>rd</sup> Street. The walks are currently 4 to 5 feet in width and we will be removing those sidewalks and put eight (8) foot sidewalks on both sides of the street that is in front of Mission Trail, as we have a lot of pedestrian activity in that area.

Also possible minor widening at the intersections. Minor means only three (3) feet wide for maybe 100 feet and it will be paved for that entire length. The intent of that will be to create a left turn lane so we can continue the bike lane through those areas. But there will not be much storage, so we are trying to minimize the widening of this as much as possible. We would replace the high pressure sodium street lights with LED Street light fixtures. A Mill and Overlay the pavement and once completed we will install the bike lanes.

In addition to that we are looking for a consultant to review the 127<sup>th</sup> Street and Mission Road intersection. That was referred to this committee a couple of years ago to do a traffic study. We were delayed a little bit on Mission Road Project at 119<sup>th</sup> to 127<sup>th</sup> Street Project. Now that that street is in, of course we have COVID-19 now so traffic is impacted and there is not as much traffic out there right now. We are hoping once traffic returns to normal, we are anticipating late 2021, that we would have that study completed. But we would include it with this engineering project. We would want them to look at the intersection to see what could be done, if its traffic signals being warranted or any other safety improvements.

Marsha Monica-asked how long would the project take? David Ley answered this will be more in line with how we have done past projects (not how we did Mission Road 119<sup>th</sup> to 127<sup>th</sup>). We are going to hire the consultant in early 2021, anticipate EVERGY begin their relocation/undergrounding of the power lines in the fall of 2021. That will take probably 4 to 6 months. It will take a while for EVERGY to do that work and they should be able to maintain two way traffic. We do not anticipate them having to close the road down while they are undergrounding their power lines. There will also be Spectrum and AT&T will need to do undergrounding of their power lines. So we would like to begin construction in March of 2022 on the roadway. Beginning on the north end at 127<sup>th</sup> Street, so we will not impact the school or be in front of the school until summer time. That is probably about a six (6) month construction project for Mission Road at least.

Marsha Monica-There are three entrances into the Waterford Subdivision and also there is one in Cherry Creek and one in Wilshire. In looking at Waterford, three of our Enter/Exits are on Mission Road. How is that going to affect residents getting in and out of the subdivision? David Ley-We should be able to maintain two entrances at all times. The only time we would need to close the entrance is if there is a storm sewer pipe crossing the intersection. There is a pipe at 129<sup>th</sup> & Mission that has to be replaced and the contractor will probably shut that intersection down for at least a week to get the pipe across the street and then patch the street. Also 132<sup>nd</sup> Street has a pipe crossing. They would work one and then after go to the next working south. We do not want to be doing any work at 132<sup>nd</sup> or 133<sup>rd</sup> during the school time. We would want all that work to occur during the summer time.

Marsha Monica-Residents in her area have been involved in a huge projected project with 600 and some apartments and 38 single family homes/ businesses and retail near 133<sup>rd</sup>. Are they going to take into consideration

designing 133<sup>rd</sup> Street intersection for the additional cars and whatever that are going to be on that intersection? David Ley-That intersection of 133<sup>rd</sup> and Mission is actually part of the Mission Road 133<sup>rd</sup> to 143<sup>rd</sup> Street Project. So that engineer is looking at the traffic counts and how that intersection is configured for future traffic. When that consultant (which is Burns & McDonald)-they are designing intersections for full build out in the City and constructing the roadway to those improvements.

Brian Scovill-We will have to evaluate it during the design and come up with a traffic phasing plan that might require one lane closure and one lane of traffic. We will have to look at that to see if we can get away with flagging or if it will be more of a long term moving operation. David Ley-Since we are replacing the metal pipe and it is parallel with the roadway, the contractor will need quite a large staging area to get their equipment adjacent to the trench while they are excavating out the existing pipe so that may narrow the roadway down enough to where we can only do south bound Mission. And the reason why we would select south bound is because of the Fire Station at 127<sup>th</sup> & Mission. We would always want to allow that southbound movement so the Emergency Vehicles could get to where they need to go.

Ken Conrad-Did you mention bike traffic study? That seems to be a real big issue on a lot of the projects discussed recently. Is there something in the Scope of the project about the incorporation of handling bike lanes/and traffic? Is that a part of the project scope for this consultant? David Ley-We anticipate a five foot wide bike lane, striped from 127<sup>th</sup> to 133<sup>rd</sup>. We have a bike lane north of 127<sup>th</sup> Street and then the Mission Road Project south of 133<sup>rd</sup> Street has a bike lane. So this would be the connecting part. This would be constructed at the same time as the south bound lane constructed but then it would be just a continuous bike lane along Mission Road. We would have them look at intersections if we could not continue the bike lanes through an intersection.

Ken Conrad-So then it won't be in their scope of work, they will take recommendations from somebody else?

David Ley-That's correct. We have the Self Propelled Leawood/bike study that was completed several years ago and it has the recommendations for pedestrian and cyclist on several corridors within Leawood including Mission Road. They will be reviewing that information to make sure what is recommended we are trying to implement on this project.

Ken Conrad-The design implementation whether or not it is a five foot bike lane or a six foot...I just know this has been discussed many times before and I guess my question is, we don't need to answer it now is. Is that a design issue that should be a part of the consultant's responsibility as opposed to being reactive to saying, we need a bike lane? If we could just make a note. We have always discussed how do we handle bike traffic and where is it and it's been looked at by a Committee which has good ideas and everything, but when you actually design a roadway and figure out how to do it (an it's something I know nothing about, that is why I'm asking). Is it appropriate to have that as an item of inclusion in a scope of work for the consultants? David Ley-That is a good question. When we get towards the end of this presentation, we do have the RFQ ranking sheet where we could discuss and add that to the ranking sheet somewhere in a category.

Ken Conrad-You mentioned this will include the underground construction of utilities, especially electrical (EVERGY). I know on Mission Road north of 95<sup>th</sup> Street there was some disappointment in how that turned out as far as the location of some pretty big boxes. Is there anything learned on that project that we want to consider or are we at the total whim of EVERGY and the utility system? David Ley-Yes we worked with EVERGY quite a bit on both of our Mission Road Projects (north of 95<sup>th</sup>) and (119 to 127<sup>th</sup>) where we undergrounded the power lines and although you may feel it does not appear that way, Yes, there are strict requirements from EVERGY on the locations of these structures. We do have a little bit of flexibility and we will work with them with placement. We clearly will not place them within sight-triangles and that was somewhat of an issue north of 95<sup>th</sup>. The other

things, we can work with the Homes Associations to see if we can get easements. More than likely they will be on the west side and a lot of that is Cherry Creek HOA.

**David Ley-Lee Boulevard, Phase 3 from Somerset to 83<sup>rd</sup>:**

Estimated construction cost is \$800,000.00. The project is similar to what we have done south of 95<sup>th</sup> Street. We will be widening the street by two feet so we can get the four foot bike lanes in. Roadside ditches will be reshaped and installation of a ribbon curb about 9 inches wide and flush with the street. We will replace the HPS street light fixtures with LED Street light fixtures. Mill and Overlay and include the bike lanes and then also included will be a traffic study for the area near Somerset where there is commercial and office. We have on street parking near Somerset and there is a sight distance issue. We want to have a traffic engineer review that corridor. We have speed limit posted in that area of 25 mph. The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile is closer to 35 mph. So we would like that area studied also. We want to complete a speed study of the section of Lee Boulevard south of 95<sup>th</sup> Street to see if the 35 mph on Lee Boulevard is appropriate and get a recommendation for a speed limit on the remainder of Lee.

Chuck Sipple-Are you going to take a look at the sidewalk on the west side of Lee Boulevard? There also are tree root problems on some of those sections.

David Ley-Thank you for bringing that up. Yes the sidewalk at least near the Somerset Shops is not continuous. We would include with this project to do a sidewalk connection to make sure it goes all the way up to Somerset. Typically we look at the tree roots as budget allows.

Chuck Sipple-Asking if we have to close lanes down from time to time, imagine north bound would be open and south closed? David Ley-On this project we would work with the Fire Department to see how critical the section of Lee is for their access. We will work with the Fire Department on any closure needs.

David Ley-Staff came up with two options we would like a recommendation on for the selection of the consultant. Option 1. We could have each firm provide a separate submittal for Mission Road and then one for Lee. And have the Public Works Committee rank each firm for each project. And we would select the highest ranked firm for each project. So you could end up with the same firm doing both projects.

Option 2. The other option would be to just have the consultants submit for Mission Road as they are somewhat similar as far as the work that is involved and we need traffic engineers. We could do just a submittal for Mission Road and have the Committee rank all the firms. Then the highest ranking firm would be selected for the Mission Road Project and the second highest ranking firm would be selected for the Lee Boulevard Project.

When these firms are going through and creating the presentations it several thousand dollars for them so that is quite a bit of a cost to do both projects and then if we did happen to just require them to do the one project, there is a 40% chance they would get selected for one of the projects.

Vice-Chair Cain-We have done it both ways. We have done Option 2 a couple times in the last four years.

Vice-Chair Cain-Has that proven to be beneficial to the City or beneficial for the project in choosing that option?

David Ley-Yes, we have not had any problems with it and I believe the consultants are happy as it does take quite a while to put a proposal together. It does give them more opportunity to be selected for a project. Brian Scovill-It spreads the money out a little bit. If we select the highest ranked for Mission Road, and the second highest for Lee Boulevard, I can tell you consultants often comment when the same consultant gets selected over and over. That is just one factor.

Discussion.

Marsha Monica-Asked about the grading form example. David Ley-We have slides coming up to show as an example to review the Request for Qualifications (RFQ). If we are proposing five firms, the grading would be 1 thru 5. Abbas Haideri-Firms are all comparable here in this list and he would not hesitate with any of them.

Ken Conrad-Is sympathetic to the cost of putting together a proposal, but having been in that business, that is part of your business. I think the projects if you look at them very objectively are significantly different. Certainly the Lee Blvd. Project is somewhat of a unique roadway though its length and the one that is farther south is a lot more technical I think in traffic and the bikes and 135<sup>th</sup> Street. I think there could be some very different qualities at least they will have to put together an approach to their work for each of these projects. And that will be the bulk of their effort I believe. We have looked at submittals before and always talked about how boiler plate they are, so I'm certainly sensitive to how much they have to spend but am more sensitive to the impact it puts on the City. Is there really an advantage to have one firm do these two projects? He is for submitting on each project individually. Will the timing of these projects overlap? David Ley-Yes the design would be completed in 2021 and the construction of the roadway would begin in March on both of them.

Ken Conrad-So do we believe that that could be a negative for maybe a smaller firm from a people power perspective when in fact they could still have excellent qualifications to do the project as a stand-alone?

David Ley-Well you might get or probably get different Project Managers for each project by the consultant. So I do not believe they would have the same team. Maybe the same traffic engineering staff.

Chris White-What they are saying is with an option 2, they would have one do the Mission Road Project and then the second runner up would do the Lee Boulevard. One team would not be chosen for both or consolidated.

Ken Conrad-so in that option the consultant would make a proposal for the Mission Road Project only, correct?

David Ley-If you go with Option 2 that would be correct. Abbas Haideri-Or you have them submit for both, and then pick one and the second gets Lee, but all present for both projects. Ken Conrad-What his suggestion would be is you have two projects, if each one is their own selection process and if you are a firm that wants to do work, you submit two proposals; one for each of them. Not sure why you would have a submittal for doing a bathroom project at your house and you also have a kitchen project so you are going to submit on the bathroom and whoever is second in that is going to do your kitchen.

David Ley-They really are not that much different. We have quite a bit of traffic on both projects. We have speed issues, traffic signal at Somerset & Lee that needs to be looked at for improvements. We have on street parking. At Somerset & Lee there is sight distance issues with driveways. All traffic engineering type work. Staff does not believe the projects are that much different. We have selected before the Residential Reconstruction selection and the second ranked firm from that project did Lee Blvd, First Phase. Those two projects were different. Staffs opinion on this one is both are fairly similar. Both will have working with utilities (Water One on Lee, EVERGY on Mission), similar type tasks.

Chris White-As we have mentioned before these are largely qualification packets and they tend to be boiler plate. So this is coming down to selecting a qualification for doing the work which we all agree is basically they are all capable of doing it. So we are looking for their ideas and their approach to the larger project with some level of confidence that they would be capable of having a reasonable approach to the secondary project. I understand

there might be a reason to do both ultimately. The more work we ask for people to do unpaid, eventually ends up in the cost of the project. So I don't see reason to exercise them unnecessarily.

Marsha Monica-Kind of agrees with Ken. Think there needs to be some differentiation in the approach. Vice-Chair Cain-Asks about the past projects we used the second scoring firm. David Ley-Residential Reconstruction where we took the second firm and did Lee Boulevard. Brian Scovill also a SMAC Waterford Stormwater Project with the second ranked firm assigned the 2020 (CMP) Corrugated Metal Pipe Replacement Project. The Stormwater Management Committee has done selections where we did one of a flood study and we selected the firm for that project and the second ranked firm was awarded the metal pipe replacement design. Julie Cain-So the second firm did not submit on the second project, they just submitted on the first project was the distinction. Everyone is making good points. You are bidding for a kitchen and a bath (in real simple terms).

David Ley-If we include a section for Lee Boulevard then we would need to discuss how to do the ranking sheet. If we are doing one ranking sheet for each project and if we want to give points to Lee Blvd-you may have a firm that scores 100 on Lee but they do not rank high enough so they will not be selected for either of those projects. Chris White-Ultimately we are not bidding a bath and a kitchen. We are bidding two bathrooms one bigger than the other. Abbas Haideri-Is okay with giving the runner up the second project, but would still like to see them submit for both projects and rank them accordingly. Do not think it would take them that much longer to add to it, as they already have their basic detail worked out and would be a matter of tweaking it. On the scoring sheet you could have two columns, one for Mission and one for Lee. In case of a tie, then you can see who had the higher rank for Lee.

David Ley-We are in discussions of having both these projects or the RFQ's kind of merged into one let's jump to the ranking sheets so we can see how we are going to rank.

Jim Rawlings-What is the Committees thought-we have two professional engineers here leading this meeting, I for one am comfortable with having one company doing both projects (based on my experience on City Council) but I ask the question to David and Brian what is your preference from a City Standpoint and a professional engineer standpoint? David Ley-Staffs opinion of these projects are pretty similar, that we feel all these firms could do both projects. It would be our opinion to go with Option 2. Brian Scovill-Do you have any thoughts on if one consultant ended up doing both projects? David Ley-Would be a little concerned on some of the firms if they were selected highest and they were doing both projects. It might be a little bit smaller firms to where they may not have the ability to do both projects at once. Brian Scovill-To Kens point. David Ley-There is a lot of utility coordination on each project and we definitely do not want to get into these projects and get behind schedule. They are critical especially Mission Road. We have to get that out on a set time so we are not in front of the school during school times.

Lori Ames-Asks Jim Rawlings what in his experience tells him he'd rather have one firm? Jim Rawlings-Well kind of like having sub-contractors (if you go back to the basic kitchen/bathroom situation). I would want one contractor in to remodel and get it done and go on. That's why I asked David and Brian, they are the professionals and they are the ones that have to deal with them. My experience has been one contractor you deal with them and the project moves forward. Just an opinion from experience but I certainly defer my vote to the professionals. And I've always done that being on the City Council when I have to make a vote I listen very strongly to the professionals that have to work the project and get it done and get it done on time.

David Ley-Jim I would just add, if these two projects were near each other or if they shared an intersection, we would definitely be here with trying to select one firm. But both of these projects are far enough apart that they



really are not that situation. There's different funding for them as well. Jim Rawlings-If you are comfortable with it, then so am I. That's fine. I'm relying and I think we should all take heed with the people that actually have to work the project what their preference is. Chuck Sipple-Is there any economic savings if we have one do both verses two companies? Is there any savings for the City in terms of dollars/expenditures? David Ley-We do not believe there would be any savings in cost if we had one rather than two firms.

Marsha Monica-If they submit one proposal is the proposal all just about Mission and Lee is not mentioned? So we really don't know what their approach is. The proposal would be based just on the Mission Road Project?

David Ley-Correct. That is how staff wrote Option 2 and if we want to just to the ranking sheet and go through that we can see.

David Ley/Brian Scovill-describe the ranking sheets. David Ley advised the example is how we ranked Mission Road from 133<sup>rd</sup> to 143<sup>rd</sup> Street Project. Staff maintained the same question or the same rankings for each item. There are six and you would score these from 1 to 10. Then you go through and read each packet. In this case if there are five firms, you could rank them 1 to 5 for each one of the items. Or another option that we have done in the past is each accountability is worth 10 points and you come up with, when you read it, you come up with what you believe is the highest score/or how you feel. Each firm would rate on each item. Brian Scovill-You could even assign more points to project approach in this case, maybe we make it worth 20 points. David Ley-If we added Lee Boulevard in Project Understanding and had one ranking it might be kind of challenging. We could always add one for Lee Blvd Project Approach.

Abbas Haideri-Two rankings side by side. Column for each. David Ley-If we do it that way, I'd prefer to have two separate submittals. Chris White-I kind of would too. I share the desire to hear their approach or see it and understand how they want to do it, but it's kind of unnecessarily exercise because the overall scoring is really. Even if we weighted them we would weigh the Mission Road heavier and then Lee Blvd. becomes the secondary score. If it is really that important, I think we have to go with two separate submittals. Abbas Haideri-What have we done if we end up with a tie? Brian Scovill-Would that be up to the Committee to make a recommendation on their prerogative?

Chris White-Maybe we should agree on the scoring. We have done 1 thru 10 for each section and added up. The proposed is that instead of doing a score for each. Some people score different firms with a 10 and others score a 5. This proposal as I understand it would rank 5 firms with a 1 thru 5 score and that would bring some possible ties. So do we like this preference? Marsha Monica-Likes where you have a sheet and you rank each firm individually at least you have some back up as to why you ranked them as opposed to just sorting them 1 thru 5. Abbas Haideri-Like before we all sat together and ranked each and you put it on the excel sheet. That works fine. Julie Stasi-In the past we had a firms name a the top of the sheet, so when Committee handed in their scores if there are five firms, each committee member hands in five sheets (with company name at the top of each page) and we then calculate everyone's rankings. David Ley-Yes that has worked fine so far. Abbas Haideri-so why not stick to that?

Brian Scovill-Staff is open to that we wanted to present this option. Past discussions when we did the ranking sheets they mentioned maybe an evaluation of how we do the ranking scores. Chris White-This is the situation where we all said we do not understand why and maybe try something different, and you present us with something different and we are wanting to know why it is not being done the way we have. Marsha Monica- Yes exactly. Brian Scovill-We can go back to putting 1 to 10 for each category, do you want an emphasis on project approach, and make it work 15 instead of 10? Marsha Monica-That's probably the most important one.

David Ley-Prior to Mission Road 133<sup>rd</sup> to 143 that is how we had it. But when we went to rank those the Committee didn't like having different level/values of points for each category so then we went back and that is why we decided everyone is going to be 10 points. So we were doing it differently prior to the previous selection. Then we changed it to 10, so if you want to change it back that is fine. We can just go through them and you can tell us which ones you feel are worth more points than the other items and we can change that. Julie Stasi-So each paragraph say is 10 and there are 6 paragraphs, then the total is 60, is that what you are saying?

David Ley-If we do a 1 to 10 score, then you would end up with 60. Or the other option is (which I think might be harder) is you have to go thru each one of these and say okay I like this firm best on project understanding so that could be pretty challenging and rank them 1 to 5 verses going thru and saying I like that one, it's a great one so 10. These others are pretty close give them an 8. It's up to the Committee, you are the ones that have to score them.

Lori Ames-The 1 thru 5/or 6 definitely forces differentiation. I think the way we have done the score sheet in the past has obviously been successful. I think it captures everything. I think we still need to solve the previous discussion with bathroom and kitchens. It is essentially approach number two. I agree, I am respectful of the fact that David and his team are the experts and they manage the project and this is why you think is best. I get that but I also agree what Abbas said which is a little bit awkward to award an \$800,000 project to a firm that actually has not submitted an approach from that project. Still want to see something about Lee.

David Ley-Will add that was the construction cost. We anticipate the design cost for Mission Road to be around \$300,000.00 and the design cost for Lee Blvd to be around \$100,000.00. The earlier costs I gave you are the construction costs, not the engineering costs.

**ACTION:** Marsha Monica-Motioned to recommend consultants submit two (2) proposals (1 for each project) and use the ranking sheets from the past formats.

Lori Ames seconded the motion.

Staff also advised that they would send in their letter of requests that the requirement will be for traffic engineering and stormwater design be in-house from the firm selected and not subcontracted out. Staff expects to have the proposals in December sometime in order for a recommendation to follow in January 2021.

Regarding the Motion:

Roll Call vote of members was taken.

In favor were: Cain, Rawlings, Sipple, Monica, Conrad, Haideri, and Ames

Against were: White

Motion passed.

**ACTION:** Abbas Haideri made a motion to adjourn the meeting

Chris White seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Cain adjourned the meeting at 8:45 AM

Minutes transcribed by: Julie Stasi, Leawood Public Works Department