

**Minutes of**  
**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**  
Meeting held: Wednesday, January 12, 2022  
Leawood City Hall-Council Chambers, 7:30 AM Via Zoom

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Julie Cain  
Chuck Sipple  
Jim Rawlings  
Kyle McCawley  
Marsha Monica  
Abbas Haideri  
Ken Conrad

**ABSENT:**

Andrew Osman  
Christopher White

**STAFF PRESENT:**

David Ley, P.E., Director of Public Works  
Brian Scovill, P.E., City Engineer  
Kristen Love, Administrative & Contract Supervisor  
Abigale Shepherd, Administrative Support Specialist

**Julie Cain called the meeting to order at 7:41 AM.**

Chris White confirms there will be a quorum without him, as he is not feeling well. Chris leaves the call.

**David Ley reads the following statement:**

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. The Public can submit comments in writing prior to the meeting by emailing [klove@leawood.org](mailto:klove@leawood.org) at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. The Committee will also accept public comments on agenda items using the Zoom media format. To sign up to speak and receive an invitation to the Zoom meeting, please contact [klove@leawood.org](mailto:klove@leawood.org) at least two (2) days in advance of the meeting. The meeting will be livestreamed 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).

**FIRST ITEM OF BUSINESS: Review/approve the old business:** Approve minutes from December 1, 2021 Public Works Committee Meeting

Chuck Sipple requests a change to the title of the third item of business from: Request from Public Works for selection of the Construction Engineering Selection Process on Mission Road (133<sup>rd</sup> to 143<sup>rd</sup>) Project to Request from Public Works for selection of the Construction Engineering Inspection Process on Mission Road (133<sup>rd</sup> to 143<sup>rd</sup>) Project. Julie Cain With change made, may I have a motion to approve? Chuck Sipple- Motioned to approve. Marsha Monica- Seconded. Approved. Motion passed.

**SECOND ITEM OF BUSINESS:** Review and Rank Engineering Qualifications for the 2023 Residential Reconstruction Project.

Julie Cain Was everyone able to send their ranking sheet to Kristen? Ken Conrad is sending them now. Jim Rawlings was unable to send it, but can take a picture and send it after the meeting, or could drop off a hard copy to the office. Marsha Monica asks if her ranking sheet was received. Kristen Love says that she received Marsha's, Julie's, Chuck's, Abbas's, Ken's, and Kyle's. Jim Rawlings reads his numbers: GBA: 20, Affinis: 19, Trekk: 18, Anderson: 18. You can see the struggle as they can all do the work.

Julie Cain do you want to open the discussion? David Ley we are tallying the scores, but while we're doing that, we can have a discussion. Are there any questions we can answer, or does anyone have any information they'd like to add? Once we get the scored completed, we want to go through each firm and see what you liked and didn't like about each proposal, so when we meet with each firm, we can pass that information along. Julie Cain I agree with Jim that is was hard to rank because they all could absolutely do it, but it's the process and we have to follow it. Chuck Sipple didn't understand the term in Affinis's proposal—RCB—when they were going to do one of the steps. David Ley it stands for reinforced concrete box culvert. It's a square or rectangle storm sewer. Ken Conrad agrees with Jim and Julie, that it's incredibly difficult to find a significant difference between the firms. Thinks it would be helpful to have a discussion to help make an intelligent decision. Would be interested to know what everyone else feels, because sometimes I feel like I'm not doing a very good job at ranking. Julie Cain feels the same way. That this comes up every time ranking needs to be done. That it doesn't necessarily have anything to do with their capabilities, but instead with buzzwords that catch the eye or the proposal itself. Do we have the numbers, David? David Ley some of the things to look for in these would be similar experience and how recent that experience is. Brian and I send out the RFQ then meet with the consultants for an hour or so, and that is where most of the information is being passed back and forth. 3 of these firms have completed work for the city; Anderson has not as they are a newer firm in Kansas City. The other 3 firms received excellent reviews on their performance. Chuck Sipple would it be fair to ask what the impression was from the face to face meeting? David Ley because we're not meeting with the entire team, it's tough to say. Brian Scovill when we meet with all 4 firms, we try to cover the same information to give them an even field of play. Some firms asked questions, while others didn't. But, when reviewing the proposals, I found that the firms that didn't ask questions went out and found that information on their own. All four firms are qualified and capable, and I know that probably doesn't help the decisions. Abbas Haideri discloses for the public record that he has worked with Anderson on a project in the recent past, and incidentally Anderson came out on top for him. Understands if we want to take his rankings out. Julie Cain thanks Abbas for the disclosure.

Jim Rawlings asks David if there is a check off sheet that could be provided to the committee with previous experience in last 3 years, staff availability, previous experience with the city...David Ley that information is on the consultant to include in the proposals. If we bring up whether they've worked for the city before, it's not going to allow a consultant who hasn't to be selected and we want to really open it up. Ken Conrad though it's difficult with everyone's schedule, this would be a good work session topic—just how to do this. It would be valuable to better understand the process and how to make a more intelligent decision. The item on the agenda about picking inspectors puts us in the same position. David Ley We're not doing another selection until September or October. We can reach out to other cities to see their ranking sheets, then have a meeting to discuss those.

David Ley We did finish up the rankings. Even though it was challenging, there was a clear winner. Affinis was first with 126 points, GBA with 110.5 points, Trekk with 110 points, and Anderson with 91.5 points.

Marsha Monica the new way of ranking (1-4 option) was much more manageable. The top firm got all 4s, third got all 3s, second got all 2s, and fourth got all 1s. Everyone has a different view when looking at these proposals, but we all came out with pretty much the same result. This system is working.

Ken Conrad when debriefing with the firms, are they shown the other proposals? David Ley some of the firms ask, and we will show them. We wouldn't show it to a firm as an example of why they didn't win. We discuss with them the comments the committee made, the likes and dislikes.

Chuck Sipple suggests the committee each outline what they thought of each proposal.

Marsha Monica- I liked how Affinis showed the projects that were under budget. Trekk and GBA were pretty much the same. Trekk used 'holistic approach' and 'improving lives' far too often. I think Anderson's was very skeletal.

Ken Conrad- No comments

Chuck Sipple- There were 3 things that made Affinis stick out: they showed pictures of the T intersection at 98<sup>th</sup> & Ensley, showed examples of sidewalk alternatives, showed availability of key staff and what they were working on related to what would be done in Leewood. They gave more information than required.

Julie Cain I highlighted the same things and that's why I put Affinis first.

Kyle McCawley- I had Affinis at the top. They were the only one to address Ensley Ln at 91<sup>st</sup> and 93<sup>rd</sup>. Also liked how they mentioned engaging the neighbors in the sidewalk discussion. I live in that area and I think it's going to take a lot of effort to find the right solution. Trekk and GBA also mentioned engaging the public; Affinis had 2 public meetings that would be useful.

Abbas Haideri- I rated Anderson higher because they went through a higher amount of engineering and what they would do with the project approach. I liked how they broke down the survey, sidewalk questionnaire, stormwater study. I had GBA last. They all seemed boilerplate. Years' experience working on the project was important to me, and Anderson had people with 30+ years' experience. They seem to be building a collaboration with other firms.

Jim Rawlings- The reason I had GBA first was because they had 4 alternatives they could do on 98<sup>th</sup> & Ensley. That's my neighborhood, so I'm very familiar. One of the firms suggested a rotary and I am all for that.

David Ley- We need a motion for recommendation to the Governing Body on Affinis for the residential recon, but we were also going to take the second ranked firm and give them the 123<sup>rd</sup> St Mill & Overlay project. Marsha Monica makes a motion to recommend Affinis to be the engineering consultant for the 2023 Residential Reconstruction Project and GBA to be the engineering consultant for the 123<sup>rd</sup> St Mill & Overlay Project. Chuck Sipple seconded. Motion passes.

**THIRD ITEM OF BUSINESS:** Review proposed Standard Operation Procedure for Consultant Selection on Construction Inspection Services.

David Ley As discussed, it's going to be difficult for the committee to rank construction inspection services, as all of these firms will have KDOT experience. It's going to depend on the consultant schedule and interviews with each firm to verify they have the qualified staff and that those staff are available. We are proposing the following steps:

1. Governing Body would refer to the committee the selection of the consultant for a specific project
2. Staff would convene a committee of staff members who would receive a minimum of 3 RFQs from firms that have qualified and available staff. Staff committee will rank the firms based on proposed staff, the availability of the staff, experience, and certifications.
3. Staff committee will provide a summary to the PW Committee with the firm their recommendation and why.
4. PW Committee makes a recommendation to the Governing Body to accept the recommendation.

This will take away the ranking like was just done.

Ken Conrad I thought there was going to be a group of firms that the department was going to pick from. David Ley Yes that is what we discussed at the last meeting. Ken Conrad So what, as a committee, do we do? It's as if all we are going to do is say, 'we agree'. David Ley Staff will provide a summary of the selected firms, and if you have questions, we will answer those. But yes, it is more similar to a consent item. We can get into a discussion if it's wanted but, it's more of a staff recommendation based on interviews and meetings. We will provide a summary sheet and the ranking sheet. Julie Cain asks where in the write up does it discuss the time frame that 3 firms will be in rotation. David Ley explains that,

after staff discussion, PW decided not to have the short list of 3 firms. Instead, we would go out for each project. For these federal projects, we're only getting inspection services every three or four years, so we're not going through this process a lot. Instead of having the list, we would go out and see who is available and whether they have their qualifications. This undoes what we talked about last meeting. Julie Cain How does this streamline the process? David Ley The concern staff has is that we just talked about the previous item, which was challenging to rank, this process will be much harder. It's challenging to rank these without actually doing interviews. It really boils down to staff being comfortable with the firm that is selected because there is a lot of communication with the federal government and the state to make sure everyone is staying in the loop. We talked about having the short list of 3 firms for 3-4 years, but the problem with that is that you'll get staff turnover. We're going to go out and interview the best 3 firms that are available for the project each time, then provide the recommendation to the PW Committee. Kyle McCawley and this would be just for this specific project? David Ley No, this would be for any federally funded project for the inspection services. This typically is only one project every 4 years. Kyle McCawley is on board for this. As David mentioned, this is very nuanced. Ken Conrad Have we ever provided this service in house? David Ley We did on a project back in 2010, but things were a bit slower then and we were able to provide full time inspection.

David Ley The committee recommendation would then go to the Governing Body agenda under 'Committee Recommendations'.

Marsha Monica makes a motion to recommend to the Governing Body to accept the Standard Operating Procedure for the Consultant Selection on Construction Inspection Services. Kyle McCawley seconds. Motion passes.

David Ley the plan for the February meeting was to discuss the 93<sup>rd</sup> St No Parking issue. We may want to delay that with the Covid increase potentially affecting the school's numbers. We will let everyone know.

Meeting is adjourned at 8:36 AM.

Summary report submitted by: Kristen Love, Leawood Public Works Department