Stormwater Management Committee

Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, January 30, 2019
Leawood City Hall
Main Conference Room
4800 Town Center Drive
Leawood, KS  66211
7:30 AM to 9:00 AM

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Review/Approve Minutes from last meeting of November 28, 2018.

NEW BUSINESS:

2. Selection of Design Consultant for Second Phase of
Stormwater Project in the Waterford Subdivision; 3504 W 129th Area
SMAC Project TM-04-007, Leawood Project 77017

ADJOURN

MISSION STATEMENT
To recommend to the Governing Body how to enhance the stormwater policy;
and to provide a forum for citizens, staff and Council to discuss and study
stormwater concerns and issues.

~ 2018 APPOINTMENTS- STORMWATER COMMITTEE MEMBERS ~
James Azeltine, Chair, City Council Member Ward 4
Debra Filla, Vice-Chair, City Council Member Ward 1
Lisa Harrison, City Council Member Ward 3
Mary Larson, City Council Member Ward 2
Skip Johnson….John Kahl….Carole Lechevin
David Lindley….Curt Talcott….William “Bill” Ramsey

If you require any accommodation (i.e. qualified interpreter, hearing assistance, etc.) in order to attend this meeting, please notify this office at (913)339-6700, x130 no later than 48 hours prior to the scheduled commencement of the meeting.
These Minutes are in “DRAFT” form and will be presented at a future Committee Meeting for approval.

MINUTES of the
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
Meeting of: Wednesday, November 28, 2018
Leawood City Hall, Main Conference Room

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
James Azeltine, CHAIR and Councilmember Ward 4
Debra Filla, Vice Chair and Councilmember Ward 1
Lisa Harrison, Councilmember Ward 3
Skip Johnson
Mary Larson, Councilmember Ward 2
Carole Lechevin David Lindley
David Lindley
Bill Ramsey
Curt Talcott

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:
John Kahl

STAFF PRESENT:
David Ley, P.E., Director of Public Works
Bria Scovill, P.E. City Engineer
Julie Stasi, Admin. Services Manager, Sr.

GUEST:
Justin McGeeney, 2701 W 86th Street, Leawood, KS  66206

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Azeltine called the meeting to order at 7:32 A.M.

FIRST ITEM OF BUSINESS: Previous Meeting Minutes
ACTION: Debra Filla made a Motion to approve the Minutes of August 29, 2018.
        Skip Johnson seconded the Motion to approve. All members in attendance were in favor.
        Motion passed; Minutes approved.

INTRODUCTION: Brian Scovill, P.E., City Engineer
David Ley introduced Mr. Brian Scovill our City Engineer that was hired in September. Brian
previously was at the City of Overland Park for ten years and prior to that worked for Platt County
and the Missouri Department of Transportation. We are glad to have him on board.

SECOND ITEM OF BUSINESS: Staff Updates
David Ley-Gave an update for the storm water maps have been worked on and we have a final
version. We have not yet posted the map to the City’s Web Site, as the Information Services
Director is updating the City’s Web Page at this time. Once the web site is ready, we will have the
map posted on the City’s Web site.
Julie Stasi-Gave an update of the BMP’s (Best Management Practices) this year; the stormwater
cost share program with residents for installation of rain gardens, rain barrels, native trees. This
year we have had an increase in participation with five (5) different properties participating. That is
up from two (2) that participated in 2017. The City received reimbursement this past week from the
Johnson County Program, just over $400.00. Our residents this year installed five (5) rain barrels
and one (1) native tree. A map is included in today’s packet. The properties involved this year are
throughout the City; areas of 89th & High Drive, 97th & Sagamore, 128th & Sagamore, 129th & Briar
and the area east of Nall on 130th Terrace. We plan to continue the program in 2019, once the
County has the next Agreement available. We have participated in this program since 2013, this is
the most participation we have had. As the web page changes we will post again and continue with
the brochures and promotion of the program.
THIRD ITEM OF BUSINESS: New Business; review Selection Grading of Design Consultants for a stormwater Project in Waterford. David Ley—advised in 2019, the City has a SMAC (Stormwater Management Advisory Council) stormwater project for pipe replacement through the Waterford subdivision. This will be Phase 2 of a project that is currently under design. At this time we need to hire a consultant. We will be needing to go out and request for qualifications (RFQ) to five (5) consultants. Staff wanted to discuss the grading before we go out to choose the firms to respond to the RFQ to ask if everyone is okay with the five firms. Do you think five is too many or do you want more to review?

Deb Filla asks for an explanation of the map and the whole project in Waterford. David Ley—Shows 127th Street and an area on Wenonga Road on the map. Dave explained that there is a low point that collects a couple hundred acres of drainage. We have undersized pipes here. In 2010 and in 2013, there was flooding of about 2 ½ feet in the street. Roadway flooding and the water got into a few of the homes. The residents in this neighborhood came to us with a petition to do a SMAC Project. We were able to get funding thru the Johnson County SMAC Program.

David Ley—shows Phase 1 and it is currently under construction; running down Wenonga to the Golf Course, crossing south to Sagamore Street. That phase is currently designed by Shafer Kline & Warren. The Leawood South portion.

The current project we are looking to for 2019, is Phase 2 and goes north to Pawnee and replaces pipes; placing a larger pipe system in the Waterford portion. The total construction cost is estimated at roughly $2.5 Million with the City receiving $1.66 Million from the County’s SMAC Funds and about $800,000 in City Budget Funds. We would like to hire a consultant for the second phase design with selection by this Committee in January of 2019. The firm would probably then start their design in March with construction probably in the fall of next year. We also need to be aware that the Golf Course is there and they would most likely prefer us be there in the winter and not during a summer tournament.

Chair Azeltine asked how we arrived at the five firms. David Ley—advised typically Brian and him use the firms we have worked with in the past and eliminate the current ones being used (so we spread the wealth/work around). These area all firms that we have worked well with or that have worked well for others (Overland Park) that we are familiar with. If we have any negative issue with the firm or in their designs we would not use them in the grouping. Typically we go for qualification based bids for the Engineer. Then we work with them on their contract cost. Typically the consultant’s fee is around 10 to 12 percent of the construction cost.

Chair Azeltine asked why we do not bid the project? Staff advised we generally have the Committee’s select the consultants and the construction is bid. We have standard contracts as well that we use.

David Ley—advised when we do the ratings, staff does not have any input with your ratings. But we are comfortable with any of these five firms chosen for RFQ. The Public Works Committee recently changed how they rank the firms due to the difference of how each individual ranks firms. Some
members rate firms with large separations of points while others rate firms close to each other. This method could change the order of the selected consultant. Instead of tallying the total scores, the PW Committee now ranks each firm based on the total points. For example if five firms submit an RFQ the firm with the highest overall points would receive five (5) points while the firm with the lowest overall points would receive (1) point. The scoring sheets would remain the same. The firm with the highest score would be the selected firm.

Brian Scovill—When asked about the grade sheet, Brian advised Leawood’s is identical to the ones he has used for the last 10 years.

Lisa Harrison—asked if pricing comes into play with the consultant selection?

Dave Ley—advised there is no pricing discussion, engineering is just on qualifications.

Lisa Harrison—So it is not about who comes in at the cheapest.

Curt Talcott—Technically with a City this size we are not supposed to select on price.

Bill Ramsey—We really do not want to be known as a City that selects engineering services for their bids. That is different than the construction. It is much better to have selected someone on their qualifications with the design. The design will outline exactly how the project is going to be built. You want to make sure they know what they are doing in the design. The construction can be Curt Talcott—Cutting costs. Good quality engineering can save you a lot on the construction side of things. You do not want to cut costs in the engineering side.

David Ley—Did not need any Motion unless the group wanted to. Advised staff could go ahead and notify the consultants in early December and then come back to the group at a January meeting for the actual ranking of the firms.

Chair Azeltine—confirmed then there were no Motions voiced and that there being a consensus that this methodology appears it will work and be better than the 0 to 100 point system. All members present were in agreement to give it a try and to ask five (5) firms.

Chair Azeltine concluded the meeting’s Business at 8:00 AM.

Resident McGeeney—had a question about what types of projects are eligible for the Johnson County SMAC Funding and what is the process like?

David Ley—Currently SMAC works on flood control projects. There typically has to have several homes involved in order to qualify for SMAC Funding. The County is looking at and is in the process of updating their funding to do maintenance projects in the future and some stormwater treatment projects. They have not provided those updates to us yet, but they are expected in the future.

Curt Talcott—Elaborated that there is a point system, and there has to be things such as erosion issues, flooding of the streets, flooding of homes, frequency of the storms (5, 10, 100 year). Number of storms in the last 10 years. Also they fund 75%/25% and that is changing to a more watershed based approach. Where they feel the project would benefit the whole watershed possibly could be 100% but if it is more localized it would be more 50%/50% split. And a group of cities will decide. One City cannot decide on a project.

David Ley—Gave an example of the Waterford area’s SMAC rating qualifiers.

Chair Azeltine adjourned the meeting at 8:26 AM.

Minute summary transcribed by Julie Stasi, Leawood Public Works Department.
January 2, 2019

Benesch
Attn: Robert Krewson, PE
11010 Haskell Avenue, Ste. 200
Kansas City, KS 66109
rkrewson@benesch.com

ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICE
WATERFORD STORM SEWER

Mr. Krewson,

The City of Leawood is requesting a submittal of qualifications for the design of the Waterford Storm Sewer SMAC project. This project is scheduled for construction in 2019.

Anticipated improvements include replacing CMP with RCP, increasing curb inlet capacity, increasing pipe sizes or adding additional parallel piping, and adding a bypass pipe in accordance with the PES used for the SMAC submittal. Attached is a map indicating the drainage area and limits of concern. The consultant may request a copy of the PES by emailing myself at: brians@leawood.org.

The submittal of qualifications will be ranked by a committee based on the following categories:

1. Project Understanding
2. Project Approach
3. Similar Experience (include your firm’s role, assigned staff, and year of work).
4. Key Personnel and Availability
5. Project Schedule
6. Customer Service

To be considered for this project please provide 12 hard copies and 1 electronic copy of your submittal of qualifications by 12:00pm Wednesday, January 23, 2019. The submittal should be limited to no more than 12 pages of content (6 pages front and back).
Once reviewed and ranked the committee’s recommendation will go to City Council for approval. The selected consulting firm will be required to enter into the City’s Standard Engineering Design Contract based on a negotiated scope and fee. A copy of the standard contract can be provided upon request.

This request for qualifications does not commit the City of Leawood, Kansas to award a contract, pay any costs incurred in the preparation of a submittal or to procure or contract the services for supplies. The City of Leawood reserves the right to accept or reject any or all submittals received as a result of this request, to negotiate with any qualified source, or to cancel in part or in its entirety the Request for Qualifications, if it is in the best interest of the City of Leawood, Kansas.

Thank you for your interest in the City of Leawood. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Brian Scovill, P.E.
City Engineer
January 2, 2019

George Butler Associates  
Attn: Les Barnt  
9801 Renner Blvd. Ste. 300  
Lenexa, KS 66219  
lbarnt@gbateam.com

ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICE
WATERFORD STORM SEWER

Mr. Barnt,

The City of Leawood is requesting a submittal of qualifications for the design of the Waterford Storm Sewer SMAC project. This project is scheduled for construction in 2019.

Anticipated improvements include replacing CMP with RCP, increasing curb inlet capacity, increasing pipe sizes or adding additional parallel piping, and adding a bypass pipe in accordance with the PES used for the SMAC submittal. Attached is a map indicating the drainage area and limits of concern. The consultant may request a copy of the PES by emailing myself at: brians@leawood.org.

The submittal of qualifications will be ranked by a committee based on the following categories:

7. Project Understanding  
8. Project Approach  
9. Similar Experience (include your firm’s role, assigned staff, and year of work).  
10. Key Personnel and Availability  
11. Project Schedule  
12. Customer Service

To be considered for this project please provide 12 hard copies and 1 electronic copy of your submittal of qualifications by 12:00pm Wednesday, January 23, 2019. The submittal should be limited to no more than 12 pages of content (6 pages front and back).

Once reviewed and ranked the committee’s recommendation will go to City Council for approval. The selected consulting firm will be required to enter into the City’s Standard
Engineering Design Contract based on a negotiated scope and fee. A copy of the standard contract can be provided upon request.

This request for qualifications does not commit the City of Leawood, Kansas to award a contract, pay any costs incurred in the preparation of a submittal or to procure or contract the services for supplies. The City of Leawood reserves the right to accept or reject any or all submittals received as a result of this request, to negotiate with any qualified source, or to cancel in part or in its entirety the Request for Qualifications, if it is in the best interest of the City of Leawood, Kansas.

Thank you for your interest in the City of Leawood. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Brian Scovill, P.E.
City Engineer
January 2, 2019

Lamp Rynearson
Attn: Dan Miller
9001 State Line Rd., Ste. 200
Kansas City, MO 64114
dan.miller@LRA-inc.com

ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICE
WATERFORD STORM SEWER

Mr. Miller,

The City of Leawood is requesting a submittal of qualifications for the design of the Waterford Storm Sewer SMAC project. This project is scheduled for construction in 2019.

Anticipated improvements include replacing CMP with RCP, increasing curb inlet capacity, increasing pipe sizes or adding additional parallel piping, and adding a bypass pipe in accordance with the PES used for the SMAC submittal. Attached is a map indicating the drainage area and limits of concern. The consultant may request a copy of the PES by emailing myself at: brians@leawood.org.

The submittal of qualifications will be ranked by a committee based on the following categories:

13. Project Understanding
14. Project Approach
15. Similar Experience (include your firm’s role, assigned staff, and year of work).
16. Key Personnel and Availability
17. Project Schedule
18. Customer Service

To be considered for this project please provide 12 hard copies and 1 electronic copy of your submittal of qualifications by 12:00pm Wednesday, January 23, 2019. The submittal should be limited to no more than 12 pages of content (6 pages front and back).

Once reviewed and ranked the committee’s recommendation will go to City Council for approval. The selected consulting firm will be required to enter into the City’s Standard
Engineering Design Contract based on a negotiated scope and fee. A copy of the standard contract can be provided upon request.

This request for qualifications does not commit the City of Leawood, Kansas to award a contract, pay any costs incurred in the preparation of a submittal or to procure or contract the services for supplies. The City of Leawood reserves the right to accept or reject any or all submittals received as a result of this request, to negotiate with any qualified source, or to cancel in part or in its entirety the Request for Qualifications, if it is in the best interest of the City of Leawood, Kansas.

Thank you for your interest in the City of Leawood. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Brian Scovill, P.E.
City Engineer
January 2, 2019

Olsson
Attn: Jamie Fain
7301 W. 133rd Street, Ste. 200
Overland Park, KS 66213
jfain@olsson.com

ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICE
WATERFORD STORM SEWER

Mr. Fain,

The City of Leawood is requesting a submittal of qualifications for the design of the Waterford Storm Sewer SMAC project. This project is scheduled for construction in 2019.

Anticipated improvements include replacing CMP with RCP, increasing curb inlet capacity, increasing pipe sizes or adding additional parallel piping, and adding a bypass pipe in accordance with the PES used for the SMAC submittal. Attached is a map indicating the drainage area and limits of concern. The consultant may request a copy of the PES by emailing myself at: brians@leawood.org.

The submittal of qualifications will be ranked by a committee based on the following categories:

19. Project Understanding
20. Project Approach
21. Similar Experience (include your firm’s role, assigned staff, and year of work).
22. Key Personnel and Availability
23. Project Schedule
24. Customer Service

To be considered for this project please provide 12 hard copies and 1 electronic copy of your submittal of qualifications by 12:00pm Wednesday, January 23, 2019. The submittal should be limited to no more than 12 pages of content (6 pages front and back).

Once reviewed and ranked the committee’s recommendation will go to City Council for approval. The selected consulting firm will be required to enter into the City’s Standard
Engineering Design Contract based on a negotiated scope and fee. A copy of the standard contract can be provided upon request.

This request for qualifications does not commit the City of Leawood, Kansas to award a contract, pay any costs incurred in the preparation of a submittal or to procure or contract the services for supplies. The City of Leawood reserves the right to accept or reject any or all submittals received as a result of this request, to negotiate with any qualified source, or to cancel in part or in its entirety the Request for Qualifications, if it is in the best interest of the City of Leawood, Kansas.

Thank you for your interest in the City of Leawood. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Brian Scovill, P.E.
City Engineer
January 2, 2019

Walter P. Moore
Attn: Dan Brown
1100 Walnut Street, Ste. 1825
Kansas City, MO 64106
dlbrown@walterpmoore.com

ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICE
WATERFORD STORM SEWER

Mr. Brown,

The City of Leawood is requesting a submittal of qualifications for the design of the Waterford Storm Sewer SMAC project. This project is scheduled for construction in 2019.

Anticipated improvements include replacing CMP with RCP, increasing curb inlet capacity, increasing pipe sizes or adding additional parallel piping, and adding a bypass pipe in accordance with the PES used for the SMAC submittal. Attached is a map indicating the drainage area and limits of concern. The consultant may request a copy of the PES by emailing myself at: brians@leawood.org.

The submittal of qualifications will be ranked by a committee based on the following categories:

25. Project Understanding
26. Project Approach
27. Similar Experience (include your firm’s role, assigned staff, and year of work).
28. Key Personnel and Availability
29. Project Schedule
30. Customer Service

To be considered for this project please provide 12 hard copies and 1 electronic copy of your submittal of qualifications by 12:00pm Wednesday, January 23, 2019. The submittal should be limited to no more than 12 pages of content (6 pages front and back).

Once reviewed and ranked the committee’s recommendation will go to City Council for approval. The selected consulting firm will be required to enter into the City’s Standard
Engineering Design Contract based on a negotiated scope and fee. A copy of the standard contract can be provided upon request.

This request for qualifications does not commit the City of Leawood, Kansas to award a contract, pay any costs incurred in the preparation of a submittal or to procure or contract the services for supplies. The City of Leawood reserves the right to accept or reject any or all submittals received as a result of this request, to negotiate with any qualified source, or to cancel in part or in its entirety the Request for Qualifications, if it is in the best interest of the City of Leawood, Kansas.

Thank you for your interest in the City of Leawood. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Brian Scovill, P.E.
City Engineer
**Design Engineering Selection – 2019 Waterford Storm Sewer SMAC Project**

Firm: Benesch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING</th>
<th>30 Point</th>
<th>20 Point</th>
<th>10 Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Acceptable</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Project Understanding:**
   Does the firm have a decent understanding of the basic scope of services and key issues or concerns? Is it clear they did their research, visited the site, and met with staff?

2. **Project Approach:**
   Does the proposal communicate a logical approach or design process? Did they describe any methods or tools that could set their firm apart from others? What does this firm recommend that others did not?

3. **Similar Experience:**
   Consider previous project experience and references in relation to the proposed project. How recent was the experience? Did they describe their firm’s role (ie; concept study, survey, lead designer)? Are they proposing the same staff for this project?

4. **Key Personnel & Availability:**
   Consider comparable experience and background of the Project Manager and Lead Engineer assigned to this project. Do they indicate staff availability or work load? What portion of work are they sub-contracting (survey, geotech, or structural design)?

5. **Project Schedule:**
   In evaluating the schedule, does the firm indicate they can meet the project design timeline? Do they show milestones and allow for survey, utility coordination, easement acquisition, bid documents, etc.?

6. **Customer Service:**
   Evaluate the team on proposed communication with the City and residents. Do they describe other approaches to customer service such as timeliness and quality control.

**TOTAL POINTS**

Ranked By: ____________________________       Date: _________________
Firm: GBA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING</th>
<th>30 Point</th>
<th>20 Point</th>
<th>10 Point</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Acceptable</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Project Understanding:**
   Does the firm have a decent understanding of the basic scope of services and key issues or concerns? Is it clear they did their research, visited the site, and met with staff?

   Maximum Points: 20
   Score: _____

8. **Project Approach:**
   Does the proposal communicate a logical approach or design process? Did they describe any methods or tools that could set their firm apart from others? What does this firm recommend that others did not?

   Maximum Points: 30
   Score: _____

9. **Similar Experience:**
   Consider previous project experience and references in relation to the proposed project. How recent was the experience? Did they describe their firm’s role (ie; concept study, survey, lead designer)? Are they proposing the same staff for this project?

   Maximum Points: 20
   Score: _____

10. **Key Personnel & Availability:**
    Consider comparable experience and background of the Project Manager and Lead Engineer assigned to this project. Do they indicate staff availability or work load? What portion of work are they sub-contracting (survey, geotech, or structural design)?

    Maximum Points: 10
    Score: _____

11. **Project Schedule:**
    In evaluating the schedule, does the firm indicate they can meet the project design timeline? Do they show milestones and allow for survey, utility coordination, easement acquisition, bid documents, etc.?

    Maximum Points: 10
    Score: _____

12. **Customer Service:**
    Evaluate the team on proposed communication with the City and residents. Do they describe other approaches to customer service such as timeliness and quality control.

    Maximum Points: 10
    Score: _____

**TOTAL POINTS**

_____

Ranked By: ____________________________       Date: _________________
**Design Engineering Selection – 2019 Waterford Storm Sewer SMAC Project**

Firm: Lamp Rynearson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING</th>
<th>30 Point Question</th>
<th>20 Point Question</th>
<th>10 Point Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Acceptable</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maximum Points** | **Score**

13. **Project Understanding:**
   Does the firm have a decent understanding of the basic scope of services and key issues or concerns? Is it clear they did their research, visited the site, and met with staff?

14. **Project Approach:**
   Does the proposal communicate a logical approach or design process? Did they describe any methods or tools that could set their firm apart from others? What does this firm recommend that others did not?

15. **Similar Experience:**
   Consider previous project experience and references in relation to the proposed project. How recent was the experience? Did they describe their firm’s role (ie; concept study, survey, lead designer)? Are they proposing the same staff for this project?

16. **Key Personnel & Availability:**
   Consider comparable experience and background of the Project Manager and Lead Engineer assigned to this project. Do they indicate staff availability or work load? What portion of work are they sub-contracting (survey, geotech, or structural design)?

17. **Project Schedule:**
   In evaluating the schedule, does the firm indicate they can meet the project design timeline? Do they show milestones and allow for survey, utility coordination, easement acquisition, bid documents, etc.?

18. **Customer Service:**
   Evaluate the team on proposed communication with the City and residents. Do they describe other approaches to customer service such as timeliness and quality control.

**TOTAL POINTS**

---

Ranked By: ____________________________       Date: _________________
Design Engineering Selection – 2019 Waterford Storm Sewer SMAC Project

Firm: Olsson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING</th>
<th>30 Point</th>
<th>20 Point</th>
<th>10 Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Acceptable</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Understanding:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the firm have a decent understanding of the basic scope of services and key issues or concerns? Is it clear they did their research, visited the site, and met with staff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Approach:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal communicate a logical approach or design process? Did they describe any methods or tools that could set their firm apart from others? What does this firm recommend that others did not?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider previous project experience and references in relation to the proposed project. How recent was the experience? Did they describe their firm’s role (ie; concept study, survey, lead designer)? Are they proposing the same staff for this project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Personnel &amp; Availability:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider comparable experience and background of the Project Manager and Lead Engineer assigned to this project. Do they indicate staff availability or work load? What portion of work are they sub-contracting (survey, geotech, or structural design)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Schedule:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In evaluating the schedule, does the firm indicate they can meet the project design timeline? Do they show milestones and allow for survey, utility coordination, easement acquisition, bid documents, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the team on proposed communication with the City and residents. Do they describe other approaches to customer service such as timeliness and quality control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POINTS

Ranked By: ____________________________       Date: _________________
Firm: Walter P Moore

### Design Engineering Selection – 2019 Waterford Storm Sewer SMAC Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING</th>
<th>30 Point Question</th>
<th>20 Point Question</th>
<th>10 Point Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Acceptable</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Project Understanding:</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the firm have a decent understanding of the basic scope of services and key issues or concerns? Is it clear they did their research, visited the site, and met with staff?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 26. Project Approach: | 30 | _____ |
| Does the proposal communicate a logical approach or design process? Did they describe any methods or tools that could set their firm apart from others? What does this firm recommend that others did not? |         |

| 27. Similar Experience: | 20 | _____ |
| Consider previous project experience and references in relation to the proposed project. How recent was the experience? Did they describe their firm’s role (i.e; concept study, survey, lead designer)? Are they proposing the same staff for this project? |         |

| 28. Key Personnel & Availability: | 10 | _____ |
| Consider comparable experience and background of the Project Manager and Lead Engineer assigned to this project. Do they indicate staff availability or work load? What portion of work are they sub-contracting (survey, geotech, or structural design)? |         |

| 29. Project Schedule: | 10 | _____ |
| In evaluating the schedule, does the firm indicate they can meet the project design timeline? Do they show milestones and allow for survey, utility coordination, easement acquisition, bid documents, etc.? |         |

| 30. Customer Service: | 10 | _____ |
| Evaluate the team on proposed communication with the City and residents. Do they describe other approaches to customer service such as timeliness and quality control. |         |

**TOTAL POINTS**  

Ranked By: ____________________________       Date: _________________
TO: James Azeltine, CHAIR
   Committee Members

FROM: David Ley, P.E.
   Director of Public Works

SUBJECT: See attached agenda

---

Approval of Minutes of November 28, 2018

OLD BUSINESS

Included in the packet are Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the design of the City’s Waterford SMAC project. The City sent the RFQs to five consultants and all consultants submitted a proposal. Also included is the letter sent to the consultants and a scoring sheet for each proposal.

This project will use SMAC funding to address stormwater improvements within the Waterford subdivision as recommended in the 2nd phase of a 2016 Preliminary Engineering Study. The study recommends replacement of existing pipe due to deterioration or inadequate capacity and installation of additional pipe and inlets, see attached map. These improvements will reduce flooding and extend the life of the stormwater infrastructure system.

Anticipated schedule is to begin design in March, public meeting after field check, two months for easement donations, and begin relocation of utilities with construction starting early in 2020. Construction is expected to last 5 months. Challenges include minimizing impacts to properties, fast tracked design schedule to coordinate timing with the County Club of Leawood, and Johnson County Wastewater conflicts.

Please review the proposals and rank each consultant prior to the meeting. As discussed at the November meeting instead of tallying the total scores for each firm the Committee Member will now rank each firm 1-5 based on their total points for each firm. For example the firm with the highest overall points would receive five (5) points while the firm with the lowest overall points would receive one (1) point.

Staff will review the sheets and tally the scores during the meeting. The firm with the highest ranked score will be the selected firm.