



July 15, 2020

City of Lee's Summit Development Service

Atten: Sue Pyles, P.E.

220 SE Green St

Lee's Summit, MO 64063

Dear Ms. Pyles:

We received your comments regarding the Aria Public Water Main plans on June 24, 2020. Our response to your comments are as follows:

1. General:

- *Submit an Engineer's Estimate of Probable Construction Costs.* – An Engineer's Estimate of Probable Construction Costs is attached to this letter.
- *Include the City's standard details, as appropriate.* – We have added the necessary standard details to our plan set (see Sheets 8 and 9).
- *Please revise to provide specific bend and/or deflection requirements throughout the plan set, rather than leaving it open-ended for the contractor to decide in the field. Verify notes and callouts are coordinated.* – We have clarified the notes and added station callouts specifying the start, end, and degree of deflection.

2. Sheet 1:

- *KCP&L is now Evergy. Please update the plan set.* – Updated.
- *Include a Summary of Quantities table.* – We have added a Summary of Quantities table (see Sheet 3).

3. Sheet 2:

- *Review water line graphics for overlapping text. Revise for clarity.* – Revised.
- *Why is the road crossing at such an angle? The City prefers road crossings closer to 90 degrees.* – There are several factors affecting the angle of the road crossing. First, there is an existing storm culvert near the tie-in location that crosses beneath the road. This causes the ground elevation to drop steeply on either side of the road. The water line cannot cross the road at a 90-degree angle will maintaining adequate ground cover and a reasonable depth. Second, the existing water line that the proposed water line will tie into does not parallel the road in the proposed tie-in location. It approaches the road at an angle. This affected that angle that the proposed water line could cross the road at.
- *Show and label existing R/W.* – The existing R/W was incorrectly labeled as proposed. We have corrected the labeling.

4. Sheet 3-6:
 - *Notes 1 & 4 contradict each other. – Note 1 has been removed.*
 - *The “Deflect as Necessary” label in the Profile view contradicts Note 4. – We have added “See Notes” after the “Deflect as Necessary” label to clarify that the contractor should deflect as necessary within the given deflection parameters.*
 - *Include FH locations in the Profile views. – Added.*
5. Sheet 3: *The air release valve stationing shown in the Plan view is incorrect. Please revise.*
– Revised.
6. Sheet 4: *Revise the Exist. Grade leader to point to the correct line in the Profile view.*
– Revised.
7. Sheet 5: *Relocated the north match line overlapping text in the Plan view for clarity.*
– Revised.

Thank you for your assistance on this project.

Sincerely,



Jonathan Hoflander, PE



Michelle King, EI



Date: 7/17/2020

