

**PUBLIC WORKS/UTILITIES (PWUC) COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, June 6, 2017 6:30 p.m., Park View Room**

---

**1. Roll call.**

Meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm by Mr. Haas

Present: Mr. Casperson, Mr. Harley, Mr. Coons and Mr. Domaszek.

Absent: Mr. Kressin and Mr. Jacobsen

Also Present: Mr. De Angelis, Mr. Harrigan, Mr. Paul Jr, Mary Inden, Rich Klein, Dave Fowler and Aaron Volkening.

Mr. De Angelis asked for a nomination for Mr. Haas to preside as chairman of the committee in Mr. Kressin's absence. Mr. Coons moved and Mr. Domaszek seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

**2. Review and selection of engineering firm for interviews regarding Underwood Creek Daylighting Project**

Mr. De Angelis explained to the committee that the purpose of this meeting was to discuss and review the bids from the engineering firms and then to decide which firms to invite back for an interview. Mr. De Angelis informed the committee that the budget for the engineering was \$160K, with an additional \$15K contributed for a total of \$175K.

Bids were received from Strand and Associates for a range of \$306,900-\$373,340, R.A. Smith National \$171, 275 with additional alternatives proposed, Ruekert-Mielke \$152,285-\$199,750, Stantec \$159,870-\$336,730 and Hey & Associates/Graef at \$288,064.

Mr. De Angelis explained that due to the variations in the proposals and costs associated, the committee should consider the proposal as a whole, whether or not they think the firm has an understanding of the project goals, what the firm intends to provide for the bid price/range and the scalability involved and any additional items that should be considered when interviewing the firms.

Mr. Harley questioned where we ended up with the environmental with Mr. Haas questioning whether we needed a Phase 1 and Phase 2 since we already have details regarding the contamination caused by the dry cleaner in the past but have current documentation. Mr. De Angelis explained we already do have the environmental reports from the dry cleaner as well as details from the tunnel project, but we will need to investigate further south. Mr. Harley felt we could cut out approximately \$12,000 since we already have reports on file for much of it, and there is an amount of due diligence required on behalf of the firm to get the answers needed and should reflect in the proposal.

The committee had concerns about Strand and Associates proposal due to the 4 month longer timeline and higher cost, but still felt they would have an understanding of the project. R.A. Smith, though lighter on the design, have team members that were listed on the project team that are very competent and knowledgeable. Ruekert-Mielke has experience with this type of work and a working knowledge of the Village and also was closest to the budgeted numbers. Stantec and Hey & Associates/Graef, with the experience and knowledge of the goals of the Village would certainly know what the Village's goals and needs are as well.

The committee decided based upon the knowledge level and abilities of each of the firms, that it would be helpful to have all of them in to discuss their proposal in more detail and allow for more questions by the committee. The committee also requested the firms be prepared to present a plan that meets the \$175,000 budget threshold. This would include either making changes in scope or reduction in deliverables such as the level of completeness of plans as presented by one of the firms. The committee felt it would be best to have all 5 firms respond to these changes during the interview scheduled for Monday, June 19<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

**8. Other business**

None.

**7. Adjourn.**

Mr. Domaszek moved and Mr. Harley seconded to adjourn. Motion carried 6-0. Meeting adjourned at 7:53 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Richard Paul, Jr.  
Public Works Director

DRAFT