

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS FEBRUARY 2, 2012

ITEMS REQUIRING BOCC APPROVAL

3 Items

**1. LAKE AFTON MUSHROOM RESTROOM RENOVATION - FACILITIES DEPARTMENT
FUNDING -- FACILITIES DEPARTMENT**

(Request sent to 121 vendors)

RFB #11-0219 Req 10046850

	Arambula Construction Co., Inc.	Compton Construction	Descon, Inc.	Hahner Foreman & Harness, LLC
Base Bid	\$249,500.00	\$143,600.00	\$150,900.00	\$161,800.00
Alternate #2	\$2,900.00 14 Days	\$1,490.00	\$0.00	\$4,004.63
Total Cost	\$252,400.00	\$145,090.00	\$150,900.00	\$165,804.63
Total Days	119 Days	110 Days	180 Days	120 Days
	Petra	Sutherland Builders, Inc.	Walz Harman Huffman Construction, Inc.	
Base Bid	\$144,990.00	\$154,300.00	\$143,000.00	
Alternate #2	\$4,600.00	\$3,990.00	\$3,500.00	
Total Cost	\$149,590.00	\$158,290.00	\$146,500.00	
Total Days	120 Days	150 Days	110 Days	
No Bids	MW Builders	McPherson Contractors, Inc.	Cornejo & Sons, LLC	Martin K. Eby Construction Co
	Sauerwein Construction Co., Inc.	Icon Structures, Inc.	Wildcat Construction	Bauer & Son Construction
	Robl Commercial	Encore Construction LLC	AI Serv Co	

On the recommendation of Angee Sisco, on behalf of the Facilities Department, Jennifer Dombaugh moved to **accept the low overall bid from Compton Construction in the amount of \$145,090.00.** David Spears seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Project scope will include a new 900-square-foot restroom and shower facility to replace existing facility. Add alternate two is longer lasting, more vandal proof, stainless steel fixtures versus traditional porcelain as included in the base bid. The project is approved in the 2011 CIP. Sandy Anguelov - Facilities, Mark Sroufe - Park Superintendent, and Angee Sisco - Purchasing, reviewed all bids received and unanimously agreed to recommend Compton Construction for award. Compton has previously done satisfactory work for the County.

Note - Add Alternate #1 is demolition of existing facility which was removed in Addendum 1. Sedgwick County Park Staff has demolished the existing structure.

Question: Is this item the same project that was considered and approved for additional funding at yesterday's (February 1, 2012) County Commission meeting? Yes.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS FEBRUARY 2, 2012

2. UTILITY BILL AUDIT -- FACILITIES DEPARTMENT

FUNDING -- NOT APPLICABLE

(Request sent to 30 vendors)

RFP #11-0231 Req N/A

	ConEdison Solutions	EMG, Inc	TriStem, Ltd
Cost Savings/Sharing Proposal	60% County 40% ConEdison or \$41,600	\$120 per bill \$11,880 annually	51% County 49% EMG

On the recommendation of Angee Sisco, on behalf of the Facilities Department, Jennifer Dombaugh moved to **accept the proposal from ConEdison Solutions and establish a contract for a period of one (1) year at the cost sharing rates as indicated above.** Tim Kaufman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Sedgwick County currently spends approximately \$2.6 million on gas and electric, annually. This contract is being established to ensure efficiency in our billing. Services acquired under this contract will provide the County with an audit and follow up communication to utility providers (gas, electric and water) to ensure the County is being billed appropriately in the future and receives credits as due. The vendor will be responsible for obtaining current and historical bills, analyzing for overcharges in meter readings, inappropriate rates, incorrect or nonexistent equipment, etc. Upon completion of review, the vendor will request appropriate changes and refunds. Under the proposed plan, any savings will be credited to Sedgwick County, with a cost sharing of 60/40 (County will keep 60% and provide back to ConEdison 40% of any actual checks received). For any rate or other long term ancillary changes, the County will provide ConEdison the same 60/40 share for a period of one year from initial change date.

The County will not incur any actual cost through this solicitation. ConEdison recently conducted a facility energy audit, and completed services in a satisfactory manner. In addition, they provided the most advantageous cost sharing method.

Question: What is the difference between the monetary and percentage pricing in the chart? This type of service can be provided through a flat rate or sharing realized savings. This project does not have any funding authorized, and as such, the review team only considered options that provided a percentage share of any savings actually received.

Question: What is the length of term for any shared savings? Any historical pricing that is modified will be paid and shared in a lump sum. If corrections are found that will have a continuing effect, the share will remain in place for one year from the effective date of the change.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS FEBRUARY 2, 2012

3. RENEWAL OF ANNUAL MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT - DIVISION OF INFORMATION AND OPERATIONS FUNDING-NETWORKING AND TELECOM (Annual Maintenance and Support Renewal)

Req 10046807 (State of Kansas Contract #10932)

	XIOTECH
12 months annual support renewal Emprise 7000 SSN 13789 (13) with ISE1 (91) effective 2/29/2012 to 3/29/2013	\$7,979.14
12 months annual support renewal Emprise 7000 SSN 13628 (13) with ISE1 (91) effective 2/29/2012 to 3/29/2013	\$7,979.14
12 months annual support renewal Brocade SSN 00801 (12) effective 3/8/2012 to 3/8/2013	\$2,856.00
12 months annual support renewal Mag 3D 4000s SSN 11418 (12) effective 3/31/2012 to 3/31/2013	\$13,145.04
Grand Total	\$31,959.32

On the recommendation of Dallas Shaffer, on behalf of the Division of Information and Operations, David Spears moved to **accept the quotes from Xiotech in the amount of \$31,959.32**. Jennifer Dombaugh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Storage Area Networks (SANs) is an arrangement of data storage devices (typically hard drives) that are accessed by servers to retrieve application data, especially useful for databases, and high usage file servers. Sharing disk storage simplifies storage administration and adds a layer of flexibility by removing cables and devices that do not have to be physically moved to shift storage from one server to another.

SAN environments are able to better utilize space by being able to consolidate disk arrays in one system. This lets us better manage the space purchased rather than each server having its own disk arrays with lots of additional storage only available to that server.

SANs are crucial in adding disaster recovery options by giving our environment the ability to 'mirror' and "copy" data across our system to other hardened datacenters for another facet of redundancy.

Without the maintenance agreement, all issues would be handled on a cost per hour format, and the response time is much longer than if you have a support contract. With support contracts, the equipment and its software also receive patches and critical system fixes that would not be received without such support in place. This agreement is not available from other vendors.

Last year we spent \$79,101.00, but it included a storage upgrade, and this year, we have one less SAN device which is being taken out of service.

Question: What is the response time? The response time is 4 hours.