

ITEMS REQUIRING BOCC APPROVAL
(5 Items)

1. FUEL - FLEET MANAGEMENT
FUNDING - FLEET MANAGEMENT
(Request sent to 25 vendors)

RFB #17-0099 Contract

RE-2021-0000 Contract									
TANK WAGON 5,000 GALLONS OR LESS	MJ Murphy, LLC				TANK WAGON 5,000 GALLONS OR MORE	MJ Murphy, LLC			
	Mark-up	Freight	Surcharge	Total Fees		Mark-up	Freight	Surcharge	Total Fees
1. Treated 87 octane E10 unleaded gasoline	\$0.079	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.079	1. Treated 87 octane E10 unleaded gasoline	\$0.039	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.039
2. Diesel fuel #1	\$0.094	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.094	2. Diesel fuel #1	\$0.054	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.054
3. Diesel fuel #2	\$0.084	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.084	3. Diesel fuel #2	\$0.049	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.049
4. Diesel fuel #1 Dyed	\$0.094	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.094	4. Diesel fuel #1 Dyed	\$0.054	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.054
5. Diesel fuel #2 Dyed	\$0.084	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.084	5. Diesel fuel #2 Dyed	\$0.049	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.049
Acknowledge Addenda	Yes								
TANK WAGON 5,000 GALLONS OR LESS	Kanza Cooperative				TANK WAGON 5,000 GALLONS OR MORE	Kanza Cooperative			
	Mark-up	Freight	Surcharge	Total Fees		Mark-up	Freight	Surcharge	Total Fees
1. Treated 87 octane E10 unleaded gasoline	\$0.0865	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0865	1. Treated 87 octane E10 unleaded gasoline	\$0.0470	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0470
2. Diesel fuel #1	\$0.0915	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0915	2. Diesel fuel #1	\$0.0515	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0515
3. Diesel fuel #2	\$0.0915	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0915	3. Diesel fuel #2	\$0.0515	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0515
4. Diesel fuel #1 Dyed	\$0.0915	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0915	4. Diesel fuel #1 Dyed	\$0.0515	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0515
5. Diesel fuel #2 Dyed	\$0.0915	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0915	5. Diesel fuel #2 Dyed	\$0.0515	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0515
Acknowledge Addenda	Yes								
TANK WAGON 5,000 GALLONS OR LESS	Hampel Oil				TANK WAGON 5,000 GALLONS OR MORE	Hampel Oil			
	Mark-up	Freight	Surcharge	Total Fees		Mark-up	Freight	Surcharge	Total Fees
1. Treated 87 octane E10 unleaded gasoline	\$0.0850	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0850	1. Treated 87 octane E10 unleaded gasoline	\$0.0750	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0750
2. Diesel fuel #1	\$0.0900	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0900	2. Diesel fuel #1	\$0.0800	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0800
3. Diesel fuel #2	\$0.0900	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0900	3. Diesel fuel #2	\$0.0800	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0800
4. Diesel fuel #1 Dyed	\$0.0900	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0900	4. Diesel fuel #1 Dyed	\$0.0800	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0800
5. Diesel fuel #2 Dyed	\$0.0900	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0900	5. Diesel fuel #2 Dyed	\$0.0800	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.0800
Acknowledge Addenda	Yes								
TANK WAGON 5,000 GALLONS OR LESS	Petroleum Traders Corporations				TANK WAGON 5,000 GALLONS OR MORE	Petroleum Traders Corporations			
	Mark-up	Freight	Surcharge	Total Fees		Mark-up	Freight	Surcharge	Total Fees
1. Treated 87 octane E10 unleaded gasoline	\$0.0174	\$0.1450	\$0.000	\$0.1624	1. Treated 87 octane E10 unleaded gasoline	\$0.0174	\$0.0255	\$0.000	\$0.0429
2. Diesel fuel #1	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	2. Diesel fuel #1	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid
3. Diesel fuel #2	\$0.0174	\$0.1450	\$0.000	\$0.1624	3. Diesel fuel #2	\$0.0174	\$0.0282	\$0.000	\$0.0456
4. Diesel fuel #1 Dyed	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	4. Diesel fuel #1 Dyed	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid
5. Diesel fuel #2 Dyed	\$0.0174	\$0.1450	\$0.000	\$0.1624	5. Diesel fuel #2 Dyed	\$0.0174	\$0.0282	\$0.000	\$0.0456
Acknowledge Addenda	Yes								
No Bid	Amalgamated Inc.	Broyles, Inc.	Boone Opportunities	Dark Oil Company, Inc.	Double Check Co.	Hoidale Co., Inc.	Parker Oil	Shepherd Oil, Co.	
	Dupree Testing Services, Inc.			McMaster- Carr	HCS Petroleum Equipment	Center Pointe Energy			

On the recommendation of Kristen McGovern, on behalf of Fleet Management, Ellen House moved to **accept the overall low bid from MJ Murphy, LLC at the fees listed above and establish contract pricing for one (1) year with four (4) one (1) year options to renew.** Richard Powell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Contracted fuel price is based on the low Oil Price Information Service (OPIS) price market index from the preceding week for purchases incurred the following week plus the vendor fees. OPIS price will fluctuate on a weekly basis but the fees do not fluctuate.

Questions and Answers

Richard Powell: I have a question as to the term of the contract. We have a one (1) year with four (4) one (1) year renewals, which is a little bit different than a lot of the contracts we see sometimes where we have two (2) or three (3) year with additional single year renewals. Is there a particular reason?

Kristen McGovern: I created the terms that way so it would give the department some flexibility because there are delivery requirements with this contract. I just wanted to give them some flexibility if we ended up with a vendor who was late with deliveries or we had invoicing issues. We don't want to be stuck with something for 3 years if there were issues.

Richard Powell: That makes sense, especially with an organization as large as Sedgwick County, having quite the mobile fleet that we do.

Tom Stolz: Penny, can you come talk about consumption levels because diesel fuel #1 for our chosen vendor is higher? How much gas do we use? How much diesel #1 and how much diesel #2 do we use?

Penny Poland: For 2017 we used 478,433 gallons unleaded and 149,141 gallons of diesel. We use the #1 during the winter months.

Tom Stolz: So we use way more unleaded than anything else so that price is really what drives this Murphy decision pretty much correct?

Kristen McGovern: Correct

2. CONSERVATION TREATMENT FOR THE SOLDIERS AND SAILORS CIVIL WAR MONUMENT - FACILITIES DEPARTMENT FUNDING - FACILITIES DEPARTMENT

(Request sent to 17 vendors)

RFP #17-0095 Contract

	New Roots Historic Restoration, LLC	Russell-Marti Conservation Services, Inc.
Materials and installation to perform triennial maintenance for 2018	\$22,000.00	\$22,440.00
Materials and installation to perform annual maintenance for 2019	\$12,000.00	\$13,950.00
Materials and installation to perform annual maintenance for 2020	\$12,500.00	\$13,950.00
Materials and installation to perform triennial maintenance for 2021	\$22,800.00	\$13,950.00
Materials and installation to perform annual maintenance for 2022	\$13,000.00	\$13,950.00
Grand Total	\$82,300.00	\$78,240.00
Hourly Labor Rate for additional work	\$50.00	\$125.00
Acknowledge Addendum	Y	Y
No Bid	Case Forensics	WMA Architects
	Pishny Restoration Services	Mid Continental

On the recommendation of Kim Bush, on behalf of the Facilities Department, Linda Kizzire moved to **accept the low proposal from Russell-Marti Conservation Services, Inc. for a total five (5) year cost of \$78,240.00 and establish contract pricing for any additional work at \$125.00 per hour.** Ellen House seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

A review committee comprised of Tania Cole and Jeff Cooper - Facilities, Doug King - Records Management, and Kim Bush - Purchasing reviewed and scored the responses based on criteria set forth in the RFP. Russell-Marti Conservation Services, Inc. received the highest score and is being recommended for award.

The scope of this work is to provide conservation treatment and maintenance services for the historic Soldiers and Sailors Monument located on the south side of the Historic Courthouse. Russell-Marti Conservation Services, Inc. has previous experience in conservation work with this monument. They have an excellent reputation for this type of work and county personnel confirmed that their previous experience with this company was exceptional.

The monument was constructed in 1912-1913 and has been placed on the National Register Of Historical Places by the National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, November 1998. The experience and references provided weighed significantly in the evaluation process to ensure the highest level of care be given.

Notes: The triennial service is a more in-depth treatment than what is required annually and includes additional preservation steps that are not required annually. Treatment plans are created in conjunction with county staff and best practices in preservation techniques as suggested by trained professionals. This is the same maintenance plan the county has used over the past 10 years.

The county does not anticipate utilizing any additional hours. There were no additional hours used on the previous contract for these services. It is best practice to contract a fixed rate in the case they are needed.

Questions and Answers

Linda Kizzire: Are they our current vendor?

Tania Cole: We currently do not have a contract for this work right now. What we are referring to in their experience is when we had previous contracts on the conservation treatment of the monument they were the awarded vendor for that.

Linda Kizzire: So this is not a continuance or new bid from 2017?

Tania Cole: No. This is a new bid we have put out for new contract.

Linda Kizzire: How long has it been since any work has been done?

Tania Cole: I want to say at least six or seven years since they have done any conservation work. We have had some CIP projects in those years where we addressed the Lady Liberty statue, as well as the granite structure.

Richard Powell: It mentions in our supporting documentation the triennial services more in depth requiring more materials and man hours. I noticed that for 2018 the two respective bidders are almost equal in their estimates for the triennial service but when we get down to the next three year period in 2021 the recommended vendor is about 40% less. It seems interesting to me that in 2018 they are almost neck and neck but then three years later there is a drop of about 40%. Is there any explanation given?

Kim Bush: As part of Russell-Marti's response, they did state due to their previous experience working with this monument they didn't feel like it would cost as much that year because some of those services probably wouldn't be needed.

Tania Cole: What happens in that triennial service is mostly focused on the bronze and copper sculptures. They basically take off the wax and lacquer and they reapply that every three years. Russell-Marti said if we have a good maintenance program in place that will likely not be needed in that third year. So we'll start off doing that in the first year and when that third year comes, they felt pretty strongly in their experience and knowledge that won't be required in the third year.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS FEBRUARY 1, 2018

Richard Powell: In the event that should change, we have hostile weather over a period of time or some extenuating circumstances, to get it back to that standard, would we see ourselves billed at the hourly rate to get it back to that standard?

Tania Cole: That's correct.

Tom Stolz: Since we haven't had this for six years, I'm going to assume some of your CIP projects came about because we weren't doing this annual maintenance?

Tania Cole: That's correct. So the two CIP projects we had addressing the granite and the Lady Liberty statue came from Russell-Marti's work they did for the maintenance and suggesting to us what they are seeing on the monument.

Tom Stolz: Are you budgeted for this in 2018?

Tania Cole: Yes.

3. PUMPER TRUCK -- SEDGWICK COUNTY FIRE DISTRICT #1**FUNDING -- SEDGWICK COUNTY FIRE DISTRICT #1**

(Request sent to 62 vendors)

RFP #17-0089 -- Contract

	Hays Fire and Rescue	Danko Emergency Equipment
	Unit Price	Unit Price
Pumper Truck	\$617,084.00	\$605,531.00
Independent Front Suspension Option	\$23,500.00	\$17,574.00
Total	\$640,584.00	\$623,105.00
Manufacturer	Rosenbauer	Smeal Holding, LLC
Delivery Date	365 Days ARO	390 Days ARO
Bid Bond	Y	Y
Acknowledge Addenda	Y	Y
	Sutphen Corporation	Conrad Fire Equipment, Inc.
	Unit Price	Unit Price
Pumper Truck	\$685,697.00	\$699,387.00
Independent Front Suspension Option	N/A	\$17,056.00
Total	\$685,697.00	\$716,443.00
Manufacturer	Sutphen Corporation	Pierce
Delivery Date	11 - 13 Months ARO	9 - 10 Months ARO
Bid Bond	Y	Y
Acknowledge Addenda	Y	Y
	Emergency Fire Equipment, Inc.	
	Unit Price	
Pumper Truck	\$612,314.00	
Independent Front Suspension Option	\$19,600.00	
Total	\$631,914.00	
Manufacturer	Spartan ERV	
Delivery Date	365 Days ARO	
Bid Bond	N	
Acknowledge Addenda	Y	
No Bid	Life Line Emergency Vehicles	Feld Fire Equipment Co., Inc
	Roberson Fire & Safety, Inc.	North Central Emergency Vehicles
	Watts Manufacturing	CTE Custom Truck & Equipment

On the recommendation of Britt Rosencutter, on behalf of Sedgwick County Fire District #1 (SCFD), Richard Powell moved to **accept the low proposal from Danko Emergency Equipment in the amount of \$623,105.00**. Ellen House seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

A committee comprised of Ray Hensley, Troy Hilger, Brad Burdick, and Brian Richey - SCFD, Randy Bargdill - Treasurer's Office, and Britt Rosencutter - Purchasing reviewed all proposal responses based on experience, qualifications, and ability to provide the specified apparatus. Danko Emergency Equipment met specifications and was the lowest overall proposal.

A pumper is traditionally what most people refer to when they see a fire engine and is the backbone of any fire department. It is used in all aspects of the fire service. A pumper is usually designed by each fire department to fit the departments' needs and carries a fire pump, water tank, ladders and all tools needed to fight fires. Its main purpose is to pump water to fight fires from a static or pressurized water supply.

The average lifecycle of a pumper is 10 to 15 years. The Sedgwick County Fire District #1 currently has 8 pumpers in their fleet.

The apparatus that is being replaced does score a 15 on the 15 point replacement system used by Fleet Management.

Note: This is a replacement vehicle and the surplus will be sold on Purple Wave.

Questions and Answers

Richard Powell: The current vehicle we have right now that is being replaced, what is its status right now as far as age and usability and etc.

Tavis Leake: It is a 1998 Central States Pumper.

Tom Stolz: Chief, is there a domino effect with this? Can you go through that with us?

Tavis Leake: If we were to acquire the new engine then it would replace one of our current front line and that current front line would go to a reserve status and then we would push out that 1998 and put it on Purple Wave. We would have to have something in reserve in case one of our front lines went down.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS FEBRUARY 1, 2018

Tom Stolz: Is the one we are replacing actually in Viola?

Tavis Leake: Yes.

Tom Stolz: So that's been in service for almost 20 years, so it has exceeded expectations on how long they should normally last. When you say that a normal life is 10-15 years, is that front line service?

Tavis Leake: That is probably the reserve and front line.

Richard Powell: Does this new truck come with a turnkey and all the equipment in already in place mounted or do we have any additional purchases we require?

Tavis Leake: We'll have to do some additional purchases, yes.

Talaya Schwartz: Is it standard to wait over a year for a new truck?

Tavis Leake: That's pretty much the standard practice. Yes, it takes about a year for delivery. Those current trucks will continue to put miles and wear and tear on the ones we are using.

Tom Stolz: Do we have any other Danko built trucks?

Tavis Leake: Yes.

Tom Stolz: How many do we have in our fleet of eight?

Brian Richey: Three

Tom Stolz: As we get this new one in, from a parts and maintenance compatibility, this will mesh in with the rest of our fleet? About as good as we can get?

Travis Leake: Absolutely, we will be able to service it.

Tom Stolz: Where are these built?

Britt Rosencutter: Snyder, Nebraska.

Brian Richey: Just to clarify on that question a little more. This truck will be built in Snyder, Nebraska, is actually built in two facilities. The chassis part comes from their parent company, which is Spartan Motors out of Lansing, Michigan. Once that cabin chassis is built, it is shipped to Snyder, Nebraska, where they do the outfitting for the fire pump, basically the fire body which typically sets on the rear of the fire truck. It's all from one source, Smeal owns Spartan or Spartan owns Smeal. It's all one company but built in two different facilities.

Tom Stolz: Since it takes a year of build time, do we monitor stages of this construction?

Brian Richey: Typically in the past, we do one, two or three site visits during that construction period. Once the chassis is built and delivered to the Nebraska facility, we usually have a trip there to make sure that component meets specifications that we designed. When the truck is completed, we do a final inspection to make sure that the entire truck meets our specifications.

Tom Stolz: At that facility before they deliver them?

Brian Richey: Yes, before they deliver.

Tom Stolz: In this contract there are two compulsory trips we have to make; on delivery to Nebraska and final product? Is that correct?

Brian Richey: Yes.

Tom Stolz: Who goes to that? Brian, do you do that?

Brian Richey: Typically Chief Leake and I take one or two other department people that have been involved with the specification and the whole process so we don't have to reeducate everybody on what our specification is saying. In the past it has been me and one of our Battalion chiefs that is involved in the process.

Tom Stolz: Are those costs embedded in the price? Do we have to pay for that separately?

Brian Richey: Those costs are on us on this one because we did not include those inspection trips. We used to have them as part of our specification, at the request of the previous purchasing they recommended to absorb the cost after the fact due to location of various vendors. They all had different costs associated. Some plants are in Florida, Wisconsin, and Nebraska. Luckily, on this one it is close enough we can drive, so the cost will be minimal.

Tom Stolz: That's different from the EMS contract. I like that logic much better, to where you can go when you need to.

Linda Kizzire: This is going to be housed in Viola once you get it?

Brian Richey: No. The new one will go into one of our fire stations and move the current one to reserve and send the one in reserve to Viola.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS FEBRUARY 1, 2018

4. SEDGWICK COUNTY DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY ORGANIZATION (SCDDO) INTELLECTUAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY PROGRAMS (NON-HCBS) - SEDGWICK COUNTY DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY ORGANIZATION (SCDDO)

FUNDING -- STATE AID

(Request sent to 45 vendors)

RFP #17-0108 S/C 8000121700

		Rainbows United, Inc.
Name of Program - Therapeutic Child Care 0 - 5		
Funding Requested		\$26,983.00
Recommended Award		\$26,983.00
Name of Program - Therapeutic Child Care for School-Age Children/Youth with Disabilities		
Funding Requested		\$106,153.00
Recommended Award		\$106,153.00
Name of Program - Infant/Toddler Services		
Funding Requested		\$430,120.00
Recommended Award		\$304,120.00
Name of Program - Creating Happiness by Building Relationships		
Funding Requested		\$140,348.00
Recommended Award		\$0.00
Total Funding Requested		\$703,604.00
Total Recommended Award		\$437,256.00
No Bids		
Dream Catcher Case Management, Inc.	Love, Comfort & Care	Rudy Ranch House
People First Employment & Residential Services	Sullivan Gang Care Center	Dream Vision, LLC.
Independent Living Resources Center	Heart of Care Agency, LLC.	Taylor Drug
Arrowhead West, Inc.	Individual Advocacy, LLC.	The Looking Glass
Thrive Skilled Pediatric Care	Home Technology Solution, Inc.	Helpers, Inc.
Catholic Charities	Envision Industries, Inc.	Starkey, Inc.

On the recommendation of Britt Rosencutter, on behalf of Sedgwick County Developmental Disability Organization (SCDDO), Linda Kizzire recommend to **accept three (3) of the four (4) proposal options and approve funding to Rainbows United, Inc. in the amount of \$437,256.00.** Talaya Schwartz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

A review committee comprised of Dee Nighswonger, Jeannette Livingston - SCDDO, Brenda Gutierrez - COMCARE, Greg Sullivan - Sedgwick County Intellectual/Developmental Disability Advisory Board and Britt Rosencutter - Purchasing, evaluated the proposals based on criteria set forth in the RFP. The committee unanimously recommended to fund the proposals for Therapeutic Child Care 0-5 and Therapeutic Child Care for School-Age Children/Youth with Disabilities at the amount requested and the proposal for Infant/Toddler Services at the rate of \$304,120.00. The proposal for Creating Happiness by Building Relationships was not recommended for funding. The total funding available for this grant program is \$561,000.00. The committee determined the proposals recommended for funding best fit the criteria in the RFP and purpose of the grant funding. The recommendations result in \$123,744.00 of the available funding being unallocated and the committee agreed to re-issue a request for proposal with preference for programming that will serve adults with Intellectual and/or Developmental Disabilities (I/DD), as none of the proposals received under the current RFP serve individuals over the age of 21.

SCDDO oversees the service system for individuals with I/DD in Sedgwick County. The agency's mission is to assist people with developmental disabilities to receive quality services and achieve greater independence. The funds utilized for these grants are received from the State of Kansas Department of Aging and Disability Services through an annual contract. SCDDO puts these state aid dollars out for competitive bid every three years. In particular, these funds are targeted to serve children with I/DD, particularly those age zero to five, and adults with I/DD who are eligible for the system but are determined not in need of services.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS FEBRUARY 1, 2018

5. AUMENTUM MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT -- INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND SUPPORT SERVICES (ITSS)

FUNDING -- TAX SYSTEM

(Hardware/Software Maintenance)

#18-2006 S/C #8000119592

	Thomson Reuters
Support for 1/1/2018-12/31/2018	
Aumentum Records Admin Std Support	\$19,142.11
Aumentum Tax System Support	\$231,890.28
Aumentum Assmt Admin Support	\$77,163.97
Aumentum Personal Prop Admin Sys Support	\$20,524.93
Grand Total	\$348,721.29

On the recommendation of Kim Bush, on behalf of ITSS, Ellen House moved to **accept the quote from Thomson Reuters in the amount of \$348,721.29**. Richard Powell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Linda Kizzire recusing herself from the vote due to her office using this software.

This is support for the Aumentum (Manatron) tax system. This system assists in the management of taxation billing and revenue collection for Sedgwick County.

Note: Last year was the final year of support approved with the original award and the county paid \$335,308.94. Efforts were made to negotiate a new 3-5 year fixed/fixed escalation agreement, however there were time constraints. The intent is to work on a term maintenance agreement starting with 2019 support.

Questions and Answers

Linda Kizzire: I have a question for Will. Since my office is the primary user of this, do I need to abstain?

William Deer: I would recommend you do.

Talaya Schwartz: Is this a sole source?

Kim Bush: Correct. This is software maintenance on an existing system we have. The developer provides the maintenance and support.

Tom Stolz: It looks like this is an extension for a year rather than go out for a more permanent solution.

Kim Bush: What happened was this year I tried to work with the vendor to negotiate a longer contract as indicated in the note. Last year was the final year for the previously awarded support with the original contract. The vendor was not able to return a response in a timely manner from their Legal Department about a fixed contract so it was decided by the department to get it done this year because we are past our renewal and pay the auto renewal this year and towards the end of this year we will try to work with the company again to establish a longer term agreement for support.

Talaya Schwartz: How long would you like the new contract to be for?

Kim Bush: Usually we do three to five years of maintenance. It depends on what their pricing is and if they give us an escalator.

Talaya Schwartz: If they agree to do that, will it have to come back in front of Bid Board?

Kim Bush: Correct. Next year we would come back and if we negotiated a five year agreement, we would get the five year agreement approved up front and each year we would pay the invoice when it comes in. Since we have not had the chance to do that yet because of time, this is the only year on this one.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS FEBRUARY 1, 2018

Tom Stolz: How old is the original contract?

Kim Bush: I believe this was implemented in 2007. I think it started in 2007 and didn't get done until 2010 maybe.

Kelly Looney: Aumentum is the product that Thomson Reuters sells.

Tom Stolz: We buy this in 2010 from the sales company and with that purchase we got a six year maintenance agreement?

Kelly Looney: Correct.

Tom Stolz: Do we pay annually on it?

Kelly Looney: Yes sir.

Tom Stolz: What was the 2016 actual on it? In your notes Kim, you have \$335,308.94. Is that what we have paid annually historically in the past?

Kelly Looney: It has been the same since the contract started. It is now going to be increased with this new contract.

Kim Bush: The original contract increased every year a little bit.

Tom Stolz: We're in the ballpark here. We aren't astronomically going up?

Kim Bush: Correct. Typically the idea is we would like to get in place another three to five year contract so we can put a max on their escalator. If we kept auto renewing annually, it's possible they would try to go 15% or something ridiculous. The intent is to try to do that with software.

Tom Stolz: Do we have any other choice other than Thomson Reuters?

Kelly Looney: No.

Tom Stolz: This really is a sole source.

Kelly Looney: Yes it really is. They take care of everything because they have written it. We have tickets with them every week we need help with.

Tom Stolz: It's disappointing they can't get back with us timely because we'll be doing business with Thomson Reuters again next year.

Kim Bush: Correct.

Tom Stolz: The only other option is to go with a whole different product.