

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MARCH 8, 2018

1. MID-SIZE TRACKED EXCAVATOR WITH WOOD SHREDDER OPTION -- FLEET MANAGEMENT FUNDING --STREAM MAINT

(Request sent to 84 vendors)

RFP #17-0104 -- S/C #8000123889

	G.W. Van Keppel Co.	Murphy Tractor & Equipment Co.
	Unit Price	Unit Price
Mid-Size Tracked Excavator	\$164,304.00	\$169,328.00
Wood Shredder Option	\$26,990.00	\$29,667.00
Total	\$191,294.00	\$198,995.00
Make/Model	Volvo - ECR145 EL	John Deere 130G LC
Delivery Date	60 to 75 days ARO	Approx. 120 days ARO
No Bid	Agri Center	American Equipment Co.
	Berry Tractor	Bobcat of Salina
	Cummings, McGowan & West, Inc.	Kansas Truck
	Leachrod, LLC	Logan Contractors Supply, Inc.
	MHC Kenworth - Salina	Midway Freightliner, Inc.
	Prairieland Partners - Wichita	Rusty Eck Ford
	Stamm Manufacturing	Straub International
	Summit Truck Group	Wichita Tractor Co.
Truck Center Companies, Wichita		

On the recommendation of Britt Rosencutter, on behalf of Fleet Management, Richard Powell moved to **accept the proposal from Murphy Tractor & Equipment Co. in the amount of \$198,995.00.** Linda Kizzire seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

A committee comprised of Penny Poland - Fleet Management, Jon Medlam, Jon Mills, and Danny Evans - Public Works, Mark Furry - Noxious Weeds, and Britt Rosencutter - Purchasing reviewed all proposal responses based on experience, qualifications, and ability to provide the specified equipment. Murphy Tractor & Equipment Co. met specifications as requested.

This excavator was approved by BoCC as an addition to Fleet during the 2018 budget process. Heavy rainfall and flooding during the summer and fall of 2016 has called attention to a wide array of drainage and flooding issues in the county. The stream maintenance program has been a very successful and relatively inexpensive way to clear stream obstructions and improve the flow of runoff in natural streams around the county.

The main duty for this apparatus will be clearing and cleaning out around bridges and culverts of trees, sediment, other debris, and fixing washouts around these structures. It will also be used to load the trees in to the tub grinder. It will also help out on the channel cleaning projects that stream maintenance has to do by using the tree grinding attachment on the site instead of having to haul them off-site.

The proposal from G.W. Van Keppel Co. did not meet specifications on two vital items. The specification called for a minimum of a 270 cu. in. engine, G.W. Van Keppel Co. quoted a 244 cu. in. engine. The specification called for a minimum 42,000 lbs. drawbar pull. G.W. Van Keppel Co. quoted a 27,500 lbs. drawbar pull. These two items are important as they affect the performance and safety in the operation of the apparatus.

Note: This is an addition to Public Works fleet for Stream Maintenance.

Questions and Answers

Richard Powell: The wood shredder option, is that a separate device like a grinder with a trailer that you pull behind trucks and things or is it an integral part of the machinery itself?

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MARCH 8, 2018

Penny Poland: The grinder will be a part of the excavator and they will use it to grind trees and other material and debris while they are there so that it doesn't have to be hauled off.

Tom Stolz: Let's talk about cubic inches of an engine size and draw pull. Somebody from Public Works may have to assist you on this. So we're dealing with a more expensive bid because the less expensive one has a smaller engine, which is directly related to the amount of draw pull that the machine can provide, I would assume?

Penny Poland: Well really those are two separate issues. The smaller engine will require this machine to work at 100% capacity from day one on any task that they're doing. It's expected to be performing as much as it can, where if we purchase the bigger engine it would be doing medium and heavy-duty so it would be able to do the smaller task and the heavy task and the engine is to perform as expected.

Tom Stolz: And the give back on that is if the machine is working out of less than 100% capacity it will last longer right?

Penny Poland: True, also fuel economy. I would assume that if you were pushing it at maximum capacity, you would have more maintenance.

Tom Stolz: And how is that not related to the amount of draw pulls? I thought the bigger engine could pull more weight.

Penny Poland: The draw pull is actually the machine's ability for a horizontal force so it will help the machine to not get stuck. It will help it to pull it out.

Tom Stolz: In your experience Jim, the kinds of work that this machine is going to do requires this level of engine work and requires this level of draw pulls?

Jim Weber: I would describe it this way. You see backhoes working a lot in the environment. So if you're out in a parking lot or the streets that's one thing. But this backhoe will go out off-road and it's going to be down at the bottom of the creek. If you don't have the power to get in and get out of there, getting it is very tough. So this is not a piece of equipment we would want to go lighter on because it could essentially make it useless if we can't get it out.

Tom Stolz: So these specifications, for this piece of equipment and the exact kind of work that we're going to ask for it to do is correct?

Jim Weber: Yes.

Tom Stolz: This is all part of BoCC wanting to allow us to stay proactive on the clearance of maintenance and streets. There's another piece of equipment that you are purchasing in addition to this or is this it?

Jim Weber: This is the second piece, the first one that went out was a pickup truck, basically a crew truck.

Tom Stolz: And you already got that?

Jim Weber: Yes.

Tom Stolz: And you had a couple of staffers?

Jim Weber: Yes, the two staff people are on board and hired.

Tom Stolz: So this concludes that we are ready to go?

Jim Weber: Right, that's everything.

2. FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTER MECHANICAL RETROFIT -- PROJECT SERVICES**FUNDING -- RFTOP HVAC REPL-RFSC**

(Request sent to 286 vendors)

RFB #17-0101 S/C #8000123564

	American Mechanical, Inc.	Central Consolidated, Inc.	Kruse Corporation
Base Bid	\$295,970.00	\$297,050.00	\$356,682.00
Days to substantial completion	210	165	40
Days to final completion	60	10	15
Total Calendar Days	270	175	55
Acknowledge Addenda (1 & 2)	Y	Y	Y
Bid Bond	Y	Y	Y
Deduct Alternate #1 from Base Bid - Remove replacing RTU#9 from the project	-\$34,423.00	-\$42,020.00	-\$34,521.00
Option 1, Reliable Controls	\$29,900.00	\$27,190.00	\$29,907.00
Option 1A, Reliable Controls without RTU #9	\$25,660.00	\$23,330.00	\$25,658.00
Option 2, Johnson Controls	\$27,275.00	\$24,800.00	\$27,276.00
Option 2A, Jonson Controls without RTU #9	\$24,945.00	\$22,680.00	\$24,946.00
TOTAL	\$323,245.00	\$321,850.00	\$383,958.00
No Bid	ACM Removal - Kansas, LLC.	Dondlinger Construction	Evans Building Co., Inc.
	Greening Construction, Inc.	Hentzen Contractors, Inc.	Hopper Construction, Inc.
	McPherson Contractors, Inc.	Piping & Equipment, Co., Inc.	Sauerwein Construction, Inc.
	The Best Home Guys	United Contractors	Van Asdale Construction
	8760 Engineering, LLC.	Encore Constructions LLC	Wildcat Construction Co., Inc.
	FSC, Inc.	Merrick & Co.	Snodgrass Construction
	Hutton Construction	Professional Engineering Consultants, PA.	

On the recommendation of Kimberly Bush, on behalf of Project Services, Richard Powell moved to **accept the low bid including Option 2 from Central Consolidated, Inc. in the amount of \$321,850.00.** Talaya Schwartz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

This project will replace 4 roof top HVAC units at the Regional Forensic Science Center. These new units will enable staff to more precisely control the temperature and humidity in the labs of the facility annex as well as provide the ability to control exhaust hood fan speeds and their interaction with the HVAC system.

These labs require strict control over temperature and humidity due to the handling and testing of evidence. The current units have periodically not been able to perform within the necessary standards during times of extreme temperature or humidity fluctuations in the weather. The new units utilize technology that was not available when the lab was built and will provide the ability to meet and maintain the required temperature and humidity tolerances during all weather conditions.

Questions and Answers

Richard Powell: I have a few questions, the first one deals with the existing equipment now. Can someone tell us how old this equipment is?

Rob Lawrence: The existing equipment is original to the facility, which opened in 2010. Eight years old.

Tom Stolz: We are talking about the annex?

Rob Lawrence: That's correct, the north portion.

Richard Powell: This may be a question for Dr. Rohrig. This statement that requires strict control over temperature and humidity due to handling and testing of evidence. What types of concerns are there if we have significant swings in temperature control and humidity settings?

Dr. Rohrig: Well there are several. One, the analytical instruments have specified operating ranges, humidity ranges from 50 to 85%. If they get outside of those ranges, equipment can malfunction and become inoperable. High humidity when you're dealing with electronics is not good for us, it is going to reduce the lifetime of the analytical instrument. On top of that in these laboratories we have microscopes and we have them serviced every year as required. Our vendor is noticing a lot of wear and tear and we are having to spend more money replacing parts and again reducing the lifetime of these particular instruments. On top of that, especially in low humidity, I think I went in there this morning it was like 19% or if you're on the high-end that can impact drug weights. We have to weigh our drugs because part of the sentencing is based upon weight so if we have a weight that's erroneous that could impact or have questionable results. So when we have these major swings, we just don't weigh the drugs. There's also a safety concern. In low humidity you get a lot of static electricity. We're dealing with a lot of white powders and I think we've all heard enough in the news about the opioid crisis. If you start to aerosolize these drugs, when we're trying to weigh them although they are in an enclosed environment, they can get out into the air. That's hazardous for the scientist doing that procedure. Multifaceted reasons why this is creating wear and tear on the environment, making an unsafe environment and has the potential to call into question the results, but to mitigate that we just don't do the testing at that point and time but that has a negative impact on workflow. Those of you that are in the laboratory arena or at least use results, you hear about this term called backlog that is exacerbating the problem.

Tom Stolz: Do these units solve your cross contamination problem regarding air flow within the system? I mean to where rooms are pristine and their air environment to where you don't get cross-contamination?

Dr. Rohrig: We really don't have cross contamination because we have four units that will take care of different areas in the way the outflow goes. The one thing I didn't mention but Rob kind of alluded to is it gives us better control on our exhaust. We do 100% exhaust so there is a cost of maintaining that environment. So if we have better control over that, our energy cost will also be slightly reduced.

Talaya Schwartz: With the four existing units, is there any chance to resell them or what's the plan to use those four existing ones?

Rob Lawrence: We haven't looked at the possibility of reselling them typically they become the property of the contractor that does the work for them to dispose of. So I don't know the answer as far as from our standpoint. We haven't looked into that.

Talaya Schwartz: It looks like these proposals are pretty similar in price. What was the final criteria that led to the decision with this particular company?

Rob Lawrence: Because they were competitive, as the low bidder, they met all of our technical requirements.

Richard Powell: Are they both located in the city or in the county?

Rob Lawrence: I believe they are.

Kim Bush: Yes.

Rob Lawrence: Yes they are.

**3. ONBASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT -- INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND SUPPORT SERVICES (ITSS)
FUNDING -- DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT**

(Joint Governmental Purchase NJPA-#083116-KON)

#18-2013 S/C #8000121989

	Konica Minolta Business Solutions USA, Inc.
Maintenance and Support (4/1/2018-3/31/2019)	\$147,833.00

On recommendation of Kimberly Bush, on behalf of ITSS, Linda Kizzire moved to **accept the quote from Konica Minolta Business Solutions USA, Inc. in the amount of \$147,833.00.** Richard Powell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

OnBase is the county standard scanning and document management solution.

Last year the county paid \$142,534.00 for this support.

Questions and Answers

Tom Stolz: Is there any way to get a multi year deal instead of going from year to year?

Kim Bush: That's something we've been visiting with a lot of our IT support contracts. So this one would be something we would want to visit as well, yes.

Talaya Schwartz: This is part of our joint governmental contract?

Kim Bush: Yes, this is under the NJPA contract listed and it is a contract that has been competitively solicited and that we are piggybacking off of that contract, yes.

Tom Stolz: Since Konica is the only bidder, is that who our vendor is? Is this a sole source, single source? Are they the only ones who can provide maintenance?

Joe Thomas: They are not the only ones. We have a contract with them through the joint governmental purchase as Kim mentioned. There was a competitive solicitation and this vendor was chosen.

Tom Stolz: Did anyone else bid?

Joe Thomas: On the original bid, I don't know. We would have to go back and look.

Talaya Schwartz: But the original bid wasn't done by Sedgwick County?

Kim Bush: Correct.

Tom Stolz: We're latching onto another government?

Joe Thomas: Correct.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACT MARCH 8, 2018

4. 2018 CRACK SEAL (R175-H) -- PUBLIC WORKS

FUNDING -- (R175-H) PREVENTIVE MX-16+

(Request sent to 46 vendors)

RFB # 18-0008 S/C #8000123182

Engineer's Estimate: \$478,221.00	PPJ Construction Inc.	Conspec, Inc., dba Kansas Paving	Cornejo & Sons	Pavement Pro's LLC
Road Improvement - Crack Seal (R175-H)	\$423,203.40	\$812,185.00	\$412,599.00	\$354,425.00
Bid Bond	Y	Y	Y	Y
No Bid	BRB Contractors, Inc.		Wichita Construction	McConnell & Assoc.
	SealMaster Denver		Unruh Excavating	Mission Construction Co., Inc.
	Cillessen & Sons, Inc.		Interstate Sealant & Concrete	Wildcat Construction
	Circle C Paving		BergKamp Construction	Nowak Construction Co., Inc.
	South Central Sealing and Paving			

On the recommendation of Kristen McGovern, on behalf of Public Works, Talaya Schwartz moved to **accept the low bid from Pavement Pro's LLC in the amount of \$354,425.00.** Linda Kizzire seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

This work consists of producing and placing a mixture of cationic polymer modified emulsions, aggregate, mineral filler, water and other additives as needed to prepare and seal all cracks in pavement for 75 miles on selected roads in Sedgwick County.

Questions and Answers

Linda Kizzire: Have we used Pavement Pro's LLC before?

Jim Weber: Yes, multiple times.

Richard Powell: There seems to be a significant variance from the vendors that did respond based against the engineer's estimate. We go from something that is maybe 75% higher than what the estimate was to some things that are maybe 25% lower. Any particular reason why we have such a swing there?

Jim Weber: Some people specialize in crack sealing. There are other people that bid, for example Conspec, Inc. That is something they can do but it's not their primary business. We'd like to figure out what the pattern is. Pavement Pro's has done it several times and they have done a fine job.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACT MARCH 8, 2018

**5. BRIDGE REPLACEMENT -- PUBLIC WORKS
FUNDING -- (B4742) 295TH STREET WEST**

(Request sent to 46 vendors)

RFB #18-0007 S/C #8000123183

Engineer's Estimate: \$607,123.00	Klaver Construction Co., Inc.		Mies Construction Inc.		Multicon, Inc.	
Bridge on 295th St. West Between 45th & 53rd Street North (B472)	\$431,828.37		\$506,645.16		\$957,280.26	
Bid Bond	Y		Y		Y	
Acknowledge Addendum	Y		Y		Y	
No Bid	BergeKamp Construction	Nowak Construction Co., Inc.	Unruh Excavating	Wildcat Construction	Conspec, Inc. dba Kansas Paving	L & M Contractors
	Reece Construction Co., Inc.	APAC - Kansas, Inc.	Cillessen & Sons, Inc.	Cornejo & Sons, LLC	DH Gable & Associates	Dondlinger & Sons Construction Co., Inc.
	Hacker Bros. Construction		Mid - Kansas Construction Services		Wichita Concrete Pipe	

On the recommendation of Kristen McGovern, on behalf of Public Works, Linda Kizzire moved to **accept the low bid from Klaver Construction Co., Inc. in the amount of \$431,828.37.** Richard Powell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

This is a bridge replacement which includes grading, asphalt surfacing, seeding, guardrail and pavement marking.

Questions and Answers

Talaya Schwartz: Is this bridge replacement already in the budget for this year?

Jim Weber: Yes. This is in our 2018 CIP. This is approved.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MARCH 8, 2018

6. RISK MANAGEMENT CONSULTING SERVICES -- RISK MANAGEMENT FUNDING -- RISK MANAGEMENT

(Request sent to 20 vendors)

RFP #17-0105 Contract

	Charlesworth Consulting, LLC	IMA, Inc.
Annual fee, Year 1	\$70,000.00 - \$80,000.00	\$50,000.00
Annual fee, Year 2	\$70,000.00 - \$80,000.00	\$50,000.00
Annual fee, Year 3	\$70,000.00 - \$80,000.00	\$50,000.00
Annual fee, Year 4	\$72,100.00 - \$82,400.00	\$50,000.00
Annual fee, Year 5	\$74,263.00 - \$84,872.00	\$50,000.00
	\$356,363.00 - \$407,272.00	\$250,000.00
Standard retainer rate per consultant hour (additional meetings)	\$150.00 (plus reasonable expenses)	\$150.00
Acknowledge Addenda	Y	Y
No Bid	Adjusters International / Tidal Basin	Hays Companies of Kansas
	M&M Insurance Associates	Marsh USA
	Origami Risk	Rutledge Agency, LLC
	Washington National	

On the recommendation of Joe Thomas, on behalf of Risk Management, Talaya Schwartz moved to **accept the low proposal from IMA, Inc. for contracted rates as shown above for three (3) years with two (2) one (1) year options to renew.** Linda Kizzire seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Colonel Powell recusing himself from the vote as he was on the evaluation committee.

An evaluation committee comprised of Jeff Cooper - Facilities, Rick Durham - Finance, Scott Hadley - EMS, Diana Mansouri - Risk Management, Donald Paget - Fire District #1, Penny Poland - Fleet, Richard Powell - Sheriff's Office, Jim Weber - Public Works and Joe Thomas - Purchasing reviewed and scored the responses based on criteria set forth in the RFP. IMA, Inc. received the highest score and is being recommended for award.

Sedgwick County is seeking a consultant in regards to all property and casualty insurance programs. The consultant will assist in seeking competitive insurance coverage, provide analysis of insurance markets, create a comprehensive decision framework, evaluate of insurance market options, and provide assistance in the creation of and maintaining a safety program for the county. The consultant will be responsible for managing and coordinating all aspects of insurance bidding and selection process and will work directly with designated staff from the Division of Finance to make final approvals.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MARCH 8, 2018

Questions and Answers

Richard Powell: Being one who was actually on the evaluation committee and reviewing the various vendors who had submitted their materials, would it be appropriate for me to vote on this or should I recuse myself from it?

William Deer: I would recommend you abstain.

Tom Stolz: If I'm reading this right, is the Charlesworth Consulting LLC giving us a range of costs?

Joe Thomas: Yes sir. In the first three (3) years, it goes from \$70,000.00 to \$80,000.00. In the fourth year, there is a 3% increase and in the fifth year, there is another 3% increase on top of that.