ITEMS REQUIRING BOCC APPROVAL March 3, 2022 (6 Items)

1. 2022 PAINTED PAVEMENT MARKING (R175-R) -- PUBLIC WORKS FUNDING -- R175 PREVENTATIVE MX-16+

(Request sent to 46 vendors)

RFB #22-0008 S/C #8000197543

Engineer's Estimate: \$650,750.00	Cillessen & Sons, Inc.	Traffic Control Services, Inc.	
2022 Painted Pavement Marking (R175-R)	\$543,067.00	\$564,550.00	
Bid Bond	Yes	Yes	
Acknowledged Addendum	Yes	Yes	
No Bid	Dondlinger Construction	L & M Contractors, Inc.	
	Nowak Construction Co., Inc.	Pearson Construction, LLC	
	Unruh Excavating	Vance Brothers	
	Wildcat Construction Co., Inc.		

On the recommendation of Lee Barrier, on behalf of Public Works, Greg Gann moved to accept the low responsive bid from Traffic Control Services, Inc. in the amount of \$564,550.00. Brandi Baily seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Sedgwick County Project 2022 Painted Pavement Marking (R175-R) will result in new pavement markings on approximately 210 miles of roadway in Sedgwick County as part of our Pavement Preservation Program. Traffic Control Services, Inc. is well known to Public Works and has successfully worked on many county projects.

Notes:

The apparent low bid at the time of the bid opening was rejected per section 102 of the General Clauses and Covenants included in contract documents. Sub-section 102.17g(1) states that, "County will reject a proposal as non-responsive if the bidder failed to include a unit price for each line item of work listed on the Schedule of Prices."

The submitted proposal from Cillessen & Sons, Inc. did not include all bid items in the revised schedule of prices included in Addendum 1 and was therefore rejected as being non-responsive.

Questions and Answers

Tim Kaufman: Can someone address what appears to be an issue with the low bid versus low responsive bid?

Lynn Packer: We received the two (2) bids. Cillessen & Sons, Inc. submitted a schedule of prices that was amended in addendum 1. It had two (2) additional bid items on it due to an amendment with the project and their bid they turned in did not include prices for those two (2) additional bid prices even though they acknowledged receiving the addendum. They simply turned in the wrong bid documents, therefore per our state statute, we are required to reject their bid.

2. BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS (B506) – PUBLIC WORKS FUNDING – B506 BRIDGE ON 85TH NORTH BTWN OLIVER & WOOD

(Request sent to 46 vendors)

RFB #22-0009 S/C #8000197542

TO B HEEL GOOD BIC HOOGGITY TO TE				
Engineer's Estimate: \$750,678.00	Bridges, Inc.	Dondlinger & Sons Construction, Co.	King Construction Company, Inc.	
Bridge Improvements (B506) 598-30-1456; Bridge on 85th Street North between Oliver	\$727,792.32	\$890,285.40	\$686,915.50	
Ave. and Woodlawn Blvd.				
Bid Bond	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Acknowledged Addenda	Yes	Yes	Yes	
No Bid	Nowak Construction Co., Inc.	Unruh Excavating	Vance Brothers	
INO BIG	Wildcat Construction Co., Inc.			

On the recommendation of Lee Barrier, on behalf of Public Works, Tim Myers moved to accept the low bid from King Construction Company, Inc. in the amount of \$686,915.50. Greg Gann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Sedgwick County CIP Project B506 will replace a bridge originally constructed in 1964, located on 85th Street North between Oliver Ave. and Woodlawn Blvd. The bridge is structurally deficient with a sufficiency rating of 44.4 out of 100. Load restrictions are currently in place for this bridge. King Construction Company, Inc. is well known to Public Works and has successfully worked on many county projects.

Questions and Answers

Greg Gann: Will a replacement plan effectively close 85th Street North during reconstruction or replacement?

Lynn Packer: Yes. This will close down a section of the road while it is being replaced.

3. AAC UPGRADE 911 PHONE SYSTEM -- EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS FUNDING -- 911 TELEPHONE TAX

(Sole Source)

#22-2016 S/C #8000197701

	Kansas 9-1-1 Coordinating Council
Set-Up Cost	\$59,000.00
Annual Cost Sharing Estimate not to exceed \$12,000.00*	\$12,000.00 per year

On the recommendation of Lee Barrier, on behalf of Emergency Communications, Jeff Bush moved to accept the quote from Kansas 9-1-1 Coordinating Council for a one-time set-up cost of \$59,000.00 and authorize continued annual support renewals per contract language. Tim Myers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Emergency Communications is currently in contract with Kansas 9-1-1 Coordinating Council for participation in the Statewide Call Handling System, this system has been in place since 2017.

Emergency Communications would like to upgrade the current software system to include the Automatic Abandoned Callback (AAC) feature of the system, which allows abandoned 911 calls to be automatically redialed and an electronic messaging system utilized to attempt to confirm or deny the existence of an emergency.

Notes:

*The annual estimate is \$12,000.00, cost could be less each year depending on how many counties add this to their system as the county is currently participating in a cost sharing model for some of the maintenance of this feature.

Questions and Answers

Greg Gann: This system will certainly increase efficiencies for 911 staff and timed saved, correct?

Elora Forshee: Yes, indeed it will. Currently our practice is we manually call back every one of these abandoned cell phone calls. That is to the tune of 91,033 calls last year. That is going up every year steadily. It is a big time waster for us as we have smart technology on watches and cell phones and every other gadget that can call 911. We just expect to see that increase. Having that automated without manual intervention would be a big time saver for us.

4. COMMUNITY E-WASTE COLLECTION EVENT -- ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES FUNDING - ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES

(Request sent to 38 vendors)

RFP #22-0006 Contract

	Dynamic Recycling, Inc.		
Community E-Waste Collection Event - Lump sum event cost for two (2) weekends (Thursday-Saturday) Spring of 2022.	\$161,400.00		
Per pound, collected material	\$0.24		
No Bid	Air Capital Waste	Allmetal Recycling	Cascade Asset Management, LLC
	Electronix Recyclers, Inc.	Emergent Systems Exchange	Results Technology
	Starkey, Inc.	Terra Cycle Regulated Waste	Waste Connections of Kansas
	Wichita Iron & Metals Corporation	Wichita Material Recovery, LLC	

On the recommendation of Britt Rosencutter, on behalf of Environmental Resources, Greg Gann moved to accept the proposal from Dynamic Recycling, Inc. for a cost of \$161,400.00 and a collection rate of \$0.24 per pound for the duration of the event. Tim Myers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

A review committee comprised of Susan Erlenwein and Cindy Le - Environmental Resources; Jon Medlam - Public Works; and Britt Rosencutter - Purchasing reviewed and scored the response based on criteria set forth in the RFP. Dynamic Recycling, Inc. was recommended for award.

This event will be held on two (2) weekends (Thursday through Saturday starting April 21, 2022 and April 28, 2022) this spring at the Public Works' West Yard. The awarded vendor is responsible for equipment and staffing to facilitate event days to include: collection of materials from customer vehicles, weighing and tracking materials collected for reporting back to the county, loading material onto trucks for transport back to their facility, and event site preparation and clean-up. The vendor will recycle all material collected through appropriate domestic recycling facilities following laws and standards that govern recycling. The vendor will also shred or drill all hard drives received during the event.

The last event was conducted over two (2) consecutive weekends in April 2020. That event resulted in 562,356 lbs. of E-waste material collected.

Notes:

Dynamic Recycling, Inc. provided an extremely detailed and thorough response including references who have utilized their services for similar large scale events over multiple years and is the vendor we used for our last event.

I would like to start with saying this is a proposal not a bid. Proposals are scored based on criteria set forth in the RFP. There are five (5) components to this RFP.

Component	Points
A. Demonstrate clearly and completely your organization's ability and capacity to meet all Scope or	40
Work requirements, including specific details as to how items will be achieved. Yes or No answers	
may result in lower scoring for this section.	
B. Quality of references detailing performance of proposed services that will verify service levels and	20
capability of the respondent to provide a thorough solution.	
C. Proposing the services described herein with the most advantageous and prudent methodology to the	20
county.	
D. Following all instructions and meeting firm requirements.	10
E. Overall cost of the proposal*	10

5. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (CIP) PROJECTS APPLICATION/SOFTWARE SOLUTION -- ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING (ERP)

FUNDING -- ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING (ERP)

(Request sent to 359 vendors)

RFP #21-0070 Contract

RIT #21-00/0 Contract	ATSER Systems, Inc.	Century Business Technologies	ClearGov, Inc.
	•	Inc.	•
Number of Users	25	Unlimited	Unlimited
	Annual Subscription Fee		
Year 1*	\$15,000.00	\$36,000.00	\$9,975.00
Year 2	\$15,000.00	\$36,000.00	\$19,950.00
Year 3	\$15,000.00	\$36,000.00	\$19,950.00
Year 4	\$15,000.00	\$36,000.00	\$19,950.00
Year 5	\$15,000.00	\$36,000.00	\$19,950.00
Total	\$75,000.00	\$180,000.00	\$89,775.00
		Implementation Fee	
	\$50,000.00	\$488,000.00	\$3,600.00
Grand Total	\$125,000.00	\$668,000.00	\$93,375.00
	Definitive Business Solutions,	High Touch Inc. dba High Touch	I.C. A. D. LIC
	Inc.	Technologies	Infinite - Data LLC
	25		
Number of Users	(Additional users can be added at	Unlimited	Unlimited
	no additional cost)	o minimou	
	no additional cost)	Annual Subscription Fee	
Year 1	\$45,000.00	\$4,999.00	\$17,500.00
Year 2	\$47,250.00	\$4,999.00	\$17,500.00
Year 3	\$49,612.50	\$4,999.00	\$17,500.00
Year 4	\$52,093.13	\$4,999.00	\$17,500.00
Year 5	\$54,697.78	\$4,999.00	\$17,500.00
Total	\$248,653.41	\$24,995.00	\$87,500.00
Total	\$240,033.41	Implementation Fee	\$87,300.00
	\$0.00	\$79,240.00	\$6,100.00
Grand Total	\$248.653.41	\$104.235.00	\$93,600.00
Grand Total	Keenology Corp. dba CIPPlanner	Professional Engineering	\$93,000.00
		Consultants, PA (PEC)	Questica
	Corp.	66	
Number of Users	24	(6 Creator, 10 Editor,	Unlimited
Number of Osers	24	50 Viewer Level)	Ommited
V1	¢52.772.90	Annual Subscription Fee	\$50.750.00
Year 1	\$52,772.80 \$52,772.80	\$0.00	\$59,750.00 \$50,750.00
Year 2	\$52,772.80	\$10,000.00	\$59,750.00
Year 3	\$52,772.80 \$52,772.80	\$10,000.00	\$62,737.50
Year 4	\$52,772.80	\$10,000.00	\$65,874.38
Year 5	\$52,772.80	\$10,000.00	\$69,168.10
Total			\$317,279.98
	Implementation Fee		
	\$97,750.00	\$75,000.00	\$66,500.00
Grand Total	\$361,614.00	\$115,000.00	\$383,779.98

On the recommendation of Jaimee Witmer, on behalf of Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP), Tim Kaufman moved to accept the proposal from ClearGov, Inc. for a one (1) time implementation fee of \$3,600.00 and establish contract rates listed above for a period of three (3) years with two (2) one (1) year options to renew, beginning July 1, 2022. Brandi Baily seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

A committee comprised of Mike Elpers and Chris Duncan - ERP; Lynn Packer - Public Works; Carli Sanchez - Budget; Andrew Dilts - Facilities Maintenance; and Jaimee Witmer - Purchasing, evaluated all proposal responses based on the criteria set forth in the RFP. ClearGov, Inc. received the highest score and the committee unanimously agreed to accept their proposal.

. .

The county's current Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) application utilizes .NET software developed in-house to replace excel spreadsheets in 2012 and Crystal Reports to create pages for the annual budget book. The application has been problematic to maintain over recent years and creating the budget book reports has been difficult to complete. The ClearGov, Inc. solution is cloud based, with much better reporting options. It will eliminate the current application entirely, remove Crystal Reports as the vehicle for producing budget pages and has the possibility of eliminating the need and expense of other applications used by Public Works (Plan-It!). Approximately 250 projects are contained in the current system with some projects replicating as ongoing projects year after year without a completion date.

Notes

*Due to the start date of July 1, 2022, the annual subscription fee for the first year will be a six (6) month pro-rated cost of \$9,975.00.

I would like to start with saying this is a proposal not a bid. Proposals are scored based on criteria set forth in the RFP. There are five (5) components to this RFP.

Component	Points
A. Ease of use. Intuitive design	25
B. Ability to replicate/replace current system	10
C. Hosted versus on-premise (preference given to a hosted solution)	5
D. Ability to meet requested enhancements listed in section V	30
E. Overall cost	30
Total Points	100

Questions and Answers

Greg Gann: It is fair to say that the existing solution capacity has been exceeded and this solution would be a dramatic improvement over the process, correct?

Mike Elpers: Yes, that is correct. The current solution has been around for about 15 years and has proven to be, as Jaimee read, very problematic. Year after year there is always something breaking that we have to fix. We also have problems with rolling projects from one year to the next and we believe this will be a great improvement for us.

Tim Kaufman: Does this product have to interface with our ERP system?

Mike Elpers: It does not. It is a standalone solution that is just purely and entirely used for planning and budgeting of CIP (Capital Improvement Plans) projects.

6. 7 EA. MARKED AND 2 EA. UNMARKED POLICE INTERCEPTOR UTILITY VEHICLES -- FLEET MANAGEMENT / SHERIFF'S OFFICE FUNDING -- 2022 FORD EXPLORER - UTILITY POLICE INTE, FOR ALL VEHICLES

(Request sent to 96 vendors)

RFB #22-0016 S/C #8000197747

RED #22 0010 SIC #0000177747	Don Hattan Ford				
Description		Price	Extended Price		
2022 Utility Police Interceptor SUV AWD Vehicles - Marked		\$41,000.00	\$287,000.00		
2022 Utility Police Interceptor SUV AWD Vehicles - Unmarked	2 Ea.	\$41,700.00	\$83,400.00		
Total			\$370,400.00		
Make and Model:		Ford Police Interce	eptor		
Order Cut Off Date:		N/A			
Delivery Date:		90 - 120 Days from ord	er (ETA)		
		Olathe Fleet Solut	ions		
Description	Qty.	Price	Extended Price		
2022 Utility Police Interceptor SUV AWD Vehicles - Marked	7 Ea.	\$41,463.00	\$290,241.00		
2022 Utility Police Interceptor SUV AWD Vehicles - Unmarked	2 Ea.	\$41,058.00	\$82,116.00		
Total		\$372,357.00			
Make and Model:		Ford Explorer			
Order Cut Off Date:	N/A				
Delivery Date:	90 - 120 Days				
	Rusty Eck Ford, Inc.		Inc.		
Description	Qty.	Price	Extended Price		
2022 Utility Police Interceptor SUV AWD Vehicles - Marked	7 Ea.	\$40,197.00	\$281,379.00		
2022 Utility Police Interceptor SUV AWD Vehicles - Unmarked	2 Ea.	\$40,922.00	\$81,844.00		
Total			\$363,223.00		
Make and Model:	2022 Ford Police Utility		Itility		
Order Cut Off Date:	N/A from Ford Fleet				
Delivery Date:	26 -28 Weeks				
		Hatchett Hyundai East	Masters Transportation		
No Bid		Midway Motors of Hutchinson	Orr Nissan of Wichita, Inc.		
No Did		Stuteville CBG of Ponca City, LLC	Subaru of Wichita		
	The P1 Group				

On the recommendation of Britt Rosencutter, on behalf of Fleet Management and Sheriff's Office, Jeff Bush moved to accept the low bid from Rusty Eck Ford, Inc. in the amount of \$363,223.00. Greg Gann seconded the motion. The motion passed four out of five with Tim Myers abstaining.

These are pursuit vehicles, so they must be able to perform at high rates of speed and maneuverability. The Sheriff's Office uses these vehicles to overtake speeding traffic violators, engage in vehicle pursuits, patrol the county, and respond to calls for service regardless of environmental conditions.

Vehicles being replaced:

ics being replaced.			
2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	VIN #1GNLC2E01ER207581	Points -20	Mileage - 129,961
2014 Dodge Charger PP	VIN #2C3CDXKT6EH288454	Points -18.3	Mileage - 156,025
2015 Dodge Charger PP	VIN #2C3CDXKT3FH891539	Points -18	Mileage - 149,838
2015 Dodge Charger PP	VIN #2C3CDXAT0FH890365	Points -16.8	Mileage - 139,487
2015 Dodge Charger PP	VIN #2C3CDXAT6FH890368	Points -18.1	Mileage - 158,408
2015 Dodge Charger PP	VIN #2C3CDXKT1FH891538	Points -16.9	Mileage - 157,520
2016 Dodge Charger PP	VIN #2C3CDXKT3GH277656	Points -18.2	Mileage - 129,269
2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	VIN #1GNLC2E00ER170927	Points -17.8	Mileage - 147,190
2013 Dodge Charger PP	VIN #2C3CDXAG1DH542770	Points -13.5	Mileage - 95,510 (Totaled)
	S .	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe VIN #1GNLC2E01ER207581 2014 Dodge Charger PP VIN #2C3CDXKT6EH288454 2015 Dodge Charger PP VIN #2C3CDXKT3FH891539 2015 Dodge Charger PP VIN #2C3CDXAT0FH890365 2015 Dodge Charger PP VIN #2C3CDXAT6FH890368 2015 Dodge Charger PP VIN #2C3CDXKT1FH891538 2016 Dodge Charger PP VIN #2C3CDXKT3GH277656 2014 Chevrolet Tahoe VIN #1GNLC2E00ER170927	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe VIN #1GNLC2E01ER207581 Points – 20 2014 Dodge Charger PP VIN #2C3CDXKT6EH288454 Points – 18.3 2015 Dodge Charger PP VIN #2C3CDXKT3FH891539 Points – 18 2015 Dodge Charger PP VIN #2C3CDXAT0FH890365 Points – 16.8 2015 Dodge Charger PP VIN #2C3CDXAT6FH890368 Points – 16.8 2015 Dodge Charger PP VIN #2C3CDXAT6FH890368 Points – 18.1 2015 Dodge Charger PP VIN #2C3CDXKT1FH891538 Points – 16.9 2016 Dodge Charger PP VIN #2C3CDXKT3GH277656 Points – 18.2 2014 Chevrolet Tahoe VIN #1GNLC2E00ER170927 Points – 17.8

Notes:

These are replacement vehicles for the Sheriff's Office. Surplus vehicles will be sold on Purple Wave, Inc.

Questions and Answers

Brandi Baily: So the item from Rusty Eck Ford, Inc. has a delivery date of 26 - 28 weeks where the other two (2) bidders are 90-120 days and the prices aren't a huge difference. Did we take that into consideration and are we okay waiting that long for a vehicle?

Britt Rosencutter: Rusty Eck Ford, Inc. along with their bid, provided paperwork from Ford Motor Company that showed what their actual dates are for delivery. In case the Board is not already aware, there is a shortage of computer chips as well as other supply line issues that the car manufacturers are experiencing, which is pushing delivery dates beyond what they normally are. The 90 - 120 days that the other two (2) have recommended is just their average response when asked for an estimated delivery date. We are trusting that the information we received from Ford Motor Company is the most reliable considering it is coming straight from the source.