

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

**ITEMS REQUIRING BOCC APPROVAL
(6 ITEMS)**

1. ROAD IMPROVEMENTS -- PUBLIC WORKS

FUNDING -- R175 PREVENTIVE-MX-16+

(Request sent to 46 vendors)

RFB #18-0032 S/C #8000127538

Engineer's Estimate: \$ 227,827.00	Andale Construction, Inc.		
2018 High Dense Seal (R175-P)	\$223,337.18		
Bid Bond	Y		
No Bid	Bergkamp Construction	Vance Brothers, Inc.	RoadSafe Traffic Systems
	Unruh Excavating	Nowak Construction Co, Inc.	Dondlinger & Sons
	Traffic Control Services	Wildcat Construction Co., Inc.	

On the recommendation of Kristen McGovern, on behalf of Public Works, Jennifer Dombaugh moved to **accept the bid from Andale Construction, Inc. in the amount of \$223,337.18.** Richard Powell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Project R175-P is for a High Density Mineral Bond (HDMB). This is a mixture of asphalt emulsion and aggregates applied as a high density roadway surface preservation treatment. Asphalt seals are engineered to preserve the native asphalt binder in roads by protecting it from oxidative damage. Sedgwick County Public Works has utilized various types of roadway seals over the years in its pavement preservation program. Most recently, they have tried two (2) very similar seals: a frictional seal and a high density mineral bond seal.

Both of these seals combine aggregates with an asphalt emulsion. The frictional seal did not provide sufficient protection based on several test sites. The high density mineral bond, on the other hand, has proven successful thus far when used in combination with other types of road projects. This year we are utilizing the HDMB seal in a standalone application as we continue to evaluate its effectiveness and range of use. Andale Construction, Inc. is the only franchisee for this asphalt preservation product in this area.

Note: 2018 High Dense Seal (R175-P) consists of 68,251 S.Y. of High Density Mineral Bond (HDMB). Included in this number are 3 parking lots at Sedgwick County Park: Cottonwood Shelter Lot, Boundless Playground Lot, and the Lot NE of the South Entrance, totaling 10,377 square yards of parking lots. Also included are 1.25 miles of Cheney Main Street (Shadybrook to MacArthur), and 0.5 miles of 295th Street (Kellogg and 15th St S).

Questions and Answers

Richard Powell: If we only have one vendor that provides this type of product, I'm assuming this is a routine maintenance of roadways like they normally do on an annual basis?

Jim Weber: Is that the question?

Richard Powell: Yes, sir.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

Jim Weber: Yes it is; this is part of our annual preventive maintenance. We have about \$9,000,000.00 a year we spend on preventive maintenance of wide variety of types and projects. This one this year, we're using it in three of the parking lots out at the Sedgwick County Park. About 3/4 miles of roadway, I think we are having good luck with it. It's a very small part of our program, it's one of those that we can use it when we can.

Richard Powell: If this is a practice that we normally do, any ideas or thoughts of why there's only one vendor that provides that level of service or product if this is a common practices? Is this something that only Sedgwick County has a common practice?

Jim Weber: No, in fact they are doing it for communities around here. The issue is that it is another one that takes specialized equipment, you either gear up for it or you don't. So they tend to be working in our region.

Richard Powell: We had a discussion about a similar situation the last time we had a bid board meeting.

Jim Weber: Yes we did.

Richard Powell: Different product?

Jim Weber: Same kind of problem.

Richard Powell: Right, thank you.

Tom Stolz: Jim, in the several hundred miles of roadway that we have in the county, what makes the half a mile or that small piece of roadway for this product different from all the other miles?

And you said it was for three parking lots too? Is this a better products for parking lots? Are you going to use some on roadways? How do you determine?

Jim Weber: It is probably a better product where the speed are slower, one of the reason why it's good for parking lot, they are low speed. Cheney Main Street is one of them, so that's going to be low speed. It is also going to depend on the condition of the asphalt that is under it, what we got coming up to it and how well it's going to work with it. It's a combination of things.

Tom Stolz: Without looking at the other kinds, seems like we have these each week, is this more expensive or less expensive than other types of pavement that we do on county roads?

Jim Weber: This is on the less expensive side.

Tom Stolz: Lesser side.

Jim Weber: The thickness of this is more like a seal. Nova chip for example, which we do a lot of, that's 1/2 an inch thick this is 1/10 of an inch, it's a seal.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

2. JAIL ANNEX -- PROJECT SERVICES

FUNDING -- JAIL ANNEX

(Request sent to 124 vendors)

RFB #18-0034 S/C #8000127580

	Harman Huffman Construction Group	Bauer & Son Construction	Compton Construction Services, LLC.
Lump Sum, Base Bid	\$830,000.00	\$752,000.00	\$644,800.00
Alternate	\$80,000.00	\$78,500.00	\$79,511.00
Base Bid plus alternate	\$910,000.00	\$830,500.00	\$724,311.00
Days to Substantial Completion	270	136	150
Days to Final Completion	15	24	30
Total Calendar Days	285	160	180
Bid Bond	Y	Y	Y
Acknowledge Addendum	Y	Y	Y
No Bid	Fabric Structures-USA, LLC	Graycon Building Group	Greening & Construction Inc
	Legacy Building Solutions, Inc.	Snodgrass & Sons Construction	Structures Unlimited, LLC
	Wildcat Construction, Co.	Greystone Construction Company	The Best Home Guys

On the recommendation of Kimberly Bush, on behalf of Project Services, Jennifer Dombaugh moved to **accept the low bid including alternate from Compton Construction Services, LLC. in the amount of \$724,311.00.** Linda Kizzire seconded the motion. The motion passed 4 to 1 with Richard Powell abstaining himself from the vote as he has direct budgetary authority over the Jail Annex.

With the responsibility and supervision of work release inmates transferring to the Department of Corrections, the opportunity exists to convert the existing Work Release Facility to a Jail Annex. By upgrading the security of the facility, the Sheriff’s Office will be able to return at least 157 inmates from out of county housing for a savings of about \$2,000,000.00 per year with the main expense being this capital improvement. When inmates are housed in surrounding counties, the Sheriff’s Office is still responsible for the inmates legally and financially. Currently, all medical costs for out of county inmates are sent back to Sedgwick County to be paid under the existing medical contract and out of the Sheriff’s Office budget once the cap is reached. Additionally there are the transportation costs and manpower of moving inmates all around the State of Kansas instead of merely moving them back and forth from a local annex.

The current facility will require renovations to secure it for the lower level medium to minimum security inmates that will be in the Sheriff’s custody 24/7. Work will be done on the exterior to include fencing enclosures around the pod exterior exits, fencing with a gate for the delivery area, bollards at the east delivery gate and front entry, razor wire on top of all fences, gates, and their surrounding parapets, and steel bars will be added to all windows in areas that inmates will have access to. Interior work will include remodel of an office for a nurse’s station, replacing bunks, tables, plumbing fixtures, and security doors with correctional grade replacements, replacing drop ceilings with secured ceilings in certain areas, and replacement of the aged diesel generator, and some updates to the fire alarm system. The alternate will replace lighting in the pods and hallways with detention grade LED lighting which will increase safety of inmates and staff and provide energy efficiency.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

Questions and Answers:

Richard Powell: I would ask Council again, similar situation we've asked before but I having direct budgetary authority over the Jail Annex and that's being referenced here. Even though this is a CIP, not part of our operating budget. Do council recommend I abstain on this or would it be appropriate for me to offer a vote?

William Deer: I would recommend you abstain.

Richard Powell: Thank you, sir.

Talaya Schwartz: How many other inmates do we have housed outside of Sedgwick County right now?

Richard Powell: I can answer that. Today our count was 291.

Talaya Schwartz: Total? That includes this 157?

Richard Powell: No, this 157 we are speaking of here would come out of that 291 and we would relocate them from other Sheriff's jails, where we pay a daily fee into this building.

Talaya Schwartz: Ok.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

3. IT INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADE SOLUTION -- DISTRICT COURT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (DCIT)

FUNDING -- COURT TECHNOLOGY

(Joint Governmental Purchase GSA GS-35F-303DA)

#18-2019 S/C #8000127277

	Ramsys Storage Solutions
Scale Computing HC1150Z 5-node Cluster, switches and cabling, includes one (1) year 24/7 support.	\$62,118.30
Dell X4012 10GbE Switch (quantity 2, one free during promotion)	\$1,314.00
Hardware Subtotal	\$63,432.30
Years 2-5 24x7 Maintenance and Support	\$8,340.00/yr
Total five (5) year cost	\$33,360.00
	\$96,792.30

On the recommendation of Kimberly Bush, on behalf of DCIT, Linda Kizzire moved to **accept the quote from Ramsys Storage Solutions for an initial purchase of \$63,432.30 and establish contract pricing for maintenance and support for years 2-5 for a total cost of \$96,792.30.** Talaya Schwartz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

This purchase is adding additional hardware to District Court's existing Scale virtual server environment that was originally established in 2016. A virtualized environment is much more cost effective and provides greater efficiencies in storage space and application performance.

Questions and Answers:

Tom Stolz: Why only one bid, do we know?

Kimberly Bush: This is a joint governmental purchase, we're using the GSA Schedule for this.

BOARDS OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

4. DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM -- CORRECTIONS

FUNDING -- CORRECTIONS

(Request sent to 206 vendors)

RFP #17-0086 Contract

	Helix Business Solutions LLC	cFive Solutions, Inc.	Konica Minolta Business Solutions U.S.A., Inc.	Tribridge Holdings, LLC		Journal Technologies, Inc.	
	Hosted	On-Premise	On-Premise	On-Premise	Hosted	On-Premise	Hosted
Implementation Costs	\$775,000.00	\$145,257.00	\$240,000.00	\$630,001.00	\$630,001.00	\$350,000.00	\$350,000.00
Licensing Fees (where applicable)	included	\$267,650.00	\$222,500.00	\$189,314.00	\$119,274.00	included	included
Training	included	\$80,560.00	\$10,000.00	\$57,600.00	\$57,600.00	included	included
Maintenance and Support Year 1	\$5,972,933.00	\$99,127.00	\$44,500.00	included	included	included	included
Maintenance and Support Year 2	\$5,972,933.00	\$103,013.00	\$44,500.00	\$63,947.00	\$119,274.00	\$226,000.00	\$354,000.00
Maintenance and Support Year 3	\$5,972,933.00	\$107,051.00	\$44,500.00	\$63,947.00	\$119,274.00	\$226,000.00	\$354,000.00
Maintenance and Support Year 4	\$5,972,933.00	\$111,248.00	\$44,500.00	\$63,947.00	\$119,274.00	\$226,000.00	\$354,000.00
Maintenance and Support Year 5	\$5,972,933.00	\$115,608.00	\$44,500.00	\$63,947.00	\$119,274.00	\$226,000.00	\$354,000.00
Total five (5) year cost	\$30,639,665.00	\$1,029,514.00*	\$695,000.00	\$1,132,703.00*	\$1,283,971.00	\$1,254,000.00*	\$1,766,000.00
Hourly rate for additional on-site training outside initial training (hourly rate should include travel expenses)	No Bid	\$185.00	\$200.00	\$185.00		\$175.00	
Hourly rate for additional remote training	No Bid	\$160.00	\$200.00	\$160.00		\$175.00	
No Bid	Valor System, Inc.	ASG Technologies	VanDyke Software Inc.	The Sidwell Company		Nexlearn, LLC.	
	Innova-Consulting, LLC.	Accusoft Corporation	CDW-G	Globanet			

*Indicates revised pricing

On the recommendation of Kimberly Bush, on behalf of the Division of Corrections, Talaya Schwartz moved to **accept the proposal from Journal Technologies, Inc. for a total five (5) year cost of \$1,254,000.00 and establish contract pricing for any additional training that may be utilized.** Jennifer Dombaugh seconded the motion. The motion passed 3 to 2, with Richard Powell and Linda Kizzire voting no.

BOARDS OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

A review committee comprised of Mary Fulghum, Mario Salinas and Steve Stonehouse - Division of Corrections, Joe Currier, Greg Gann and Bobbi Meairs - Information Technology and Support Services (ITSS) and Kim Bush - Purchasing reviewed and scored the responses based on criteria set forth in the RFP. cFive Solutions, Inc., Tribridge Holdings, LLC and Journal Technologies, Inc. received the top three (3) scores and were shortlisted. Each shortlisted proposer provided a technical demonstration of their solution and were requested to submit a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) request for revised pricing.

The Division of Corrections (DOC) currently utilizes outdated and obsolete databases which are not supported by ITSS. DOC and ITSS have been in partnership to resolve database concerns for over four (4) years without any resolution. Due to the fact that Microsoft Access is NOT designed to function at this scale, and is NOT sustainable or effectively supportable, the division is paying \$110.00 per hour to contract with High Touch to maintain and support the current databases. This project is critical in achieving the division mission, reducing recidivism, and increasing client and public safety. The DOC databases will eventually become unstable. Without accurate intake and release information, state reimbursements will decrease, and the county will be more susceptible to lawsuits from clients and outside entities that count on accurate client records. Without the ability to make substantive changes to the current system, state mandated reports have to be hand calculated, which takes substantial administrative support time and raises the probability of errors.

The new software will provide detention/residential facility management, community corrections case management tracking, client medical and food allergy information, client programming hours, staff training information, client/provider web portal access for payments, judicial system status and client case notes from treatment, ad hoc reporting tools, kiosk for client check in for all DOC locations, and a division wide system that will communicate across all programs.

cFive Solutions, Inc. didn't offer OnBase file transfer, and they were unable to replace the check-in, accounting, and tracking system. Their mapping feature for home visits is still under development and not live yet.

Tribridge Holdings, LLC did not appear to have a polished and complete product. Their system also lacked accounting functionality.

Konica Minolta Business Solutions, U.S.A., Inc. did not offer a complete proposal. Responses provided to the Scope of Work were fairly generalized and would require additional discovery in order for them to formulate a complete solution. The pricing they provided was based on an initial discovery and limited licensing. More costs would be incurred as they developed the actual solution to meet the needs of Department of Corrections.

Note: Scoring criteria set in this RFP were as follows:

1. Meeting all proposal requirements and instructions, submitting clear, detailed information and providing all requested documentation.
2. Data security standards and practices, experience in integrating with a variety of existing applications.
3. Experience with similar projects for government entities (social services, probation, corrections).
4. Ease and ability to run ad hoc reports across the entire system.
5. Overall cost of solution (calculated and scored by mathematical equation as provided in RFP).

BOARDS OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

Questions and Answers:

Richard Powell: Apologize for asking so many questions, but this one is interesting to me. I would ask, if this solution is being recommended has properties in solutions built-in that would potentially be also available in the long-term solution the county is looking at for a new CAD JMS and RMS integrative type system? If there is anyone here that can answer that?

Tom Stolz: That is a good question, I'll ask it more simply. Do you share data? Would it be beneficial for you to get data from the jail, or from CAD, or from police or from any other components of Criminal Justice? Would it be a benefit for you to have that kind of data with this system?

Mario Salinas: Administrative Manager for Division of Corrections. It is our understanding that this product is used across the board for government, as far as jail management, as well as the court system and the district attorney's office. All that information would be available if those other types of departments where to use the same kind of program.

Linda Kizzire: I am going to do a follow-up. So you're saying that the Sheriff, CAD and everybody would have to go to Journal Technologies, too?

Mario Salinas: Or they would have to work with that vendor to have some type of interface where they can communicate with each other.

Linda Kizzire: I thought the goal was to get all of those consolidated?

Mario Salinas: It is.

Tom Stolz: The problem that we run into with this project is timing. This system that we currently have is, was defined to me as crashing over a year ago, when we began to go through the budget process. What Colonel Powell is talking about and what Linda is referring to, is the broader scope right now of looking at a single system that can integrate all these components together, be efficient, talk back and forth, could save us money on purchase and acquisition and at the end of the day give us a better product. I don't have any trouble with your mathematics I think that the committee did a really good job on picking the right vendor for this. My struggle is, if you see benefit to being part of a bigger system can we delay this a bit? And bring it to the table with the Sheriff, 911 dispatcher, Police Chief, Fire Chiefs and Mark Bennet and talk about integrating you into a larger system; is that feasible at all?

Greg Gann: Good afternoon Greg an IT Project Manager, Information Technology. This question was brought up many times in our discussion the timing is unfortunate for us because of, as you stated Mr. Stolz, the access databases are not talking to each other, the tremendous amount of manual input and effort to create reports just to update the data on a daily basis. If any one of these systems fails it cripples the Department of Corrections ability to serve the public. In a perfect world we would love to be on the same system. We did ask questions: could we share data, could we make this system available to the upcoming system that Sheriff and 911 and everyone else is looking at? Simple consolidation and sharing of data that is a possibility, at this time though the time frame is such that we just can't wait.

BOARDS OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

Linda Kizzire: Do you have any idea Greg, how much total spend to High Touch was at that \$110.00 an hour?

Greg Gann: \$10,000.00 to \$15,000.00 for 2017 approximate.

Tom Stolz: Is it possible that we have such a crash that High Touch couldn't fix it anymore?

Greg Gann: Yes it is very possible.

Mario Salinas: From the meaning of IT is that each year Access comes out you lose more and more functionality. Eventually we're going to hold ourselves back with what software our employees can use in order to keep that Access database. We can't upgrade to a newer version of anything because we have to keep Access down to an older version.

Greg Gann: Each subsequent version of Access does not play well with older versions.

Tom Stolz: Greg, if we push this down the road, in other words with the commission votes on this and we go to acquisition what's an estimate on transition time before we could get into this system?

Greg Gann: It's a largely dependent on the vendor and Corrections but, if we could put this into effect this calendar year that would be ideal.

Tom Stolz: Is that a goal?

Greg Gann: It is definitely.

Tom Stolz: At minimum what we need to ask the Sheriff and the committee that's looking at the global solution would be the factor if we're going to go down this track. Let me ask a technical question from Purchasing, how long do these bids how long are they valid before they would expire?

Kim Bush: Proposals are typically valid for a 120 days, we've already passed that, these vendors are holding their pricing for us.

Tom Stolz: It could go at anytime then, we have no guarantee?

Kim Bush: Potentially, yes. And if I might add I also worked on the RFI for the CAD and the Sheriff's RMS as well so I know that they're still reviewing that information and it could be a while until something comes out.

Tom Stolz: Or fiscal '19 before we implemented anything.

Kim Bush: Right, but those questions were asked because I was working on both projects simultaneously.

Tom Stolz: Can I ask, did the committee feel like this should go forward? The internal committee?

Kim Bush: For this project?

-- ~ - --

BOARDS OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

Tom Stolz: Yes.

Kim Bush: Absolutely.

Talaya Schwartz: I just have one question. During the review process for the reference checks, were any of the references for other county entities within the state or close to?

Kim Bush: I believe they were all public sector Correctional Departments. There were state and some local governments.

Talaya Schwartz: I'm assuming those references were all good, for high praise of the product.

Kim Bush: We also use Journal Technologies, Inc. in the DA's office, they have been using it for quite a while and I believe they do have some data exchange with the city of Wichita if I recall correctly so I know that it's possible to set up those that exchanges between different systems.

Mario Salinas: Essentially as long as we know what the other system is that would determine if they can communicate with each other. So if we knew the Sheriff was looking at future systems we were able to ask those questions.

Tom Stolz: Why you both there, the purchase price of this and the annual maintenance seems awfully high is this typical? To have a maintenance agreement that's literally almost the cost of the installation, is that fairly typical?

Mario Salinas: I was shocked when I asked Greg to pull numbers, just from the DA's, because it's such an old software. Over 10 years old and still about the same price.

Talaya Schwartz: I would say it's similar with electronic medical records.

Tom Stolz: So maintenance program cost almost as much as the program.

Mario Salinas: Unfortunately.

Talaya Schwartz: Yes, that is how they make their money now.

Kim Bush: Yes.

Richard Powell: Looking at the various vendors by name, I cannot be absolutely certain but by far the majority of these names I don't recognize as vendors that are perspectives that we have looked at already with regards to the CAD JMS/RMS project. If purchasing knows otherwise, feel free to correct me, but I don't recognize any of these names. Which leaves me the question, did corrections take any opportunity to view the demonstrations that have been going on for the last several weeks and will continue in the next week with these various vendors and their JMS/RMS packages?

Mario Salinas: We haven't attended any of those, we weren't aware.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

5. SCANNING AND INDEXING SERVICES -- INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND SUPPORT SERVICES (ITSS)
FUNDING -- VARIOUS COUNTY DEPARTMENTS
(Contract Amendment)

Original RFP #14-0096

	Business Imaging Systems, Inc. (BIS, Inc.)
Scanning and Indexing Services	See Attached

On the recommendation of Kimberly Bush, on behalf of ITSS, Jennifer Dombaugh moved **to amend the contract for two (2) additional years through June 4th, 2020. All other terms, conditions and pricing will remain the same.** Linda Kizzire seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Purchasing is recommending the extension of this contract for an additional two (2) years for the following reasons:

1. Services provided by the vendor are excellent and deliverables meet or exceed performance expectations.
2. The original RFP was executed to get these services on contract and initially use funds that were set aside in a special fund in 2015 for departments to use on a first come, first serve basis in order to try to catch up on "back scanning" to get files moved from paper to electronic format.
3. Any department can utilize these services, however no projects have been requested under this contract since 2016. ITSS reports that several departments have an interest in utilizing these services, but no requests have been made recently.
4. The administrative time it would require to advertise and review a new RFP this year is not efficient since we cannot estimate how many projects may actually be done or a cost associated with said projects. The last RFP review process included the creation of several mock files for selected vendors to process and price out, which staff had to review for accuracy. This was a very time consuming process, which included travel to several different vendor locations.

During the previous three (3) year contract term, the county spent approximately \$160,000.00 on these services. The majority of these funds were paid out of the special budgeted funds for back scanning.

Note: The original recommendation and the unit pricing breakdown for these services are attached for review.

Linda Kizzire: Do we normally just extend contact without a rebid? Is that something under the charter we're allowed to do I just...

William Deer: I was just reviewing the charter and does appear that this is problematic but at the same time I'm not sure how we could put out an RFP when we don't what we are even asking for.

Linda Kizzire: And they're going to go ahead and do it the same pricing as before the 28 yes, 26 is that an hour?

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

Kim Bush: The way this was done last time is this the only way that we can really compare apples to apples create the mock files that I referenced in the recommendation. We had to basically create files and have them process them the pricing is based on things by how many paper clips, staples, post-it notes they have to pull, the kinds of finishing options you want, all of those types of things. We gave each vendor that were shortlisted the same exact file had them all run it and just these were the prices they gave us back. That's how we based the award back in 2015.

Tom Stolz: I seem to recall back in 2015 we had this huge county project to try and back scan and get rid of paper files and input them electronically. There was even going to be some funding available but some of that funding was available on some work did get done back then. But what's happening now is if the department wants to back scan or reduce paper files and use this service they got to come up with money within their own budget.

Kim Bush: Correct, it would be out of their own budget at this point.

Tom Stolz: It has not happened in fiscal 17 or 18?

Kim Bush: Correct.

Greg Gann: I served as project manager for the original Scanning Services Project. We scanned a considerable number of back files for the Sheriff's Office, legacy case files at 221 cases worth, for the District Attorney their criminal and juvenile records from 2008, that was stored in the salt mines at the considerable cost, 138 cases of those files for county legal their legacy case files 58 cases, Risk Management their workers compensation files 62 cases took up space in their office. For Corrections the JRBR files, they had no place to store those records management downstairs has no place for them. They stored them temporarily in the basement of JDF. That was 252 cases of documents, logbooks, case files, things like that. There's considerable document prep goes into this we asked the department's themselves to review the documents know what you're sending. The vendor then securely transports them for us, review the documents, scans them, send them back so we can check for validity and then we can confirm then destroy the paper. All said and told a considerable amount of effort put into getting paper into electronic form into OnBase. MACBD has indicated the charts and plats, and the very difficult things to store they would like to have those electronic have a lot of legacy files that are stored in file cabinets that they would like to have scanned. They have funds that they could address to this we've talked to them as recent as December of 2017. We haven't been able to move forward because we knew the contract was going to end in June so they've focus their efforts elsewhere. They're aware of our process today and a waiting to hear about the outcome.

Tom Stolz: We bought them a plot scanner too, to do some of the document. Mr. Biltz was the person back than, now I remember.

Greg Gann: Jeremy, yes I took the project over for him.

Tom Stolz: Didn't we designate some county funding?

Greg Gann: We did, and we expended those funds.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

Talaya Schwartz: I just have the concerned about the RFP. So it wouldn't be similar to the last RFP that we released 3 years ago? I mean I'm having trouble understanding what we don't know?

Kim Bush: The issue is the administrative time it would take to pair those files again and do all of those on-site demonstrations and quality checks, to purchasing. After we discussed it doesn't necessarily balance, we may not go to the vendor and ask for any business. It doesn't seem that it would be fruitful at this time to do that and then possibly departments may not decide to spend funding on this. They've gone through all the work and we've gone through all the work for a whole new RFP process and we have quite a few responses last time.

This particular vendor was way lower than everybody else as well so we felt like amending this contracts and adding an additional 2 years to it would still give the opportunity if department's wanted to spend money, and since they're willing to do it at the same pricing we figure it's kind of a win-win situation because we still got something in place in case it's needed. But if it's not needed then there's no heartburn from the vendor.

Talaya Schwartz: So when the two years is up, what will that look like will that kind of be based on how much we use it within the next 2 years?

Kim Bush: The way it should probably work is that Purchasing would get with Greg and discuss it again. I would assume that if we amended it for 2 years and didn't use it at all or very much we obviously have the discussion, do we need these services on contract? do we need to go out for an RFP? If we use the services a lot and the department spend quite a bit of money on it, it probably would be best at that point to do another competitive solicitation.

Talaya Schwartz: So the only concern would be is during these next 2 years of another vendor coming forward saying we didn't have an opportunity, since the last RFP?

William Deer: Yeah I think we're getting this is sort of a whole within charger 68 in my opinion, because an individual department could go out and utilize up to \$10,000.00 worth of scanning services right now and not ask anybody. So this keeps this pricing from 3 or 4 years ago in place. We are not buying anything today, all we're doing is just agreeing to lock in that same price for an additional 2 years. We're not agreeing to do a minimum amount of work or anything with them. Technically, it probably isn't compliant with the charter but at the same time we're also not buying anything.

Talaya Schwartz: But you believe using that justification we would be covered legally?

William Deer: Yes.

Tom Stolz: And the magic of two years was just what they agreed to? Or is that something we solicited?

Kim Bush: That is the magic number that popped into my head.

Tom Stolz: You went for two and they said yes.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

Kim Bush: I went for two and they said that would be good.

Tom Stolz: I appreciate that. What needs to happen is that we need to have more global discussion as a county about scanning documents and getting rid of paper. We need to resurrect what we were doing in 2015, and talk about this. This would provide us a stopgap to get to that point but I would be uncomfortable without some type of plan moving forward in two years if we do this again.

Linda Kizzire: Greg, have you been happy with the quality that we're getting back from them?

Greg Gann: I have, they are very responsive at questions, if there was a page that was missing. I'll share this.

Tom Stolz: Greg we haven't done any in two years right? This is all on your memory?
Back in the day? We haven't done any projects in 18, 17?

Greg Gann: Nothing in 17, the last was in 16, we ran right up to the edge of 17.

Tom Stolz: Sorry I interrupted you, go ahead.

Greg Gann: It's alright. We had some folks that threw a curve in there, they wanted to see if all of the documents were really getting scanned. There was some handwriting, a small scribble on the back of one page and they look for that. When it didn't appear they said you didn't scan everything, but they said yes we did and they supplied the documents. They had scanned both sides we didn't ask them to provide both sides because it was single-sided but, they had scan both sides and was able to give us the documents. When we started the process we actually had a case of documents from MABCD it went down for testing. In that course of time we choose a box of documents that we hoped no one would ask for, someone did. It was someone who wanted a copy of their license that was on file with MABCD. They did an open records request, normally that would take a number of days and a lot of effort and a lot of digging into boxes and finding out where that was. The vendor provided to us and to the person making the request, within minutes.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

6. PARKING MANAGEMENT SEDGWICK COUNTY COURTHOUSE COMPLEX -- COURTHOUSE POLICE

FUNDING -- COURTHOUSE POLICE

(Sent to nine Vendors)

RFP #18-0006 Contract

	The Car Park (Option A)	The Car Park (Option B)	PCAM, LLC dba Parking Company of America (Option A)	PCAM, LLC dba Parking Company of America (Option B)	PCAM, LLC dba Parking Company of America (Option C)	SP+Municipal Services	Premiere Parking
Annual Parking Management Fee	\$138,570.00	\$126,431.00	\$131,892.00	\$139,521.60	\$140,865.40	\$220,107.00	\$238,151.29

On the recommendation of Kristen McGovern, on behalf of the Courthouse Police, Richard Powell moved to **accept the proposal from PCAM, LLC dba Parking Company of America (PCAM) (Option C) in the amount of \$140,865.40 annually, and establish contract pricing for three (3) years with two (2) one (1) year options to renew.** Linda Kizzire seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Jennifer Dombaugh left at 2:30.

An evaluation committee comprised of Darrell Haynes and Ronald Spurgeon - Courthouse Police, Randy Bargdill - Treasurer's Office, Mark Manning - City of Wichita Budget Officer and Kristen McGovern - Purchasing reviewed and scored the responses based on the criteria set forth in the RFP. PCAM and The Car Park were shortlisted for further review. PCAM received the highest score and is being recommended for award.

Under this contract, the vendor will provide public and employee parking garage management and Water Street meter maintenance and repair. Services include, but are not limited to: a lot attendant, building and ground maintenance, emptying meters, and operation of gates. The monthly administrative fee is deducted from the monthly gross receipts that the vendor collects from parking charges, with the remaining sum being returned to Sedgwick County in the form of a check each month.

There were multiple requirements in the RFP. One of the proposal requirements listed in the Scope of Work was that the county required the successful firm to provide a full-time trained on-site manager in addition to a cashier attendant(s).

The Car Park submitted two options with their proposal. Option A, which partially met the requirements, only provided a cashier on-site but lacked a full-time on-site manager. Option B, which did not meet specifications recommended a fully automated system that only provides staff during times of heavy demand. The Car Park's proposal options lacked specific details concerning daily operations and when staff would be available. Both options provided generic information which was not specific for Sedgwick County. They did provide financial budgets for expenses but limited documentation as to how the daily operations would be managed. The proposal response content required proposers to provide a plan of operation, to include, but not limited to: a detailed budget and program for overseeing the daily operation of the identified parking facilities, a description of the planned method of communication between the county and successful vendor on both policy matters and emergency situations, and a detailed description of anticipated maintenance and facility updating.

PCAM Option A includes no changes to current staffing and no equipment upgrades. \$10,991.00 per month flat rent, or \$131,892.00 annual rent. Option A reflects the current contract conditions.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

PCAM Option B, does not meet specifications. This option includes fully automated parking equipment and a "QR Reader" validation system along with the addition of all new parking meter heads along Water Street. Management would be on-site five (5) days a week and the gates would be operational seven (7) days a week. PCAM would fully fund and finance the systems and amortize the cost over three (3) years for the parking meter heads and the "QR Reader" system and five (5) years for the fully automated parking system. \$11,626.80 per month flat rent, or \$139,521.60 annual rent.

PCAM Option C, which is the proposal being recommended, exceeds the requirements in the RFP. This option provides a "QR Reader" validation system as well as all new parking meter heads along Water Street. The current parking meters are 39 years old and need to be replaced. Mechanical repairs that require parts are no longer available. The meter heads have had water intrusion and are rusting inside. This option provides operation with cashiers and management five (5) days per week. PCAM would fully fund and finance the systems and amortize the cost over three (3) years for the meter heads and "QR Reader" system. \$11,738.80 per month flat rent, or \$140,865.60 annual rent.

PCAM held the previous contract for parking management and submitted a detailed proposal. They have demonstrated consistent responsiveness to a variety of needs, and have accommodated all requests made by the county over the past five (5) years.

Note: The gross revenue for the parking garage for 2017 was \$260,093.96 and \$12,855.10 for the meters. There will be no increase to the county/state employees monthly parking rates.

The Scope of Work requirements are listed below.

The successful firm will be responsible for managing the previously identified parking zones Monday through Friday, from 7:00 a.m. through 6:00 p.m. daily, excluding weekends and County holidays. The gates will be lifted/closed according to the attached schedule. The County reserves the right to change the hours of operation with a 30 day written notice to the successful vendor.

1a. The successful firm will provide a trained on-site manager (8 a.m. through 5 p.m., days as identified above) to supervise parking operations, ensure all contract requirements are adhered to and collect end of the day register receipts. The on-site manager will be trained in customer service, money handling, maintenance duties, use of equipment (see attached literature), as well as all other duties necessary to ensure safe and proper operation of facilities.

1b. The successful firm will provide uniformed attendants during the times and days identified above. Each attendant will wear a shirt containing a company logo and a badge identifying first name. Each attendant will be trained and disciplined in the performance of their duties with verification to be provided upon request.

1c. The successful firm will be obligated to control the actions of their employees and require their employees to be clean, neat, and professional in their appearance while on duty at all times.

2. The successful firm will be responsible for routine building and ground maintenance of the parking zones including, but not limited to the following:

2a. Notifying the county of necessary structural repairs to the parking facility, changes, and replacement required of operating equipment, replacement of fixtures, and landscaping while following specific obligations and the general guidelines of the Parking Garage Maintenance Manual of the Parking

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

fixtures, and landscaping while following specific obligations and the general guidelines of the Parking Garage Maintenance Manual of the Parking Consultants Council and National Parking Association.

2b. Maintaining the equipment supplied by the county in good condition and repair, and keeping the same in operating condition. Upon expiration or termination of the contractual agreement, return the same to the county in good working condition and repair. (Reasonable wear and tear and loss or damage by fire or other incident of force majeure is expected.)

2c. Keeping the premises in a clean and orderly condition by performing trash removal and such other housekeeping services three (3) times a week minimum, and as needed at the request of the county.

2d. Applying ice melt, removing snow and plowing of the roof, entrance and exit areas to and from the parking garages. As deemed necessary by weather is to be completed no later than 6:00 a.m. Ice melt will be the successful firm's sole responsibility to purchase, stock and utilize during inclement winter weather. Exposed ramps, sidewalks and any other potentially unsafe slippery locations in or around the parking garage must be covered with ice melt.

2e. Striping and maintenance painting (including supplies and labor) annually, or as needed at request of the county. This is at the firm's sole cost.

2f. Cleaning of the parking garage floor surfaces using a suitable high pressure/flush of all surfaces periodically and as necessary, but not less than twice per year, to remove sand, salt, oil, grease, and other items which are a slipping/driving hazard or could cause damage to the floor surface.

2g. The successful firm will maintain and repair the parking meters on Water Street access way.

2h. The successful firm will provide the county with an annual schedule of planned maintenance activities. Completion of such maintenance activities will be documented and provided to the county semi-annual basis in June and December.

3. The successful firm will furnish all expendable supplies (i.e., office supplies, trash bags, cleaning supplies) necessary for the operation/management of the parking zones. The county owned dumpsters located directly south of garages may be used for disposal at no cost to the vendor.

4. The successful firm will keep accurate and complete records, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, reflecting all gross receipts, operating expenses and net profit with respect to the parking zones. The successful firm will institute internal control procedures to ensure that all receipts and expenditures are properly accounted for.

4a. The successful firm will provide monthly statements of profit and/or loss accounting within ten (10) calendar days after the end of each month. Statements will include all information as indicated on attached form.

4b. Within thirty (30) days following the end of each contract year, and every twelve (12) months thereafter, the successful firm will provide the county a statement showing the annual gross receipts for the preceding contract year, the amount due and payable to the county for the preceding year and the amount of validated juror and witness tickets.

4c. The successful firm will permit the county to audit the books and records of the parking zones operation during any regular business day.

4d. The successful firm will collect all earnings, deduct the monthly management fee and provide remainder of funds by check no later than the 15th day of

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

each month.

4e. The successful firm will provide and maintain, subject to the approval of the county, insurance coverage during the terms of the agreement and extensions thereof. The expense of which will be treated as an operating expense. The successful firm will furnish to the county certificates of the required insurance coverage. It will be further understood that if any insurance furnished by the successful firm contains a deductible clause, any claims paid under such deductible clause will be considered an operating expense of the premises and payable for gross receipts.

5. The successful firm will possess and maintain Worker's Compensation and Employer's Liability coverage for all persons employed at the premises in accordance with applicable state law. The successful firm will obtain and maintain any and all necessary licenses and permits required by a governmental body or agency having jurisdiction in connection with any activities at the premises and will abide by the terms and provisions of any such licenses and permits. Any expense incurred by the successful firm to obtain such licenses and permits will be treated as an operating expense.

6. The successful firm will **NOT** use, and will make every reasonable effort to prevent any person from using, any part of the premises for any use or purpose, which is directly or indirectly forbidden by public law or which may be violation of the laws of the State of Kansas, of any City of Wichita ordinance or which may be dangerous to life, limb or property. The successful firm will provide no-charge parking for employees and other reserved spaces. The successful firm will provide free parking for authorized press vehicles, boards, commissioners, governmental bodies, contractors with county issued contractor badges, law enforcement, employees who come to the Courthouse Complex for training and other persons as deemed necessary by the county and agreed upon by the successful firm.

7a. The successful firm will supervise and administer a system for validated juror and witness parking whereby these tickets would be identified and stamped by jury clerks and or other persons so authorized by the county. The amount of parking fees incurred would be reported monthly and annually to the county.

7b. The successful firm will honor as valid all current permits held by persons other than county employees, e.g. attorneys. The entry/exit access card and monthly rates are to be reviewed prior to commencement of any renewal term. The number of such monthly permits will be limited to a total of seventy (70). Currently, non-employees are charged a key card deposit of \$15.00 in addition to \$40.00 quarterly for Con-Med (contracted medical staff in the detention facility) and \$120.00 quarterly (\$40.00/month) for all other monthly parkers.

7c. The successful firm will offer parking stamp books to be used as credit for future use by patrons. The stamps will be sold at a cost equal to the hourly and daily fees charged to transient parkers.

7d. The successful firm will provide marked spaces for persons with disabilities in accordance with K.S.A. 8-1,128.

7e. The successful firm will **NOT** contract with, rent, lease, or otherwise offer for a fee any parking space located on the premises to any employee of the county or Eighteenth Judicial District individually, except for those parking spaces which are specifically allocated for rental by such employees as designated by the county.

8. Provide the county with recommendations on how to implement a timesaving process/processes concerning an automated juror parking pass option. This

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

will be solely approved by Sedgwick County Courthouse Police Chief.

9. Upgrades, repairs, or purchases of parking control gates, electronic devices, cameras, security or safety equipment not specifically enumerated in this RFP, must be approved in advance by Sedgwick County Courthouse Police Chief or his designee prior to the expenditure. The repayment for these outlined services will be deducted from the monthly share to be provided to the County as an expense.

Questions and Answers:

Linda Kizzire: Kristen do you know how long it's going to take to replace those meters, since they're so old and falling apart?

Kristen McGovern: I do not. That was something that we did not ask. I'm assuming that if the contract is awarded, Darrell would work that out with them as far as lead time and implementation.

Tom Stolz: While you are there Darrell, on the scope of work requirements that are listed, are those all...what is new? Are they all new? Are those all new scopes compared to the prior contract?

Darrell Haynes: The scope of work, Option A meets the scope of work required, Option C meets the scope of work plus, adds additional equipment repairs or additional equipment that we think would enhance our operation.

Kristen McGovern: Were you asking about the scope of work in the proposal? Those were from the prior one, yes they are.

Talaya Schwartz: So Option A would be keeping everything the same?

Kristen McGovern: Correct.

Talaya Schwartz: Option B didn't meet the specifications?

Kristen McGovern: That's correct.

Talaya Schwartz: And Option C is keeping everything the same and then adding.

Kristen McGovern: Keeping everything the same with the addition of the new meters in the QR Reader system.

Tom Stolz: Why, if we knew we needed the new meters, why wasn't that listed as a requirement? Are they going above and beyond my replacing the meters if they're going above with the scope of what we asked for?

Darrell Haynes: Correct. They are actually current vendor and they brought it to our attention. Now with the QR Reader, we asked him for some solutions that might help speed up jury pool and validation so all the vendors were asked for that. The option of the replacement of the meters, they brought to our attention in their response and it's a very valid point because the meters are 39 years old or more, and they are rusting and definitely need replaced.

Tom Stolz: Okay I get it; my fear is though, we put out a bid we didn't include the meters as part of that, so we really can't even make a decision and factor that in. Just because they offer it, and we figured oh yeah we need it, then we're almost obligated to go back out again and put the meters into the proposal and require it and let everybody have a shot.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS MAY 17, 2018

Talaya Schwartz: And they would have had an advantage, being the current vendor and knowing that.

Kristen McGovern: None of the other proposals that we received, met the specification. If we take the meters out, like the manager and cashier requirement none of them met that.

Darrell Haynes: There is one other option here I and that is go with the status quo, Option A. Have the meters paid for out of the revenue.

Kristen McGovern: I'm sorry. There was a pre-bid meeting held. The meters were discussed during the pre-bid meeting. As far as the maintenance and repair of the meters, it is under the scope of work. I think the problem we're having now with the meters is that there's no parts available to fix them. Because the manufacturer just doesn't exist anymore.

Darrell Haynes: All of the vendors had knowledge.

Kristen McGovern: And they had visibility, they could see the meters at the pre-bid meeting.

Tom Stolz: So under the old contract we had a full-time trained on site manager?

Darrell Haynes: Yes.

Linda Kizzire: Kristen I appreciate the detail on the options that was very helpful. I appreciate it.

Tom Stolz: So Kristen, just one more time here. If I went from left to right on this Car Park Option A-B, Option A for PCAM, Option B for PCAM and Option C for PCAM, if I went left to right, I'm not even consider the last two days are off the charts. Of these first one, two, three, four, five. If I ask you, have they meet the specifications of what we put out you would say no all the way until we got the PCAM Option C?

Kristen McGovern: correct.