3. ROAD IMPROVEMENT -- PUBLIC WORKS <u>FUNDING -- PUBLIC WORKS</u>

(Request sent to 46 vendors)

RFB #18-0060 S/C# Pending

Engineer's Estimate: Alt 1 \$644,040.50	Andale Construction, Inc.		Cornejo & Sons, L.L.C.		Vogts-Parga Construction LLC	
Engineer's Estimate: Alt 2 \$696,162.50	Alternate #1	Alternate #2	Alternate #1	Alternate #2	Alternate #1	Alternate #2
Project No. 604-W½ 16; 61st St. North between 151st & 167th Streets West (R346)	\$586,920.30	No Bid	No Bid	\$625,938.44	No Bid	\$636,038.26
Bid Bond	Y			Y		Y
Acknowledge Addendum	Y			Y		Y
No Bid	Nowak Construction	Wildcat Construction Co., Inc.	Dondlinger & Sons Construction Co., Inc.	Nowak Construction Co.	Traffic Control Services	RoadSafe Traffic Systems
	Mies Construction Co.	Pearson Construction, LLC	Flint Hills Materials	Kansas Paving		

On the recommendation of Joe Thomas, on behalf of Public Works, Ellen House moved to accept the bid for Alternate #1 from Andale Construction, Inc. in the amount of \$586,920.30. Angela Caudillo seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

This road improvement project includes grading, concrete surfacing, seeding and pavement marking.

A CIP Amendment for this project will be presented at the February 20th Commission meeting, acceptance of this request is contingent upon approval of the CIP Amendment.

Note:

The recommendation was changed from \$589,920.30 to match the table amount of \$586,920.30.

Questions and Answers

Russell Leeds: Just for clarification sake on item 3, in the table it shows \$586,920.30 and down below it says \$589,920.30. Can you just clarify that?

Joe Thomas: (Joe looked through the bid folder to find the bid response.) It looks like they didn't extend out the prices but I think it should be \$586,920.30. Yes. We'll go with the \$586,920.30. The response is in here it's just not extended out.

Russell Leeds: Legal counsel, do you want to weigh in on what the Bid Board should do acting on an uncertain number?

Michael Fessinger: Yes, while I trust everyone's backgrounds, it might be wise to defer this a week just to make sure that we have the correct numbers. Jim is saying that they're going to confirm so that we don't have to defer this for a week. Can you provide us with an email verification on that? We'll take the verbal.

Jim Weber: Purchasing has our email.

Joe Thomas: We'll confirm, change it, and send you an email confirming that for Public Works. Is that okay?

Michael Fessinger: Jim, who did you just talk to over at Public Works just now?

Jim Weber: Julie Williams, who actually takes all the contracts back and runs a full bid tab on them, tracks all the numbers on them, and sends our recommendation to Purchasing. Her email from weeks ago would have had this number in it.

Michael Fessinger: You would say she has personal knowledge on how much this number would be?

Jim Weber: She is the person.

Michael Fessinger: Based on what Mr. Weber is saying, I think we can move forward.

Russell Leeds: So for the record, we believe that \$586,920.30 is the correct number for this bid.

Joe Thomas: I will forward the email that was received. Once I get the copy from Julie, I will forward it to the Bid Board members.

Linda Kizzire: Jim, is this up by the ICM plant up by Colwich?

Jim Weber: That's right. We have to call it Element but it's ICM, the ethanol plant up there. The reason we can't wait on this is it's ready to go. We've lost some time on it because of the CIP amendment but this will be the last meeting of the month.

Russell Leeds: Could you clarify the difference in Alternate #1 and Alternate #2? Why did we have two separate items? They could or could not bid?

BOCC APPROVAL FEBRUARY 20, 2019 SPECIAL BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS FEBRUARY 13, 2019

Jim Weber: Basically, we had been using a process with some of our concrete jobs of cement stabilized base, which uses a liquid stabilizing agent cement really compact the concrete. We've had feedback from contractors that think that it is too limiting. With this job, we've looked at a more conventional approach, which is what we call conventional concrete. It has a lay down machine and it goes slower, but it's one way to do it. They use a dry cement to stabilize the base. The project has been designed that either one gets you essentially the same road in terms of its longevity. It's not mixing them. You do one or the other. Some contractors are set up to do only conventional with dry. Some are only set up to do the rolled concrete with the wet slurry. We will take either one. We don't have a preference. We don't care how you do it but we would like to see what the pricing was so we did two alternates. That way we could see how they're actually competing.

Russell Leeds: Alternate #1 is rolled?

Jim Weber: Rolled compacted concrete on a liquid slurry treated base, which we've done quite a bit of, its no problem. In fact, that's what Element has been using inside of their facility. Andale has been up there doing it inside that facility.

Russell Leeds: The quality of the product is generally comparable. You're just offering two options.

Jim Weber: Yes. Rolled compacted will be faster and cleaner but we could've gotten the same essential product out of either one.

Russell Leeds: You offered two alternatives, so a broader spectrum of vendors.

Jim Weber: More contractors bid on the job. If we had only done the rolled compacted version, we would have likely only had Andale as a bidder

Linda Kizzire: This will be significant for the weight of all this truck traffic going on this road?

Jim Weber: Yes, again this is what Element is using inside of their plant.

Russell Leeds: I would just state again that we reasonably believe the amount is \$586,930.00 to be confirmed through email here shortly. Based on that reasonable belief, I would ask if no further discussion and with legal counsel.

Michael Fessinger: Yes. I would just say that it was actually \$586,920.30.

Russell Leeds: Did I misstate? \$586,920.30 from Andale Construction, Inc.

Michael Fessinger: Correct.