

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.