

ITEMS REQUIRING BOCC APPROVAL
 July 28, 2022
 (3 Items)

1. ELECTRONIC MONITORING SERVICES -- DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

FUNDING -- DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

(Request sent to 33 vendors)

RFP #22-0036 Contract

	Greenfeather Monitoring LLC
	Price
SCRAM GPS (1 piece) with or without house arrest	\$5.40 per day
SCRAM CAM (Continuous Alcohol Monitoring) with landline or modem	\$5.50 per day
SCRAM CAM (Continuous Alcohol Monitoring) with downloads at the office of Greenfeather Monitoring every three (3) days	\$5.25 per day
Remote Breath (Handheld Alcohol Device) with Facial Intelligence	\$5.00 per day
Ally-Victim Notification paired with SCRAM GPS	\$1.50 per day
	Buddi US, LLC
Buddi Smart Tag® GPS offender monitor	\$6.65 per day
Buddi RF Beacon (optional)	N/C
Alcohol Monitoring	\$5.00 per day
	Core Monitoring
VCheck24	\$3.00 per day
VCheck 24 w/alcohol monitoring	\$5.00 per day
BLUTAG	\$4.00 per day
BLUTAG w/alcohol monitoring	\$6.00 per day
OM500	\$5.00 per day
OM500 w/alcohol monitoring	\$7.00 per day
	BI Incorporated
No Bid	Securus Monitoring Solutions

On the recommendation of Lee Barrier, on behalf of Department of Corrections, Anna Meyerhoff-Cole moved to **accept the proposal from Greenfeather Monitoring LLC at the rates listed above and establish contract pricing for one (1) year with two (2) one (1) year options to renew.** Jennifer Blasi seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

A review committee comprised of Kevin Cocking, Beth Hopper, Abigail Lessman, and Tom Struble - Department of Corrections and Lee Barrier - Purchasing evaluated all proposal responses based on criteria set forth in the RFP and unanimously chose Greenfeather Monitoring LLC.

Notes:

This is a proposal and not a bid. Proposals are scored and based on criteria set forth in our RFP. There were five (5) components to evaluate:

Component	Points
a. Ability to meet the requirements and objectives as outlined in the Request for Proposal	25
b. Management and Technical Capability	25
c. Past Performance	25
d. Location of Vendor	20
e. Cost	5
Total Points	100

Data was compiled for the 1st quarter of CY2022.

Corrections had an average of 21 GPS installs per month across all programs with 56 days being the median length of time for a participant to be monitored.

The county had 22 GPS de-installs per month during that same time frame.

Only four (4) alcohol-monitoring devices were installed in 2021.

Questions and Answers from the July 21, 2022 Board of Bids and Contracts

Russell Leeds: Were they the lowest proposal?

Lee Barrier: They were not.

Greg Gann: Can someone speak to how often this service will be utilized?

Tom Struble: Typically it is utilized off of court order. It can vary drastically depending on the program.

Greg Gann: Do you have an idea of an average number for a month or annually?

Tom Struble: I do not for the whole department. Lee, did you collect any information on what our typical spend is from past programs?

Lee Barrier: We did and I have that information available for you and I can provide that for you.*

Brandi Baily: Is Greenfeather our current vendor?

Tom Struble: They are not. Our current vendor is Buddi. Greenfeather is a local vendor, Buddi is out of Florida.

Brandi Baily: How do these rates compare to what we are paying now?

Tom Struble: Lee, do you have that information?

Lee Barrier: I do. They are comparable.

Brandi Baily: You said this was not the only vendor that submitted a proposal. How come we don't see their information as far as what some of those other proposals were?

Lee Barrier: Buddi LLC was one of the other proposal submissions and the other proposal we did not accept based on the fact the gentleman did not qualify to provide service for Sedgwick County. I can provide Buddi's proposal for you as well.

Russell Leeds: Were there three (3) proposals?

Lee Barrier: Yes there were three (3) total, only two (2) we were able to review.

Russell Leeds: That was my question initially because generally we see all proposals whether they are accepted or not. On this table we only see one (1).

Lee Barrier: I will get that information for you and send it to you all. (See revised table above.)

Russell Leeds: Yes ma'am.

Brandi Baily: I would like to move this to the next meeting so we can see what those proposals are.

Russell Leeds: Do we need to do that as a motion?

Kirk Sponzel: Yes, that can be done by motion and you can defer it formally till next week. Is there a Bid Board Meeting next week?

Lee Barrier: I believe so.

Kirk Sponzel: Okay, you can do it next week unless there is no Bid Board at which time it would be heard at the subsequent Bid Board meeting.

Russell Leeds: The next scheduled?

Kirk Sponzel: Yes.

*78,000 for 2021 across for all departments.

Questions and Answers from the July 28, 2022 Board of Bids and Contracts

Brandi Baily: Reading through the notes it looks like Core Monitoring was ineligible. Is that correct?

Tom Struble: Yes. We hired them in the past, years ago, and discovered issues and they could not be a contractor with the county.

Brandi Baily: Can you repeat the last part?

Joe Thomas: Could not be contracted by the county, isn't that right Tom?

Tom Struble: Yes

Brandi Baily: You said that was in the past. Did we verify that they still have issues?

Tom Struble: Yes. If the owner is still the owner, that is the issue.

Russell Leeds: That is pretty cryptic. Could you elaborate on that and legal counsel can step in if they think they need to?

Tom Struble: I think there were several things. 1) I believe he had felony convictions and 2) he was operating out of a storefront that existed physically but wasn't a business. There were several other issues the first few months and the county decided to end that contract.

Brandi Baily: Okay. I just asked because they appear to be low bid on some of these items so I wanted to clarify why we are not going with them

Lee Barrier: They're low bid if it does not include alcohol monitoring.

Joe Thomas: Since cost was only five (5) points that would be very small in comparison to the overall evaluation.

Russell Leeds: I was looking at some of the language here which is unfamiliar. The bid we just talked about and the second one for that matter, all use different seemingly proprietary language. It was unclear to me whether they were offering the same services or bidding something different. My question is: You guys did the evaluation of what they were offering and how they would deliver. Essentially are you saying that Greenfeather Monitoring LLC is the best value selection because they are fulfilling the needs of the department in a way that will be efficient and effective?

Lee Barrier: Yes. That is the correct assessment.

Russell Leeds: Are they meeting the needs of the department with what they bid?

Lee Barrier: They met every spec.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS JULY 28, 2022

2. GROUNDSKEEPING / LANDSCAPING -- FACILITIES MAINTENANCE

FUNDING -- FACILITIES MAINTENANCE

(Request sent to 73 vendors)

RFB #22-0050 Contract

	Commercial Lawn Management	Maverick Health LLC dba Maverick Solutions	Robin Hoods Industries, LLC
Location	Annual Cost	Annual Cost	Annual Cost
1. Main Courthouse - 525 N. Main	\$32,575.47	\$4,458.00	\$4,500.00
2. Historic Courthouse - 510 N. Main	\$33,574.17	\$4,458.00	\$4,375.00
3. Munger - 538 N. Main	\$13,288.86	\$4,458.00	\$1,900.00
4. Public Safety - 714 N. Main	\$22,314.81	\$4,458.00	\$2,900.00
5. Parking Garage - 603 N. Main / 121 W. Pine	\$11,967.50	\$4,458.00	\$1,700.00
6. Adult Detention - 141 W. Elm	\$57,303.44	\$4,458.00	\$4,200.00
7. West Tag Office - 2525 W. Douglas	\$23,955.30	\$4,458.00	\$1,500.00
8. Jail Annex - 701 W. Harry	\$51,613.53	\$4,458.00	\$3,200.00
9. Ronald Reagan - 271 W. 3rd	\$13,003.60	\$4,458.00	\$3,700.00
10. Coleman Parking lot - 250 N. St. Francis	\$10,557.50	\$4,458.00	\$1,600.00
11. Office of Medical Director - 200 W. Murdock	\$8,999.96	\$4,458.00	\$3,175.00
12. Kansas African American Museum - 601 N. Water	\$9,251.16	\$4,458.00	\$1,575.00
13. Health Department - 1900 E 9th St.	\$46,251.74	\$4,458.00	\$3,100.00
14. Main Courthouse - 525 N. Main (DUPLICATE)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Adult Residential Services, Corrections Dept. - 622 E. Central	\$18,386.86	\$4,458.00	\$1,500.00
16. Adult Intensive Supervision Program, Corrections Dept. - 905 N. Main	\$18,135.70	\$4,458.00	\$1,500.00
17. Addiction Treatment Services, COMCARE - 940 N. Waco	\$8,389.13	\$4,458.00	\$2,260.00
18. EMS Post 8, Public Safety - 501 E. 53rd Street N.	\$44,614.28	\$4,458.00	\$2,220.00
19. EMS Post 15 - South 219.65' of lot 35, Comotara Industrial Park, between 34th and 35th streets north on Webb Road	\$25,950.93	\$4,458.00	\$1,488.00
20. Primary Care Clinic, Health Department - 2716 W. Central	\$23,409.12	\$4,458.00	\$2,700.00
21. Forensic Science Center - 1109 N. Minneapolis	\$20,821.84	\$4,458.00	\$4,700.00
22. Fleet Management, Main Shop - 1021 Stillwell	\$13,840.23	\$4,458.00	\$2,000.00
23. Fleet Management, East Shop - 1015 Stillwell	\$7,982.33	\$4,458.00	\$2,000.00
24. Juvenile Detention Facility, Corrections Dept. - 700 S. Hydraulic	\$19,664.04	\$4,458.00	\$5,000.00
25. Juvenile Residential Facility, Corrections Dept. - 881 S. Minnesota	\$19,664.04	\$4,458.00	\$5,000.00
26. Juvenile Court, Corrections Department - 1015 S. Minnesota	\$19,664.04	\$4,458.00	\$5,000.00
27. Juvenile DA, District Attorney - 1015 S. Minnesota	\$19,664.04	\$4,458.00	\$4,700.00
28. Sheriff's Squad Room - 830 Stillwell	\$15,949.16	\$4,458.00	\$3,000.00
TOTAL ANNUAL COST	\$610,792.78	\$120,366.00	\$80,493.00
Acknowledge Addendum	Yes	Yes	Yes
No Bid	Arbor Masters Tree Service	Customwise Turf & Tree	Cutting Edge Lawn & Landscape
	K and K Enterprises	Prairie Landworks, Inc.	Suburban Landscape Management

On the recommendation of Tammy Culley, on behalf of Facilities Maintenance, Brandi Baily moved to **accept the overall low bid from Robin Hoods Industries, LLC and establish contract pricing for three (3) years with two (2) one (1) year options to renew at the rates listed above.** Jared Schechter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

This service will provide groundskeeping services at several county buildings including those in the downtown complex. New locations were added to this Request for Bid (RFB) to backfill the 100% vacancy rate in Facilities Groundskeeping positions.

Notes:

The previous spend from July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2022 was \$57,653.18 with Commercial Lawn Management.

Robin Hoods Industries, LLC is a new vendor.

Questions and Answers

Brandi Baily: It looks like last year's total spend was \$57,653.18 with Commercial Lawn Management. Their total annual cost this time was \$610,792.78. I know you said we added some new locations but why such a drastic increase?

Joe Thomas: When we saw this, we said what in the world is going on. What Commercial Lawn Management told us that over the previous contract period they felt they were called many more times than they should have on some of the lawn services. They felt the lawn services were complete and Facilities would call them out and tell them we need you to do this or a little more frequency. Just a lot of things they didn't agree with. We believe they did it this way just to send a message that they did not want this contract this year. They felt they got called a number of times when it was not necessary and based on that this is what they believe the contract should be charged at.

Brandi Baily: How many new locations were added to this from what we had previously?

Tammy Culley: I believe there were 14 that were added.

Brandi Baily: Do you know if there is a timeline of filling that vacant Facilities position because I'm assuming that position would cost less than what we're paying in contract pricing?

Joe Thomas: When we visited with Kendal and David (Facilities), they have the same problem as everywhere. They cannot get people to make applications and come in and commit so they have been trying again and again and again. Recently, he's had two (2) good applicants and one (1) of those is kind of iffy. So their objective is, yes, to eventually hire more personnel so this can be done in-house. The language in the RFB stated we do have that option as time goes on to bring some of the services in-house at certain locations. As of right now, they don't have anyone internally.

Anna Meyerhoff-Cole: I can speak to that. This was a recommendation since they are having issues with staffing. They would get a groundskeeper and they wouldn't stay then the Facilities Maintenance staff was having to do the groundskeeping instead. They needed to concentrate on other needs and not worry about groundskeeping right now.

Brandi Baily: I appreciate you bringing up there is language in the contract if we do find a groundskeeper that could do the job, we could pull some of these back so we're not committed.

Joe Thomas: We also brought in the vendor to make sure that was clearly stated and he agreed. Tammy (buyer) sent an e-mail outlining our conversation and he confirmed he agrees with our option to do that.

Russell Leeds: Are they doing comprehensive lawn care, mowing, edging?

Tammy Culley: Yes. There's trimming, some flower beds, mowing, leaves, bushes, and trees.

Russell Leeds: We have some facilities that have some significant needs. They look pretty trashy.

Tammy Culley: Yes. That's why we're trying to get this pushed through and possibly get the vendor to come out and do it as a separate PO to help get caught up.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS JULY 28, 2022

3. CHECK COLLECTION SERVICES -- VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS

FUNDING -- TREASURER

(Request sent to 35 vendors)

RFP #22-0024 Contract

	Butler & Associates, P.A.	CBK, Inc.	RECHECK, Inc.	TSI	Value Recovery Holding, LLC
Amount of Non-sufficient funds check returned to county	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Vendor Collection Fee (non-litigation)	\$30.00 check fee and 50% of interest collected	\$30.00 check fee	\$20.00 check fee	\$13.25 per debtor assigned	\$30.00 check fee
Vendor Collection Fee (litigation)	\$30.00 check fee, attorney fees, and 50% of interest and damages to Butler & Associates	\$30.00 check fee, attorney fees, and 50% of interest and damages to CBK, Inc.	\$20.00 Check Fee 50% of all civil damages awarded in civil judgment. Kahrs Law Offices will retain any attorney fees awarded at judgment as required under law. County receives 50% of all civil damages awarded in civil judgment. Damages awarded are equal to three times the amount of the check not to exceed the amount of the check by more than \$500.00 or a minimum of \$100.00	Phase 2 Collection - 35% of total assignment Litigation - 50% of total assignment (Typically must be over \$500.00 to pursue) Mailskips/Bad Addresses - 50% of total assignment	50% of the awarded judgment county receives 50% of the awarded judgment + \$30.00 check fee
No Bid	American Municipal Services		Central States Recovery	Client Services, Inc.	

On the recommendation of Jaimee Wittmer, on behalf of various departments, Jennifer Blasi moved to accept the proposal from RECHECK, Inc. at the rates listed above for a period of two (2) years with two (2) one (1) year options to renew. Anna Meyerhoff-Cole seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-5 with Brandi Baily abstaining.

A committee comprised of Jeremy Gibbs, Amber Burnett, and Christine Wilson - Treasurer's Office; Brad Ashens - Health Department; Maria Bias - Metropolitan Area Building and Construction Department (MABCD); and Jaimee Witmer - Purchasing, evaluated all proposal responses based on the criteria set forth in the RFP. The committee unanimously agreed to accept the proposal from RECHECK, Inc.

Annually, Sedgwick County employees collect a variety of real estate, vehicle, and special taxes, as well as fees for services throughout many county departments. Sedgwick County currently accepts cash, check, and credit card payments. This solicitation is seeking a qualified firm to provide check collection services for the recovery of returned checks. Sedgwick County has historically utilized check collection services for the Treasurer's Office (Tag and Tax), Health Department, EMS, Metropolitan Area Building and Construction Department (MABCD), and COMCARE (Community Mental Health Center), although any tax or fee accepting department may utilize the contract.

The county averages about two (2) returned checks each day with a total annual value of approximately \$200,000.00, although either of these amounts could fluctuate greatly. Approximately 90% of the returned checks are private with the remaining 10% commercial.

Notes:

This is a proposal and 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. Meeting or exceeding all solicitation conditions and instructions as outlined herein to include clarity, completeness, and comprehensiveness of the response	20
b. Ability to meet or exceed all requirements and scope of work	20
c. Proven ability to provide high quality service	20
d. Qualifications and expertise	20
e. The most advantageous and prudent methodology and costs as determined by the county	20
Total Points	100

Questions and Answers from the July 21, 2022 Board of Bids and Contracts

Greg Gann: I see the proposal refunds the amount of nonsufficient checks returned to the county at 100%. I'm assuming the vendor's fee is \$20.00? Is that how they make their money?

Jaimee Witmer: Yes. They keep that \$20.00 fee. It's actually a \$30.00 fee per the State of Kansas but they are only keeping \$20.00 of that. It's actually not as much as they could be charging.

Russell Leeds: So that's an additional cost to the consumer?

Jaimee Witmer: Correct.

Russell Leeds: Who is our current vendor since we've used services for this before?

Jaimee Witmer: RECHECK, Inc. is the current vendor.

Tim Myers: Have we been happy with RECHECK, Inc.'s performance up to this point?

Jeremy Gibbs: Yes. We've been happy with their performance and what they have done for us.

Questions and Answers from the July 28, 2022 Board of Bids and Contracts

Joe Thomas: Last week the Board of Bids and Contracts approved this item and it was deferred yesterday at BoCC. Shortly after the approval of this item, it was brought to our attention by the vendor that the category listed as Vendor Collection Fee (litigation) was missing some important pieces that were implied but not explicitly stated. It is industry standard as you can see from the other vendors listed. This clarification was then relayed, since it is a proposal, and presented back to the evaluation committee team to see if it would affect the overall score and the award of the contract. They still had the better pricing in this category and it affected the point system very little. The overall difference between RECHECK, Inc. and the next vendor was still considerable, and that is why the recommendation is made again for RECHECK, Inc. This is an example of some information that came to light, and we want to bring it back. Legal helped us to appreciate the need to bring this back to your attention so you would have all of the facts as we make the recommendation again.

Russel Leeds: It says law offices will retain any attorney fees awarded at judgment as required under law, is that in fact the case and that would apply to all five (5) of these proposals? There are statutory requirements that attorney fees would apply to all of these, correct? This is the only one that uses the language "as required by law".

Joe Thomas: I am not sure, Jeremy are you on the line?

Russel Leeds: Some of the others do not necessarily speak to attorney fees; it suggests we will get half of whatever it is. They do not indicate if this is after attorney fees or before attorney fees so, I am assuming it is the same for all.

Joe Thomas: I do not know if it is industry standard or statute driven, I believe it is industry standard, that is my guess but I was not a part of the evaluation committee.