REQUEST FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Version 6/10/19
Completed by County Counselor's Office:
Res/ No.: 20637

Sponsor(s): Charlie Franklin March 15, 2021 Date:

SUBJECT	Action Requested Resolution Ordinance					
	Project/Title: Awarding a T	welve Month Contrac	et with the optio	n of extending	g the Contract fo	or three additional
	Twelve Month periods, for Advisors of Kansas City, M.	Services for lissouri under the term	the Finance and	of Request	for Proposal No.	KD CPAs &
BUDGET	ravisors of Ransas City, iv.	iissouri under the tern	is and condition	is of Request.	ioi i ioposai ivo.	1-21
INFORMATION	Amount authorized by this	s legislation this fisca	l year:			\$137,900
To be completed	Amount previously author					
By Requesting Department and	Total amount authorized a					\$137,900
Finance	Amount budgeted for this			7-11-2 - 5		\$137,900
1 indirec	Source of funding (name of 001-1404-56010 General)			Corrigon		¢127.000
	* If account includes additional fu	nds for other expenses, tota	of budgeted in the ac	count is: \$	15-5	\$137,900
	OTHER FINANCIAL INFO					
	☐ No budget impact (no f☐ Term and Supply Contribution Department:		n the annual bud Estimated Use		ed value and use	of contract:
	\$137,900 is the estimated co	ost for the 2021 Contr	act.			
	Prior Year Budget (if applied Prior Year Actual Amount St		\$133,900			
PRIOR	Prior ordinances and (date):					
LEGISLATION	Prior resolutions and (date)	: 19399, February 27,	2017			
CONTACT INFORMATION	RLA drafted by (name, title	& nhone): Barbara	Casamanta Dur	ohosina Admi	nistrator 001 20	052
REQUEST	REFY drafted by (name, title	, & phone, Barbara	Lasamento, Fun	masing Aumi	ilistrator, 661-52	233
SUMMARY	The Finance and Purchasing Annual Financial Report (C Proposal No. 1-21 in respon	AFR) and the Single	(Grant) Audit.	Auditing Serv The Purchasin	vices for the Corng Department is	nprehensive ssued Request for
	A total of twenty-nine notif for non-compliance. The fo	ications were distribu llowing four proposa	ted and five resplants	ponses were red as follows:	eceived, one of	which was rejected
	Respondent	Respondent's Capability Government Audit Experience 45 Points	References 20 Points	Pricing 35 Points	Total Scores	Total Cost of Contract
	Allen Gibbs Houlek				Part of the second	
	Wichita, KS	41.43	20	32	93.43	\$584,490
	BKD, Kansas City, MO	43.86	20	33	96.86	\$576,825
	Clifton Larson Overland Park, KS	40.14	20	35	95.14	\$546,735
	RSM, Kansas City, MO	39.14	20	25	84.14	\$703,000
						\$700,000
	Pursuant to Section 1054.6 the Award of the Contract for Missouri as the best proposa	or the furnishing of A	y Code, the Fina uditing Service	ance and Purc s to BKD CP	hasing departme As & Advisors o	ent recommends of Kansas City,

	RANCE	Business License Ve	pleted (Purchasing & Department of Purchasing & Department of Purchasing & Department of Previous Action/Previous Action/Previ	ment) ment) ailing Wage (County Auditor's Of	ffice)
COMP	LIANCE		Goals of 9.5% were recomm ation Plan has been approved	ended, BKD is meeting those goal by Compliance	s and the Contractors
ATTAC	CHMENTS	A Recap of Bids Receive and Purchasing, Evaluati Contract/Award.	ed, Award Recommendation ion Score Sheet, the pertinen	Memorandum from Bob Crutsing t pages of BKD's proposal and the	er, Director of Finance proposed
REVIE	W	Department Director:	Bob Crutsinger	Digitally signed by Bob Crutsinger Date: 2021.02.09 11:59:39 -06'00'	Date:
		Finance (Budget Approv	ral):	APPROVED By Mark Lang at 10:35 am, Feb 09, 2021	Date:
		Division Manager:	9		Date: /8/7.021
		County Counselor's Offi	ce: 8 - (To and	Date: 3/11/2021
Fiscal	Informatio	on (to be verified by B	udget Office in Finance	Department)	
	This expend	diture was included in the	annual budget.		
	Funds for th	his were encumbered from	the	Fund in	
	is chargeab	le and there is a cash balar	nbered to the credit of the ap nce otherwise unencumbered to provide for the obligation	propriation to which the expenditu in the treasury to the credit of the herein authorized.	are fund from which
	Funds suffi	cient for this expenditure	will be/were appropriated by	Ordinance #	
	Funds suffi	cient for this appropriation	are available from the source	ce indicated below.	
	Account N	Number:	Account Title:	Amount Not to Exceed	
	This award funds for sp	is made on a need basis an pecific purchases will, of n	nd does not obligate Jackson ecessity, be determined as ea	County to pay any specific amou ach using agency places its order.	nt. The availability of
	This legisla	tive action does not impac	t the County financially and	does not require Finance/Budget	approval.

Fiscal Note:

This expenditure was included in the Annual Budget.

	P	C#							
Date:	February 9, 2021						RES#	2(0637
Org Co	de/Description	0	bject C	Code/Descr	iption			Not	to Exceed
001	General Fund	_							
1404	Finance	56	8010	Auditing a	nd Accou	nting Sei	vices	\$	137,900
E 2							_		
								-	
							_		
							_		
							_		
	,								
		_							
				**			-		
								\$	137,900

APPROVED

By Mark Lang at 10:35 am, Feb 09, 2021

Budget Office

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Barbara Casamento

FROM: RFP Evaluation Committee

SUBJECT: RFP 1-21 (County Auditing Services)

DATE: February 2, 2021

There were four respondents for RFP 1-21 (County Auditing Services): Allen, Gibbs & Houlik (AGH), BKD CPAs & Advisors, CliftonLarsonAllen LLP (CLA), and RSM US LLP. After careful review of the proposals and interviews with all the respondents, the evaluation committee is recommending BKD be awarded the contract.

The audit services will include the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and the Single Audit for the fiscal year ending December 31, 2020 with options, if exercised by the County, of extending the contact for up to three (3) subsequent fiscal years.

Evaluation Committee

The evaluation committee was composed of a broad range of County associates. The representatives on the committee were from the County Auditor's Office, COMBAT, Parks+Rec, and the Finance Department.

As stated in the request for proposal document, the factors considered when evaluating the proposals were:

- 45% Respondent's Capability and Governmental Audit Experience
- 20% References
- 35% Pricing

BKD

1. Respondent Capability and Government Audit Experience

BKD possesses a sizable governmental audit team with plenty of experience and capability of taking on an audit the size of the County's. BKD is the incumbent audit firm and has conducted the audit for the previous four fiscal years. BKD is knowledgeable of the County operations and claims to provide a higher level of partner involvement compared to other national firms. All individuals working on the audit would be based out of the Kansas City office.

BKD would be partnering with an MBE firm, CMA Group, LLC, at nine and one-half percent (9.5%) participation. This participation is equal to the goal established by the County Compliance Review Office. The services provided by this firm would include Single Audit and other financial audit support.

2. Interview

The evaluation committee members conducted a virtual interview with BKD. The representatives of BKD in the interview were Rachel Dwiggins, Managing Partner (Client Engagement Partner) and Jacob Holman (Audit Director). The interview was informative and provided the committee valuable information on the audit process and that their engagement would have substantial partner involvement.

A representative from their MBE firm, CMA Group, was not in attendance to address the committee. However, the committee did not believe this to be significant enough to deduct points.

3. References

BKD's references, City and County of Denver, Sedgwick County, Kansas, and the University of Missouri System, provided complimentary recommendations for their services.

4. Pricing

Per the RFP requirements, the pricing quote based on seven major funds and three major grant programs was \$137,900 for the first year of the audit. This is equal to the price paid for the most recent audit year. The future pricing would increase approximately three percent (3%) over the term of the contract. The total cost for the four years of the contract is \$576,825

BKD had the <u>second lowest</u> pricing among respondents. The \$576,825 quote from BKD for the four-year agreement was \$30,090 more than lowest bid and \$126,175 less than the highest bid. See attached Exhibit B for pricing analysis.

5. Evaluation Scoring

See the attached Exhibit B showing the Evaluation Scoring Summary

Recommendation Letter Exhibit A

Jackson County, Missouri Analysis of Pricing for RFP 1-21, Auditing Services

COUNTY AUDIT				
	<u>AGH</u>	BKD	CLA*	<u>RSM</u>
Audit Year 2020 \$	125,000	127,000	111,300	145,000
Audit Year 2021	130,000	130,750	115,500	149,000
Audit Year 2022	135,850	134,750	119,910	153,000
Audit Year 2023	142,640	138,750	124,425	157,000
Total \$	533,490	531,250	471,135	604,000
Additonal Fund \$	-	5,500-7,500	2,500	5,000
GRANT AUDIT	ACH	מעם	CLA*	DCM
Audit Year 2020 \$	<u>AGH</u> 12,000	<u>BKD</u> 10,900	<u>CLA*</u> 18,900	<u>RSM</u> 24,000
Audit Year 2021	12,500	11,225	18,900	24,500
Audit Year 2022	13,000	11,550	18,900	25,000
Audit Year 2023	13,500	11,900	18,900	25,500
Total \$	51,000	45,575	75,600	99,000
Additional Program \$	6,500	4,500 -6,000	5,000	6,000
TOTAL COST (excl. add'l fund/ program) \$	<u>AGH</u> 584,490	<u>BKD</u> 576,825	<u>CLA*</u> 546,735	<u>RSM</u> 703,000

^{*} Fee includes a 5% Technology and Client Support Fee

Recommendation Letter Exhibit B

Jackson County, MO --- Evaluation Scoring Sheet - Summary RFP 1-21 --- Auditing Services

		Respondent Name	ent Name	
Criteria & Scoring	AGH	ВКО	CLA	RSM
Section 1: Respondent Capability and Governmental Audit Experience (45 points available in section)				
1. a.) Response to RFP Criteria (5 points available)	4.43	5.00	4.00	4.57
1. b.) Respondent Capability (15 points available)	13.71	14.57	13.43	13.43
1. c.) Governmental Audit Experience (15 available)	14.86	14.71	14.14	13.57
1. d.) Interview (10 points available)	8.43	9.57	8.57	7.57
Total Points - Section 1	41.43	43.86	40.14	39.14
Section 2: References (20 points available in section)	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Section 3: Pricing (35 points available in section)	32.00	33.00	35.00	25.00
Respondent Total - All Sections	93.43	98.96	95.14	84.14