

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS
June 30, 2016
(1 Item)

1. TENDER/PUMPER TRUCKS -- SEDGWICK COUNTY FIRE DISTRICT #1 (SCFD)

FUNDING -- FIRE DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

(Request sent to 63 vendors)

RFP #15-0120 S/C #800081772

	Qty	Custom Fire Apparatus, Inc.		Pierce Manufacturing Inc.		Weis Fire and Safety	
		Unit Price	Ext Price	Unit Price	Ext Price	Unit Price	Ext Price
Tender/Pumper Trucks	2	\$384,667.00	\$769,334.00	\$402,637.00	\$805,274.00	\$335,998.00	\$671,996.00
Delivery date		no delivery date given		11 months from date of order		Prior to 12-31-2016	
Acknowledge Addenda		Y		Y		Y	
Bid Bond		Y		Y		Y	
No Bid		Blanchat Mfg., Inc.		Danko Emergency Equipment		Feld Fire	
		American Response Vehicles		Roberson Fire & Safety		Penn Care, Inc.	
		Fleet Sales, LLC		E-One		Life Line Emergency Vehicles, Inc.	
		REV Group, Inc.		Max Fire Apparatus, Inc.			

On the recommendation of Joe Thomas, on behalf of SCFD, Sara Jantz moved to **reject all proposals submitted and rebid at a later date.** Jennifer Dombaugh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

A committee comprised of Battalion Chief Doug Williams, Fire Captain Ray Hensley, Fire Captain Darin House, Fire Lieutenant Arlan Spexarth, Firefighter Chris Roberts, Firefighter Calvin Forbes, Fire Master Technician Brian Richey - SCFD and Britt Rosencutter - Purchasing reviewed all proposal responses based on experience, qualifications, and ability to provide the apparatus. Pierce Manufacturing Inc. offers the best long term product with the lowest cost of ownership over the life cycle of the apparatus.

An important factor for this decision includes manufacturing consistency with our latest Tender purchase in 2015, keeping apparatus design as close as possible to resolve training and operational issues firefighters face with various manufacturers of like apparatus. Downtime will be reduced and cost savings are expected by having the same manufactured apparatus. The Weis Fire and Safety and Custom Fire Apparatus, Inc. proposals did not meet all specifications in the following areas listed below:

The following items from Weis Fire and Safety did not meet minimum specifications:

1. Vehicle camera system not as specified.
2. Pump perimeter lights not as specified.
3. Body perimeter lights not as specified.
4. Side tank valves not as specified.
5. Master switch for dump valves not provided.
6. Floor of hosebed not as specified.
7. Body fender crowns not as specified.
8. Hose troughs not as specified.
9. Steps not as specified.
10. Pump shift not as specified.
11. Class 1 Gauges not as specified.
12. No service parts internet site.
13. Paint does not meet specification.

The following were areas where Custom Fire apparatus Inc. did not meet our specifications.

1. Vehicle Speed does not meet our specification of 75 mph.
2. Battery Charger not as specified.
3. 4" discharge not as specified.

Question - Are these replacement vehicles or new ones? Brian Richey with SCFD, these are to replace two of our aging Tenders in the fleet.

Question - What do we do with the old ones? Sell them on PurpleWave? Yes, we sell them through PurpleWave.

Question - Can you tell us what the typical lifespan of one of these devices is? Typically, 15-20 years is what we hope to get from them.

Notes from Special Meeting of the Board of Bids and Contracts, June 30, 2016.

The meeting was called to order by Sara Jantz. Joe Thomas stated this item is being brought before you today because a key piece of information provided was incorrect. Brian Richey-Fire District representative is here to explain the misinformation. Brian Richey stated that a key piece of information was incorrect which lead to an incorrect conclusion made by the review committee. A welded aluminum body was specified, it was incorrectly stated that Weiss Fire and Safety could not provide this type of body, when in fact they can.

BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS JUNE 30, 2016

The review committee failed to catch that mistake, and assumed it would be a different construction (bolted body) than was specified.

Sara Jantz asked - So to clarify, the committee met, and missed a key point, and brought it to Bid Board without that information, for Bid Board to review? *Yes. In January Toyne's demo equipment was brought to one of our stations and I looked at their product, and asked the salesman if this would be the body type they would be bidding for the Sedgwick County Fire District, and the answer was yes. We failed to catch what he said there, versus what they bid, it's two different things.*

Sara Jantz asked - Purchasing, what is the recommendation at this point? Is it being suggested that we cancel this approval?

Linda Kizzire asked - Does Pierce make one that has the bolted body? *No, they do not; our specifications clearly stated that it had to be an aluminum welded body. We did not ask for a bolted body. Toyne offers the body both ways; the bolted body is actually stainless steel, not aluminum. Pierce provides welded aluminum.*

Sara Jantz asked - So the statement that we were provided, *operational issues and downtime with reduced costs and cost savings are expected by having the same manufactured apparatus.* Is that not a true statement anymore, now that we know the other vendor can provide a welded body? *The body doesn't play as big a part as everyone believes.*

Sara Jantz stated - A statement was made that it was "a big issue". My understanding is, that statement was made to Commissioners.

Brian Richey stated - The Pierce product being similar, being built with the same blue prints and the same components, has value. Whether it be able to stock fewer parts, we have parts in stock typically to make repairs. When you purchase from a different vendor, you have different parts and people for supplies. Operationally, having the trucks operate the same and all the components are located in the same place does have value as well. When we made that statement, we still feel Pierce provides the best overall solution long term. We can buy the cheaper equipment, it will still put out fires, it will do most of what the Pierce truck does.

Linda Kizzire asked - Our other Tender/Pumper trucks, do they come from Pierce also? *We have two manufacturers, one is Pierce and the other was Central States, which is now Rosenbauer.*

Linda Kizzire asked - Weiss it looks like, still won't be able to provide you all the other specifications that you needed for the minimum qualifications? Is that correct? *They could have, but failed to; they had the opportunity to do that. The specification provided was generic so that anyone building fire trucks through FAMA (Fire Apparatus Manufacturing Association) could build. There was nothing proprietary about our specifications that eliminates anyone from bidding. They chose to bid something different.*

Sara Jantz asked - Purchasing, it seems we have information that was not provided to us before, at some point it has become significant information. Do we need to be rejecting this proposal and going back out for an RFP?

Joe Thomas stated - We defer to Bid Board members and Commissioners, as they take precedence. We make the recommendations. You could move forward with this, but it would be the third time we'd be recommending this, there have been many convolutions during this time period. Bid Board could decide, we're not recommending Pierce and award to another responder, or the cleanest way to address this is to reject all responses and start over. If you choose to restart the process, we will reevaluate the specifications, make sure our processes are clean, and make sure that everything that we've learned from this is applied to any future RFPs for these apparatus.

Misha Jacob-Warren- Assistant County Counselor stated - As I understand it right now, no purchase order has been issued for Pierce equipment. So at this time we have not entered into any kind of binding contract with them. Legal agrees with Purchasing, the cleanest way to do this is, if it is the will of the Board, is to reject the proposals and make that recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners who has the ultimate decision. Right now, because we have not issued that purchase order, we are within the time frame to reject the proposals.

Sara Jantz stated - my recommendation is to reject the proposals. She asked if anyone would like to second, or make an alternate motion.

Linda Kizzire asked - Since this is a replacement vehicle, what is the estimated lifespan on what we are replacing? Is it going to break down and not be operable by the time we get responses back in another 11 months? *Chances of costly repairs are imminent everyday; one of the trucks currently being replaced is 23 years old. The other truck being replaced is 17 years old. Typically 12-15 years is perfect world, it's when we roll the dice, we keep our fingers crossed.*

Linda Kizzire stated - As someone who lives in the fire district, I'd like for you guys to have good equipment and like it to be suited for your staff that you already have, that they are not trying to learn (how to use a different hose) new equipment because it's in a different location on your truck. I don't do your job, obviously, but in the event that I need you I want people that know how to operate the same type of equipment come to my house. You guys do a great job, I just want to make sure you have the right equipment. Your safety is number one priority.