



## CITY COUNCIL ACTION REPORT

June 24, 2008

TO: Phillip L. Nelson, City Manager

FROM: Susan A. Leirstein, Purchasing Director  
Charles T. Craft, Police Chief  
William S. Nelson, Fire Chief

SUBJECT: Standard Purchasing Resolution 8: Best Value Award – Public Safety Field Communications Unit

### **Background**

- The City has received specialized public safety communications equipment through homeland security grants over the past several years.
- This equipment was installed in an existing fire department 1996 Ford van as a test of the concept of a public safety field communications unit.
- The unit has been deployed at a number of scheduled events and incident scenes and has substantially enhanced the operations through the use of the on-board radio, data, and video equipment.
- The existing van has not proven suitable for continued use due to limited storage space, no on-board 115 volt power supply, limited 12 volt power supply and low headroom for personnel working in the vehicle.
- A Request for Proposal for a new vehicle was issued and opened on May 8, 2008 with five responses received from four qualified vendors.
- The RFP's were evaluated by a team of fire and police personnel and scored based on layout, design, references, similar projects completed, engineering expertise, and price.
- The proposal from Gerling and Associates received the highest score based on the above criteria.
- Gerling and Associates facilities are located in Sunbury, Ohio which is approximately 200 miles from Troy resulting in lower delivery and maintenance costs; and Gerling maintains a 24/7 service facility in which work will commence within 12 hours of equipment delivery to the site.

### **Financial Considerations**

- Funds are budgeted in the 2007/08 Fire Operations capital account #401.336.338.7984 and the Police department drug forfeiture account #401.301.10.305.7978.065.

### **Legal Considerations**

- RFP-COT 08-16, Public Safety Field Communications Unit was competitively bid as required by City Charter and Code.

June 24, 2008

To: Phillip L. Nelson, City Manager  
Re: Best Value Award – PS Field Communications Unit

### **Policy Considerations**

- This project addresses the following City Council goals:
  - Goal I - Enhance the livability and safety of the community
  - Goal II - Minimize the cost and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of City government.

### **Options**

- City management recommends awarding a contract to furnish all labor, material, tools, equipment and construction drawings to provide one (1) new public safety field communications unit to the lowest cost and highest rated bidder, Gerling & Associates Inc of Sunbury, Ohio, as a result of a best value process, for an estimated total cost of \$125,670.00.

In addition, staff recommends rejecting the delivery cost options under additional costs and opts to pick-up the completed unit in Ohio, once ready for final inspection.



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### PUBLIC SAFETY FIELD COMMUNICATION UNIT

#### STATISTICS:

- ◆ **One-Hundred Fourteen (114) Firms notified via the MITN e-procurement website**
- ◆ **Five (5) proposals were received**
- ◆ **All Four (4) Companies met the Pass/Fail Criteria.**
- ◆ **Gerling & Associates received the highest weighted score as a result of a best value process.**

The following bidders submitted a proposal and received the indicated final scores:

Company	SCORE
<b>Gerling &amp; Associates, Inc.</b>	86
Frontline Communications	82
Bickford Vehicles	67
Essco, L-3 Communications / Wolf Coach, Inc. - B	60
Essco, L-3 Communications / Wolf Coach, Inc. - A	46

#### Attachments:

- ✓ Weighted Final Scoring including layout design and assembly and price score
- ✓ Evaluation Process
- ✓ Original tabulation



**WEIGHTED FINAL SCORING**  
Public Safety Field Communications Unit

Final Score Calculation:

50% x Layout Design & Assembly  
40% x Price  
~~10% x Interview Score~~ (Deleted Phase)  
100% = Final Weighted Score

In order to equate the price to the weighted evaluation process scoring, the prices had to be converted into a score with the base of 100. **NOTE:** Vendors are listed in order of their score for layout design and assembly from highest to lowest. Vendors are noted for their price score in the same order as the layout design score. For the final score the vendors are listed in the order of rating from highest to lowest.

Weighted Average Score for Layout Design & Assembly: 50%

Raters:	1	2	3	4	AVERAGE
Vendors:					
Gerling & Associates, Inc.	94	90	92	90	92
Bickford Vehicles	91	85	84	85	86
Frontline Communications	91	87	77	84	85
Essco, L-3 Com/Wolf Coach, Inc.- A	86	85	77	79	82
Essco, L-3 Com/Wolf Coach, Inc.- B	64	58	62	60	61

Weighted Average Score for Price Score: 40%

Vendors:	FORMULA: $[1 - (\text{Proposal price} - \text{low price}) / \text{low price}] \times \text{available points}$	Weighted Criteria - Difference in costs
Gerling & Associates, Inc.	$[1 - (125670 - 125670) / 125670] \times 100$	100
Frontline Communications	$[1 - (129898 - 125670) / 125670] \times 100$	97
Essco, L-3 Comm/Wolf Coach, Inc - B	$[1 - (161311 - 125670) / 125670] \times 100$	72
Bickford Vehicles	$[1 - (174286 - 125670) / 125670] \times 100$	61
Essco, L-3 Comm/Wolf Coach, Inc.- A	$[1 - (234482 - 125670) / 125670] \times 100$	13

FINAL WEIGHTED SCORE:

VENDORS:	Gerling & Associates, Inc	Frontline Communications	Bickford Vehicles	Essco, /Wolf Coach Inc. - B	Essco /Wolf Coach, Inc.- A
Score					
Layout Design & Assembly: (x 50) =	92 x .50 = 46	85 x .50 = 43	86. x .50 = 43	61 x .50 = 31	82 x .50 = 41
Price Score: (x .40) =	100 x .40 = 40	97 x .40 = 39	61 x .40 = 24	72 x .40 = 29	13 x .40 = 5
Final Score:	86	82	67	60	46

**\*\* HIGHEST RATED VENDOR – RECOMMENDED AWARD**



## SELECTION PROCESS

### CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

The identified Committee will review the proposals. The City of Troy reserves the right to award this proposal to the firm considered the most qualified based upon a combination of factors including but not limited to the following:

- A. Compliance with qualifications criteria
- B. Completeness of the proposal and drawings
- C. Financial strength and capacity of the company
- D. Specific experience and technical competency
- E. Insight related to this project that meets the City's needs
- F. Any other factors which may be deemed to be in the City's best interest
- G. Evaluation Process**

#### Phase 1: Minimum Qualifications Evaluation

Company's will be required to meet minimum established criteria in order to go to the second phase of the process.

#### Phase 2: Evaluation of Proposals

Each Committee member will independently use a weighted score sheet to evaluate the proposals and drawings; each Committee Member will calculate a weighted score. The scores of the Committee Members will be averaged into one score for each firm for this phase of the process.

#### Phase 3: Interview Score – Optional -

The City of Troy Fire and Police Departments, at their option, will invite at least the top three (3) rated company's to participate in an interview. If less than three (3) candidates remain in the process, all will be interviewed. Each Committee Member will independently use a weighted score sheet to evaluate the Interview; each Committee Member will calculate a weighted score. The scores of the Committee Members will be averaged into one score for each firm for this phase of the process. Those being interviewed may be supplied with further instructions and requests prior to the interview. Persons representing the Company at the interview must be the personnel who will be assigned to this project.

#### Phase 4: Price

Points for price will be calculated as follows:

$$\text{FORMULA: } \{1 - (\text{Proposal Price} - \text{Low Price}) / \text{low price}\} \times \text{available points}$$

#### Phase 5: Final Scoring and Selection

The firm with the highest final weighted score will be recommended to the Troy City Council for Award.

50% Proposal & Drawings Score	(100 point base)
40% Price Score	(100 point base)
<u>10% Interview Score</u>	(100 point base)
100%	

Note: **The City of Troy reserves the right to change the order or eliminate an evaluation phase if deemed in the City's best interest to do so.**

Opening Date - 5/8/08  
 Date Prepared- 6/24/08 (sl)

CITY OF TROY  
 RFP TABULATION  
 PUBLIC SAFETY FIELD COMMUNICATIONS UNIT

RFP-COT 08-16  
 Page 1 of 2

VENDOR NAME:	Gerling & Associates, Inc.	Frontline Communications	Essco, L-3 Communications Wolf Coach Alternate	Bickford Vehicles
<b>PROPOSAL: FURNISH ALL LABOR, TOOLS, MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT, AND CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS TO PROVIDE ONE (1) NEW PUBLIC SAFETY FIELD COMMUNICATIONS UNIT</b>				
<b>FIVE (5) COPIES</b> Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE:</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>COMPLETE FOR THE SUM OF:</b>	\$ 125,670.00	\$ 129,898.00	\$ 161,311.00	\$ 174,286.00
Model:	Sentry Class MCC	C-22A	Sprinter	Centurion S
Manufactured By:	Gerling & Assoc. Inc	Frontline	Wolf Coach	Bickford Vehicles
Factory Location:	138 Stelzer Ct Sunbury, Ohio 43074	12770 44th Street Clearwater, Fl 33762	Auburn, Mass	4001 Westfax Dr Chantilly, VA 20151
<b>INCLUDES:</b> TMD-7-42-35x	\$ 15,770.00	\$ 11,200.00	\$ 8,280.00	\$ 10,503.00
<b>ALTERNATE:</b> TMD-7-34-15x	\$ 12,020.00	\$ 6,200.00	\$ 4,700.00	\$ (5,040.00)
<b>OPTIONAL:</b>				
Deliver Cost to Manufacturer	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Deliver Cost to City of Troy	\$ 830.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,598.00	\$ 2,949.00
<b>REQUIRED DRAWINGS:</b> Marked	DWG	50608	1678-A	Drawings
<b>TECHNICAL DATA:</b> Marked	Technical Data	N/A	1678-A	Proposal
<b>DELIVERY DATE:</b>				
Can Meet Schedule	XX	XX	XX	XX
Cannot Meet Schedule but offers:	95 Days ARO			
<b>CONTACT INFORMATION:</b>				
Hours of Operations	24/7	7 AM to 6:30 PM	508.791.1950	6 AM to 5 PM
24 Hr Contact No.	614.296.1454	727.419.1112	508.304.2462	571.243.8018
<b>SERVICE/PARTS FACILITY:</b>				
Location:	200 Miles from Troy, MI	Frontline Plant Clearwater, Fl	Auburn, Massachusetts or customer location	Bickford Vehicles
Inventory of Parts	Per Warranty	245,000.00	TBD	50,000.00
Service - commence	12 hours	48 hours	ASAP	48 hours
<b>TERMS</b>	Ex-Works Acceptance	50% dep/Bal due -acctpt	1/3's - PO/midpoint/completion	0%, 30 days
<b>WARRANTY:</b>	<b>AS SPECIFIED</b>			
<b>DELIVERY:</b>	<b>AS SPECIFIED - 120 days</b>			
<b>EXCEPTIONS</b>	No Exceptions	Noted on bid - Terms/Warranty	Attached to Bid	Blank
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT - Signed</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>FORMS:</b> Legal Status Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Non-Collusion Y or N	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

ATTEST:  
 Donald Mouch  
 Diane Fisher  
 Linda Bockstanz  
 G:/RFP-COT 08-16 Field Communication Unit.xls

Susan Leirstein CPPB  
 Purchasing Director

Opening Date - 5/8/08  
Date Prepared- 6/24/08 (sl)

VENDOR NAME:

Essco, L-3 Communications			
Wolf Coach			

**PROPOSAL: FURNISH ALL LABOR, TOOLS, MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT, AND CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS TO PROVIDE ONE (1) NEW PUBLIC SAFETY FIELD COMMUNICATIONS UNIT**

<b>FIVE (5) COPIES</b>	Y or N	Yes		
<b>VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE:</b>		Yes		
<b>COMPLETE FOR THE SUM OF:</b>		\$ 234,482.00		
Model:		Sprinter		
Manufactured By:		Wolf Coach		
Factory Location:		Auburn, Mass		
<b>INCLUDES:</b> TMD-7-42-35x		Without install \$ 8,280.00		
<b>ALTERNATE:</b> TMD-7-34-15x		\$ 4,700.00		
<b>OPTIONAL:</b>				
Deliver Cost to Manufacturer		\$ -		
Deliver Cost to City of Troy		\$ 2,598.00		
<b>REQUIRED DRAWINGS:</b>	Marked	1688-A		
<b>TECHNICAL DATA:</b>	Marked	1688-A		
<b>DELIVERY DATE:</b>				
Can Meet Schedule		XX		
Cannot Meet Schedule but offers:				
<b>CONTACT INFORMATION:</b>				
Hours of Operations		508.791.1950		
24 Hr Contact No.		508.304.2462		
<b>SERVICE/PARTS FACILITY:</b>				
Location:		Auburn, Massachusetts or customer location		
Inventory of Parts		TBD		
Service - commence		ASAP		
<b>TERMS</b>		1/3's - PO/midpoint/completion		
<b>WARRANTY:</b>		<b>AS SPECIFIED</b>		
<b>DELIVERY:</b>		<b>AS SPECIFIED - 120 days</b>		
<b>EXCEPTIONS</b>		Attached to Bid		
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT - Signed</b>		Yes		
<b>FORMS:</b>				
Legal Status	Y or N	Yes		
Non-Collusion	Y or N	Yes		