

ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL PURCHASING AGENCIES

MEETING REPORT #2

December 2, 2000
Las Vegas, Nevada

Attendance

The following Member Agencies were represented as indicated below:

<u>Members</u>	<u>Representative</u>
Arizona	David Wasson and Jim Migliorino
Indiana	Larry Risk and Ken Potts
Kansas	John Stanton
Kentucky	Liz Storey
Minnesota	Mike Hijek
New Mexico	Max Luft and Llew Perry
Oregon	Tammy Standley
Pennsylvania	Jeff Kimball
Washington	Ron Ricketts and Dave Uglen

Absent

Nebraska

Guests

Mike Winkler	Kawana
Mark Race	Kawana
Jim Mitchell	Pioneer Ford
Kari Arfstrom	AASA/AESA
Brian Talbott	AESA

Overview

The meeting was held in Room 701 of the Marco Polo conference area in The Venetian Hotel, Las Vegas, and began at 1:00 p.m. An overview of the agenda indicated the following tasks:

1. Introductions and General Concerns
2. Review the Award Process
3. Selection of Vendors
4. Procedure for Finalizing Contracts and Implementing Awards
5. Selection of Date for Next Meeting and identification of follow-up tasks

ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL PURCHASING AGENCIES

1. Introductions and General Concerns

There was a consensus that the solicitation process to date has been acceptable. While changes and modifications need to be made, the existing structure has generated bids capable of providing extensive procurement opportunities.

It was noted that all had contributed, however, three (3) agencies had provided extensive services. Mohave (MESC) provided the specifications for many bid areas, and David Wasson went to Albuquerque to spend three (3) days to finalize the writing of the bid. Tammy Standley from Oregon was recognized for her outstanding ability and dedication in answering questions from bidders. A certificate of appreciation, signed by all members, was presented to Tammy. Larry Risk and Ken Potts were recognized for their efforts in instituting the website and evaluating the bids. The bid summary was reviewed as the item which would allow the group to gain award closure during the meeting. A certificate signed by all members was presented to Larry, Ken and the Indiana staff in appreciation of their efforts.

At this time there was consensus to have Indiana invoice each participating agency Fifty Dollars (\$50) to cover the cost of transporting the bids from Indiana to Las Vegas, copying the bid summaries and payment for the website registration (www.aepacoop.org).

All of those in attendance were then introduced. AEPA notebooks were distributed and contained a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) from each agency.

2. Process for Awards

It was noted that the award required two (2) separate evaluations. First was whether the bid was in compliance with the Invitation for Bids (IFB) as published. This included signatures, bonds where required, and adherence to general format requirements. It was agreed minor deviations could be waived as a technicality. The second area of evaluation would be a cost comparison of like items with the bid going to the most cost effective respondent. There was consensus to review each bid area in this manner. Bid areas were reviewed in the following order - autos, roofing, carpeting, printers and supplies, and playground equipment. All vendors would be accepted or rejected by voice vote or show of hands, with one vote per agency.

3. Vendor Awards

A. Autos

Two (2) responses were received, one a no bid.

ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL PURCHASING AGENCIES

It was noted only one (1) viable bid was received, and that was from Pioneer Ford in Phoenix. Jim Mitchell, National Fleet Accounts Manager at Pioneer Ford had been invited to the meeting and was in attendance. He then summarized the bid and noted that the bid was by Pioneer Ford, a division of United Auto Group (UAG). A listing of other UAG members is available on the web. Jim indicated they would start the bid with Ford vehicles, and then progress to other makes.

Jim Migliorino of MESC requested a clarification of the cost of the vehicles. Mr. Mitchell said the cost would be the net plus the indicated margin stipulated in the bid (\$400 to \$1,800 depending on model) plus transportation if delivered at any dealer other than Pioneer. The net is that as stated in the bid; invoice to dealer less incentives to dealer less hold back. He also indicated that transportation cost to any other dealer would not exceed Three Hundred Fifty Dollars (\$350). It was noted that all purchase orders would go to Pioneer Ford, not the local dealer.

After a brief discussion, a motion was made by Jim Migliorino and seconded by Jeff Kimball to accept the Pioneer bid, except for 15 passenger vans, which would be rejected. Jim Migliorino stated safety issues are so prevalent that AEPA should not endorse sale of 15 passenger vans for student transportation. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Mitchell indicated he could get additional considerations with a non-binding guarantee. A poll of those in attendance indicated a conservative commitment of 500 vehicles through the first of the year.

Mr. Mitchell then provided original binders to each agency except Arizona and Indiana, who retained the original submissions.

B. Roofing

Five (5) responses were received, three (3) were no-bids. Both GAF building materials and Weatherproofing Technologies (Tremco) were substantially in compliance and considered for price. On each item, GAF was the most expensive.

A motion was made by Jim Migliorino and seconded by Jeff Kimball to accept Tremco. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Llew Perry and seconded by Jim Migliorino to reject the GAF bid. The motion passed unanimously.

C. Carpet

Four (4) responses were received; none were no-bids. One vendor, Collins & Aikman, bid only nine (9) agencies/states. A "no bid" was entered for Washington. It was stated that AEPA, as stated in the IFB, seeks to provide material and services to all agencies. A motion was made by John Stanton and

ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL PURCHASING AGENCIES

seconded by Llew Perry to reject Collins & Aikman as non-responsive for not including all 10 states in the bid. The motion passed by a vote of eight (8) to one (1).

Jim Migliorino noted that the Mannington bid included a fixed price for carpet with a price range for labor. Also included under "Notes" was the statement, "All prices are for Budget Purposes only. Labor for each project will be individually priced." Jim requested a clarification from Mannington, in writing, that labor prices will remain in the stated range. A motion was then made by Jim Migliorino and seconded by John Stanton that, contingent upon receipt of the requested clarification, an award be made to Mannington for carpet. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Jeff Kimball and seconded by John Stanton to accept the bids of Interface and Shaw. The motion passed unanimously.

One comment during discussion was that in the case of carpet, there were not two bids on the same identical item, therefore, comparative costs were not derived. In future bid requests, it was suggested that specifications include items that generate comparative responses where feasible and in the best interest of the agencies.

D. Printers and Printer Supplies

Twelve (12) responses were received, none were no-bids. FKM Copiers provided only one (1) original response, not the requested two (2). FKM also failed to sign the form accepting state requirements. It was the decision of those in attendance to consider these technicalities.

The awards were made by manufacturer. Although, usually, no one vendor was low on every item for a specific manufacturer, the IFB specified award would be made by manufacturer.

A motion was made by John Stanton and seconded by Ken Potts to award the Cannon bid to MicroWarehouse. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by John Stanton and seconded by Jim Migliorino to award the Epson bid to MicroWarehouse. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by John Stanton and seconded by Ken Potts to award the GCC bid to GCC. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by David Wasson and seconded by John Stanton to award the Hewlett Packard bid to MicroWarehouse and Sehi. The motion passed unanimously.

ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL PURCHASING AGENCIES

A motion was made by Ken Potts and seconded by John Stanton to award the Lexmark bid to MicroWarehouse and Lexmark. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Mike Hijek and seconded by Llew Perry to reject all Xerox bids. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Jim Migliorino and seconded by Mike Hijek to award the IBM bid to Printer Systems Inc. The motion passed unanimously.

Letters to those not receiving an award will be sent by Max Luft within one week.

E. Playground Equipment

Six (6) responses were received for playground equipment, none were no-bids. One response, that from Park Structures of Coral Springs, Florida, did not have the required security. A motion was made by Larry Risk and seconded by Jim Migliorino to reject the bid as non-responsive. The motion passed unanimously.

A bid for Recreation Creations did not identify installation amounts or dealers. A motion was made by John Stanton and seconded by Larry Risk to accept the bid, if the vendor identifies required licensed installers in each state and verifies the quoted price is an installed price, with the bid otherwise rejected as non-responsive. The motion passed unanimously.

(Note: A followup phone call to Recreation Creations indicated the equipment was not bid installed, and licensed installers had not been identified in each agency. A rejection letter was sent to Recreation Creations.)

A motion was made by Llew Perry to accept the bids of Game Time, Landscape Structures, Little Tykes and Miracle Recreation. The motion was seconded by David Wasson and passed unanimously.

Following the actions there was discussion that the AEPA needs to develop bids so items are more competitive. It was noted that each playground bid contained differing structures, which could not be compared, and each vendor was therefore awarded.

4. Process for Implementation

In summary, it was stated that bidders now fall into three (3) groups. First are those who have received the award of this group. They will be notified in writing, and a copy of the letter sent to all agencies. The award letter will contain a list of contacts at each agency. Each agency must then make an individual award to each vendor. Agencies are requested to award the approved vendors if at all possible. This then places the burden of sales on the vendor.

ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL PURCHASING AGENCIES

To complete the award process each approved vendor will contact each agency and send them an original bid response. To approve the award the agency signs the cover page and returns a copy to the approved vendor, retaining the original. During the dialog between agency and vendor's approved local representative, a marketing plan should be discussed. The approved vendor, ideally, will then have 10 individual contracts.

The second group is those who are rejected, either as non-responsive or by high cost. They will be informed by Max Luft. He will also answer questions from this group or suggest they contact other agency staff.

The third group is those needing clarification. All clarification of bids must be received in writing. If satisfactory, award letters will be drafted. If not satisfactory, a rejection letter will be sent.

It is important to share concerns during the implementation process. If a concern arises, post it on the website by emailing it to Ken Potts. He will be the point for monitoring the website communications.

5. Ongoing Activities and Selection of Next Meeting Date and Location

There is a need to monitor the implementation and use. A tracking system will be developed and posted on the website. Updates will be prepared by Max Luft and will occur at the end of each month. Agencies using the bids are requested periodically to provide information regarding vendor usage to Max Luft, who will summarize the information. It is suggested that we share problems immediately by email, but use the website for normal listing of questions and concerns.

A schedule for the next bid was developed. Working backwards, the following dates were identified:

December 1, 2001	Award Contracts in conjunction with AESA, Atlanta
November 1, 2001	Bids Due
September 1, 2001	IFB 002 Published
April 19-20, 2001	Meeting to review existing awards, select new topics, and identify responsibilities for IFB 002

The site for the April 19-20 meeting was selected as Nashville, Tennessee. The session will begin at noon and end at noon. Max Luft will develop meeting specifics.

Before departing, all accepted the responsibility to (1) list additional items for the next bid and (2) identify and contact other ESA's which might participate. The larger the membership, the greater will be the discount.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.