

ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL PURCHASING AGENCIES

Vendors

MicroWarehouse	Brad VanGemert, Tara Barbieri
Tremco	Mardee Billingsley, Craig Nelson
School Specialty	Chuck Luchen
Southwest Recreational	Craig Helwig

The following Member Agencies were not represented:

Wyoming	David Swantek
---------	---------------

It was noted that representatives from all agencies had contributed to the successful publication and review of AEPA IFB #003. Special recognition was given to David Wasson from Arizona who reviewed the final draft, making significant enhancements in several areas. Mike Hajek from Minnesota was commended for the development of marketing materials, including the AEPA flyer and the shirts. Larry Risk and Pam Clover of Indiana were complimented for their work on summarizing the bids. Tammy Standley from Oregon, who was assisted by Steve Spade from Kansas, was recognized for work on answering questions relating to the bid. All received a standing ovation for their work regarding the bid.

Dan Dreyer was recognized for guessing closest to the number of bid responses that were received.

1.2 Agenda

The Tentative Agenda had been provided to all agency representatives three weeks prior to the meeting via email, and the meeting packet consisting of the following eight attachments, which had been sent by email one week prior to the meeting to all member agencies.

1. Agenda
2. Meeting Report #5, April 14, 15, and 16
3. Concerns Relating to Meeting Participation by Minnesota and Arizona
4. Summary of Vendor Requests for Bid #003
5. Summary of Questions Asked and Responses Provided Regarding Bid #003
6. Summary of Bids Received
7. Summary of Use of Bids #001 and #002
8. Financial Summary

Prior to the meeting, additional documentation of updated use of previous bids, lists of current vendors, and names and addresses of current members were distributed to all member agencies. Printed copies of the Agenda were also available. A motion was made by Arizona and seconded by South Dakota to approve the Agenda as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

1.3 Approval of Meeting Report #5

Although minutes are not taken, Meeting Report #5, which reflects activities of the April 14, 15, and 16 gathering in Las Vegas, was reviewed. A motion was made by Indiana and seconded by Ohio to accept the report as an accurate account of the meeting.

1.4 Concerns Relating to Meeting Participation

Two concerns had been expressed for consideration prior to the meeting. First was the statement by Minnesota concerning the need for member agency representatives to be employees of the member agency or employees of a common cooperative organization within the same state of the member agency, and limiting participants to not more than two representatives from a member agency. Mike Hajek of Minnesota indicated he just wanted the membership to be aware of his concerns and requested that the item be left on the table and discussed more fully at the spring meeting.

ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL PURCHASING AGENCIES

Jim Migliorino of Arizona stated that for AEPA to become a strong and viable organization, several criteria must be met, including: AEPA must benefit all members, AEPA contracts cannot jeopardize current member contracts, the agencies need to promote the contracts, realized savings must be in proportion to the agencies' involvement, AEPA should begin to plan for a coordinator position, and meeting dates should be set one year in advance. Discussion revealed general agreement with these concerns.

2. Award of AEPA IFB #3

It was stated that the bid development and the process for bid receipt would first be reviewed.

2.1 Summary of Requests

John Tillman of Colorado provided a summary of requests. He noted that each vendor listed in this summary had been notified of the bid.

2.2 Summary of Requests

Tammy Standley of Oregon presented a summary of the questions that had been asked by potential respondents. She stated that ten questions had been answered and published on the AEPA Web site.

2.3 Summary of Requests

Larry Risk of Indiana reviewed the AEPA bid record and the bid tabulation sheets. It was noted that Indiana identified the following bids in the initial screening as non-responsive.

Carpet

1. Beaulieu Commercial Carpet (received late)
2. J & J Industries (no bid)

Grounds Equipment

3. Borders Turf & Tractor (no bid)

Office and Classroom Supply Catalog

4. Hammond & Stephens (only bid Kentucky)
5. Lakeshore Learning Materials (no bid)
6. Office Innovations, Ind. (no bid bond)
7. Sargent Welch (unable to bid on requested services)
8. Spectrum Industries (no original signatures)
9. Teaching Stuff (no bid bond)

A motion was made by Indiana and seconded by New Mexico to accept these submissions as non-responsive. The motion passed unanimously.

2.4 Summary of Requests

An outline of the process for approving vendors that submitted responses to IFB #3 was reviewed. It was agreed upon that three steps would be followed. First was determining which vendor submissions were responsive and which were not responsive to the invitation. There was consensus that any response that did not include the proper bid bond or which was received after the published deadline would initially be considered non-responsive, and those submissions would not be sent to the review committees for consideration. Second was a discussion about the review of the bids submissions from the initial responsive vendors by the committees. During this screening, bids that did not provide the further required items would be classified as non-responsive. These items included required paper forms, printouts of required digital forms, printouts of all prices, required additional information, and the required forms in digital format. Third was the selection of the responsive vendors to be approved, after ranking in cost order. It was also agreed upon that each of the five bid areas would be reviewed in order as stated in the IFB document.

ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL PURCHASING AGENCIES

2.4.1 Commercial Floor Covering Each of the responsive bids was reviewed. Bids were rejected for a variety of reasons, including:

Blue Ridge – Prices were FOB Georgia and no installation pricing was provided.

Collins and Aikman – Bid bond was not signed and a faxed copy was presented.

Interface – Items excluded did not have prices, other prices were to be determined at installation.

Lees Carpet – Indicated all carpet will be reclaimed with cost to be determined, per diem not stated, and floor preparation costs were not provided.

Mannington – Prices were FOB Georgia and the exceptions in the cancellation language were not acceptable.

Shaw – Prices were net 30 days and no estimate of freight was provided. Further, wording was identical to another bidder.

The carpet committee comprised of Arizona, Texas, and Pennsylvania recommended rejection of all carpet bids. Indiana made a motion to accept the committee recommendation. Washington seconded the motion. A lengthy discussion followed. The vote was unanimous to accept the recommendation of the committee.

2.4.2 Grounds Equipment The bid committee for Grounds Equipment was comprised of Montana, Nebraska, and New Mexico. They reported that one responsive bid had been received from Moridge Manufacturing, Inc. The committee noted that the prices provided in the bid document indicated that these prices were no different than would be provided to any school or agency that requested a bid. It was the recommendation of the committee to reject that bid. A motion to accept the recommendation was made by Arizona and seconded by California. The motion passed unanimously.

2.4.3 Office and Classroom Supply Catalog The bid committee for Office and Classroom Supply Catalog was comprised of Arizona, California, and South Dakota. They indicated five responses had been provided to them for review. Four of the responses did not provide the required forms or did not meet the qualifications of the bid document.

Corporate Express did not provide the required electronic forms.

IKON did not provide the required electronic forms.

S & S Worldwide provided a bond of 1%, not the required \$10,000.

Van Dyk could not provide services in all 20 states.

The committee did recommend School Specialty for approval of an award. A motion was made by Minnesota and seconded by Montana for approval for award by individual agency members. The motion passed unanimously.

2.4.4 Industrial Supply Catalog The bid committee composed of Missouri, Texas, and Washington indicated no bids were received in this category.

2.4.5 Paint The bid committee composed of Kentucky, North Dakota, and Ohio stated one bid was received in this category from Duron, Inc. The committee stated that there was no financial advantage to accept the bid, and distribution centers were not listed as required. A motion was made by New Mexico and seconded by Colorado to accept the committee recommendation to reject the bid. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Extension of AEPA IFB #1 Contracts

Five bid categories were approved for award in December of 2000. The contracts were approved for a one-year period, with the opportunity for four additional one-year extensions. In December of 2001, all of the vendors were approved for a second year.

ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL PURCHASING AGENCIES

3.1 Summary of Use as Reported by Vendor and Agency

South Dakota reported the use of vendors by agencies. It was noted that only ten agencies participated in the initial bid. Of the 13 vendors, three had contracts with only one state. 45% of the vendors had contracts with 50% or more of the states. Contract volume for the first nine months of 2002 ranged from a low of \$2,000 to a high of \$17,300,000. In conclusion, South Dakota stated it is difficult to report averages because MicroWarehouse data for bid one and bid two were combined.

3.2 Extension by Vendor Category

It was determined that each vendor would be reviewed individually by bid area to decide if the members would approve an extension. Committees comprised of two or three agencies had been formed for each area to gather data on the vendor. The committees made reports for each bid area.

3.2.1 Auto Arizona and Nebraska formed the auto committee and recommended extension. A motion was made by South Dakota and seconded by Washington to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to Pioneer Ford to all members. The motion passed unanimously.

3.2.2 Roofing Kentucky and New Mexico formed the roofing committee and recommended extension. A motion was made by Arizona and seconded by Nebraska to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to Weatherproofing Technologies Incorporated/WTI Tremco to all members. The motion passed unanimously.

3.2.3 Carpet The carpet extension of bid committee was comprised of Arizona, Pennsylvania, and Texas. They indicated that noting contract use by various states and reviewing the specific requests for extension provided by the vendors furnished the documentation for their respective recommendations.

3.2.3.1 Interface The committee recommended approval of a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by Montana and seconded by Nebraska to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to Interface for AEPA members. The motion passed unanimously.

3.2.3.2 Mannington The committee recommended approval of a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by Colorado and seconded by Minnesota to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to Mannington for AEPA members. The motion passed by a vote of 17 for and two against (NM and IN).

3.2.3.3 Shaw The committee recommended approval of a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by Minnesota and seconded by Nebraska to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to Shaw for AEPA members. The motion passed unanimously.

3.2.4 Playground Equipment The Playground Equipment extension of bid committee was comprised of Kansas and Wyoming. They indicated that noting contract use by various states and reviewing the specific requests for extension provided by the vendors furnished the documentation for their respective recommendations.

3.2.4.1 Game Time The committee recommended approval of a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by Montana to accept the committee recommendation and approve an extension to Game Time to all members. There was no second to the motion, the motion failed, and the vendor did not receive approval for extension of their contract.

ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL PURCHASING AGENCIES

3.2.4.2 Landscape Structures The committee recommended approval of a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by New Mexico and seconded by Arizona to accept the committee recommendation and approve an extension to Landscape Structures to all members. The motion passed unanimously.

3.2.4.3 Little Tykes The committee recommended not to approve a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by New Mexico and seconded by Montana to accept the committee recommendation not to approve an extension to Little Tykes. The motion passed unanimously.

3.2.4.4 Miracle Recreation The committee recommended approval of a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by Kentucky and seconded by Minnesota to accept the committee recommendation and approve an extension to Miracle Recreation to all members. The motion passed with 13 approving the motion, five against the motion (IA, KS, KY, MT, OH), and one abstention (NM).

3.2.5 Printers and Toner Cartridges The Printers and Toner Cartridges extension of bid committee was comprised of California and Montana. They indicated that noting contract use by various states and reviewing the specific requests for extension provided by the vendors furnished the documentation for their respective recommendations.

3.2.5.1 GCC The committee recommended not to approve a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by New Mexico and seconded by Ohio to accept the committee recommendation and not approve a contract extension to GCC. The motion passed unanimously.

3.2.5.2 Lexmark The committee recommended to approve a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by Arizona and seconded by South Dakota to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to Lexmark to all members. The motion passed by a vote of 18 for approval and one against approval (MO).

3.2.5.3 MicroWarehouse The committee recommended to approve a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by South Dakota and seconded by Nebraska to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to MicroWarehouse to all members. The motion passed unanimously.

3.2.5.4 Sehi The committee recommended to approve a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by Washington and seconded by North Dakota to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to Sehi to all members. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Extension of AEPA IFB #2 Contracts

Three bid categories were approved for award in December of 2001. The contracts awarded were approved for a one-year period, with the opportunity for four additional one-year extensions. Approval of extensions were made by bid area.

4.1 Summary of Use

South Dakota reported the use of vendors by agencies. It was noted that 18 agencies participated in this second bid. Of the 11 vendors, two had contracts with no agencies. Four additional vendors had contracts with only one state. Contract volume for the first nine months of 2002 ranged from a low of \$0 to a high of \$9,800,000. In conclusion, South Dakota stated it is difficult to report averages because MicroWarehouse data for bid one and bid two were combined.

ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL PURCHASING AGENCIES

4.2 Extension by Category

It was determined that each vendor would be reviewed individually by bid area to decide if the members would approve an extension. Committees comprised of two agencies had been formed for each area to gather data on the vendor. The committees made reports for each bid area.

4.2.1 Furniture The Furniture extension of bid committee was comprised of Missouri and Washington. They indicated that noting contract use by various states and reviewing the specific requests for extension provided by the vendors furnished the documentation for their respective recommendations.

4.2.1.1 Allsteel The committee recommended to approve a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by Washington and seconded by North Dakota to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to Allsteel to all members. The motion passed with 17 voting for the motion and two voting against the motion (IN, AZ).

4.2.1.2 Buckstaff The committee recommended to approve a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by Kansas and seconded by Minnesota to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to Buckstaff to all members. The motion passed with 16 voting for the motion and three voting against the motion (IN, AZ, SD).

4.2.1.3 Childcraft The committee recommended to approve a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by Oregon and seconded by Pennsylvania to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to Childcraft to all members. The motion passed with ten voting for the motion and seven (AZ, CO, IN, IA, KS, NE, SD) voting against the motion (two states, CA and NM, did not vote).

4.2.1.4 Interior Systems The committee recommended to not approve a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by Washington and seconded by Arizona to accept the committee recommendation and not approve a contract extension to Interior Systems. The motion passed with 18 voting for the motion and one (NM) voting against the motion.

4.2.1.5 Scholar Craft The committee recommended not to approve a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by Ohio and seconded by New Mexico to accept the committee recommendation and not approve a contract extension to Scholar Craft. The motion passed unanimously.

4.2.1.6 Spectrum The committee recommended to approve a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by Minnesota and seconded by Kentucky to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to Spectrum to all members. The motion passed unanimously.

4.2.1.7 Tesco The committee recommended to approve a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by New Mexico and seconded by Nebraska not to approve a contract extension to Tesco. The motion failed with four voting for the motion and 15 voting against the motion. A motion was made by Arizona and seconded by Indiana to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to Tesco to all members. The motion was approved by a vote of 16 for and three (MO, SD, WA) against the motion.

4.2.1.8 Virco The committee recommended to approve a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor and to include the ability to assign the support of the contract to their wholly-owned subsidiary in Ohio, Furniture Focus. A motion was made by Arizona and seconded by New Mexico to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to Virco to all members. The motion passed unanimously.

ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL PURCHASING AGENCIES

4.2.2 Technology Catalog The Technology Catalog extension of bid committee was comprised of Ohio and Pennsylvania. They indicated that noting use by various states and reviewing the specific requests for extension provided by the vendors furnished the documentation for their respective recommendations.

4.2.2.1 MicroWarehouse The committee recommended to approve a one-year AEPA extension for this vendor. A motion was made by Arizona and seconded by New Mexico to accept the committee recommendation and approve a contract extension to MicroWarehouse to all members. The motion passed unanimously.

4.2.3 Modular and Portables

The Modular and Portables extension of bid committee was comprised of Oregon and Washington. They indicated that noting use by various states and reviewing the specific requests for extension provided by the vendors furnished the documentation for their respective recommendations.

4.2.3.1 Modular Solutions The committee recommended to approve a one-year AEPA extension for Modular Solutions.

4.2.3.2 Williams Scotsman The committee recommended to approve a one-year AEPA extension for Williams Scotsman.

A motion was made by Ohio and seconded by Kentucky to accept the committee recommendation and approve contract extensions to Modular Solutions and Williams Scotsman to all members. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Concerns of Membership

Membership concerns are normally addressed in detail during the spring AEPA meeting. Brief committee reports were presented and a financial summary was presented.

5.1 Committee Reports

Brief reports were presented by previously formed committees.

5.1.1 Web Site Report Larry Risk and Pam Clover of Indiana presented a report of use of the AEPA Web site, www.aepacoop.org. A report summarizing the Web site use was presented. It indicated most hits occurred on October 28, 90% of the hits occurred during weekdays, the average number of hits per day was 668.55, and the total number of hits from January 2, 2002, through December 3, 2002, was 224,425. The members expressed their appreciation for Indiana maintaining the AEPA Web site.

5.1.2 Partnerships During the meeting last April, about half the members volunteered to be on the Partnerships Committee. Ron Ricketts from Washington chaired the committee. Ron sent a questionnaire to members by email. The results were summarized and distributed. Twelve of the states responded. Ricketts summarized the responses by saying there was not a strong interest in forming a partnership between AEPA and other organizations. Most of the respondents were members of AESA. Other prevalent affiliations were with NSBA (4), ASBO (3), and AASA (6).

5.1.3 Marketing Mike Hajek from Minnesota had volunteered to chair a Marketing committee. Mike indicated he had prepared AEPA slicks and made those available to all members. Shirts with the AEPA logo were ordered and distributed to members and vendors. Hajek indicated he would prepare a marketing plan for AEPA, including a possible ASBO booth in Charlotte next October. The members expressed their thanks to Mike for his marketing efforts.

ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL PURCHASING AGENCIES

5.1.4 New Members The New Members committee was established to help the “new members” learn more of AEPA, and to assist them with the AEPA activities. Max Luft from New Mexico indicated possible new members include Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Utah and Wisconsin.

5.1.5 Policy Review John Jankowski from North Dakota was identified as the Policy Chair at the last meeting. He indicated that a procedures manual would be distributed for review prior to the next meeting.

5.1.6 Paid Staff Concerns and Succession of Leadership There was a general concern to review the options of providing a paid staff member. Three states, including AZ, NE, and WA, volunteered to prepare a report for the next meeting, and this group formed the staffing committee.

5.2 Financial Concerns

A listing of transactions was provided illustrating all transactions through December 1, 2002. Cooperative Educational Services of Albuquerque, New Mexico, is serving as fiscal agent. Records indicate a balance of \$2,985.45.

6. Selection of Date and Site for Next Meeting

6.1 Meeting Location

Ron Ricketts from Washington suggested several sites for the next meeting. These included Phoenix, in conjunction with a school equipment meeting; Conway, Arkansas, with Virco offering to host the session; Las Vegas, where meetings have been previously successful; and Seattle, where participants could visit the Washington member, KCDA. By mutual agreement, the next meeting of AEPA will be held in Seattle, Washington.

6.2 Meeting Time and Date

A tentative schedule is that the meeting will begin on Sunday afternoon, March 23, and end at lunch on Tuesday, March 25. It was noted that this will provide lower-cost airfare rates providing a possible Saturday night stay.

6.3 Agenda and Format

The purpose of the meeting is to increase vendor awareness, develop topics for the next bid, timelines and assignments for AEPA Bid #4, address issues of membership, review and develop policy and bylaws, and deal with other matters that come before the Association. Format of the meeting will include vendor roundtables. Agencies from New Mexico and Washington will coordinate the meeting.

6.4 Adjournment

With no other business to come before the Association, the sixth general meeting of the Association of Educational Purchasing Agencies was adjourned at 5:40 p.m. with an expression of thanks to Brian Talbott and AESA for providing space and refreshments for the AEPA meeting.