

Special Meeting – Truck Development October 28, 2013

Vice Chairman Gregory Scarlato called the meeting to order at 19:00 hours, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. Vice Chairman Scarlato then read the Opening Statement, noting this meeting was advertised on Sunday, October 13, 2013 in the Asbury Park Press and posted on two (2) municipal Bulletin Boards and in the firehouse, as required by the Open Public Meetings Act, commonly referred to as “The Sunshine Law.”

Roll call was taken with Commissioners Eadicicco, Equils, Kelly, Scarlato, and Stalling being present. Chairman Equils was enroute to the firehouse. Also present was 1st Asst. Chief Jim Bailey and Asst Engineer John Thompson. It was noted that there were zero (0) other firefighters and zero (0) members of the public present.

Vice Chairman Scarlato suggested holding the agenda for the arrival of Chairman Equils, to which all agreed; and the chairman arrived at 17:08 hours.

Clerk Kelly distributed copies of the minutes for the October 4 and October 10 meetings; accompanied by the list of equipment on Engine 478 and the list of possible new equipment for the new apparatus.

Chairman Equils noted as per the public advertisement, the sole purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the lists of exceptions from the two (2) manufacturers (Pierce and KME); and to determine if any of the exceptions could qualify as a “deal breaker” and render either vendor’s proposal as unsatisfactory.

It was informally agreed to have the Clerk notify the district’s counsel and its auditor, to please be present for the next two (2) Special Meetings (Nov 14 and 21) for advise and counsel on completing the purchasing process.

The Clerk was also directed to speak to the district’s counsel, and to get some movement on the Joint Board issues, that have lain dormant for several months. Board members want the issue ready for some type of action and hopefully a conclusion, at the December Joint Meeting.

The issue of the recently purchased air compressor was brought up, with some members feeling it was too large to fit on Engine 475. Chairman Equils will speak to Chief Nichols about not placing the compressor into service at this time.

The board then started the comparison of vendor exceptions and drew the conclusion that all of the exceptions noted by KME Fire Apparatus were acceptable.

The board discussed the exceptions noted by Pierce and concluded the following:

Page 12: Engine Access Door to Check Engine Oil Level – Will cause loss of storage shelf on engine cowl. This item was discussed at two (2) separate times during this meeting. It was finally determined that the loss of the shelf **Was Not Acceptable**.

Page 17-2: Interior Storage Compartments – Dimensional changes. **Acceptable**.

Page 24: Winch Receiver – Deletion of this item was **Acceptable**.

Page 65: Issue with Officer Side Discharge – This item was also discussed at two (2) separate times during this meeting. Several reservations and dislikes of the concept to box in or grate cover the discharge piping. Concerns were expressed about hose stacking, hose falling over, snagging, etc. Also concerns with loss of space in hose bed caused by the “boxing” and less maneuverability of the hose bed dividers. It was finally determined the change **Was Not Acceptable**.

Page 68: Single Stacking of Crosslays – Members felt this would lead to problems packing hose including height of stacks, nozzles jamming due to nozzle width vs. compartment width, etc. It was determined this configuration **Was Not Acceptable**.

Page 80: Change in Compartment Dimensions – It was felt that the loss of depth was Offset by a gain in width. Members not sure if present equipment would fit. Went and measured compartments on existing Units 475 & 490; finding them to be nearly equal to the proposed measurements. This item was **Acceptable**.

Page 81: “PUC” Style Compartment Door – The configuration of this door is to be determined at pre-construction meeting. This was **Acceptable**.

Page 90: This item was left unresolved tonight; and was held for determination/decision at final meeting prior to start of construction. **Acceptable**.

At the conclusion of the review, board members expressed their opinions as to what problems they have with each proposal, and which proposal best serves the interest of the district.

Vice Chairman Scarlato felt that there were some items in their exceptions that were not able to be overcome, including the multi-thousand dollar difference in price. He felt that the KME proposal more fully complied with the board’s specification.

Treasurer Stalling noted he had reservations with the Pierce proposal regarding the height of the side compartments; and problems with at least 3 other items which were major issues for him; in addition to the loss of the pike pole storage under the jump seats.

Purchaser Eadicicco stated he had 3 major problems with the Pierce proposal, all of which were “deal breakers” for him. He also felt he would have problems justifying the increase cost of the Pierce apparatus.

Clerk Kelly felt that based on his personal knowledge and personal experience, that if necessary, he could reasonable justify the increased cost of the Pierce apparatus. However, as he had no personal knowledge or experience with KME; and he always practicing fiscal conservatism, he was less comfortable in having to justify the increased cost.

He also stated that he felt the board made a mistake in not involving Pierce in the whole process sooner, suggesting that perhaps the outcome might have been different. He too noted he had problems with 3 major items (#12, #65, and #68) which would make not choosing KME more difficult for him to justify.

Chairman Equils stated that while his observation was that there was not a whole huge difference between the proposals; the difference in cost of over of \$44,000.00 between the two manufacturers was a significant issue for him.

This concluded discussions and a motion to proceed with the purchase of the apparatus from KME Kovatch, of Nesquehoning, Pa; through their dealer, 1st Priority Emergency Vehicles of Manchester, NJ; in consultation with the district’s auditor and counsel; was made by Commissioner Scarlato and seconded by Commissioner Eadicicco. The motion was passed on a Roll Call Vote with Messrs. Eadicicco, Equils, Kelly, Scarlato, and Stalling all voting in the affirmative. There were no “NAY” votes cast, and there were no commissioners absent from the vote.

Clerk Kelly was directed to contact Counsel Jay C. Sendzik, and Auditor Barry J. Osborn, and request their presence at the Special Meeting advertised for Thursday November 14, and to please be available for the Special Meeting advertised for Thursday, November 21.

NEXT MEETING: Next meeting will be Thursday, November 14, 2013, at 19:00 hours, As publicly advertised in the Asbury Park Press.

PUBLIC COMMENT There were three (3) firefighters present. There were zero (0) members of the public present. 1st Asst Chief Jim Bailey commented he was pleased with the board's decision. No other comments were offered.

ADJOURNMENT This concluded the business for the board, so a motion to adjourn was made by Commissioners Kelly and Eadicicco, and passed unanimously by the board.

The meeting closed at 20:59 hours.
Respectfully Submitted,

Robert J. Kelly
Clerk of the Board

RJK/rjk

10/28/2013