

<u>User Department's Recommendation</u> : ITB#18-101058-Tandem Axle Front Loader Refuse Collection Truck w/37 Cu.Yd. Compaction System				
Recommended Bidder: _Peterbilt of Atlanta, LLC (Bid# 1A) meets our approval.				
Amount Spent on Previous Contract:N/A				
Funding: General Enterprise 3 Digit Fund Code621 CIP Line Item No. (if applicable):				
Disbarment and Suspension checks completed-Yes				
Project Amount This Term: _\$6,262,020.00 Justification:				
We are asking to increase the original requested quantity from 13 units to 18 units. This ITB was put out to bid prior to the approval DeKalb County's 2019 Budget, and the 5 units were not a part of				
this bid because they were a part of the 2019 budget that had not yet been approved by the BOC. We would like to adjust the number to include the 5 units that were approved as a part of the 2019 Budget.				
Peterbilt of Atlanta (Bid # 1A) is recommended as the responsive, and responsible bidder, as it meets the specifications that provide the most beneficial impact related to the operation, productivity, and longevity.				
The exceptions detailed in this justification limit the operational functionality, capabilities, and durability of the unit. Not all exceptions are detailed, only those which are most impactful to the operation, productivity, and longevity.				
The low bid by Cherokee Truck (Bid# 2) is not acceptable as is does not meet our specifications for the following reasons.				
B.2. While the bidder complied with the hopper requirement of 12 cubic yards net hopper volume, when researched online the published capacity was only 10 cubic yards.				
C.3.e Body floor minimum should have been ¼" AR200 - 90,000PSI steel the bidder stated the body floor met our specification, but the bidder's floor is listed as 7 ga. 100,000 PSI which is 1/16" thinner than what our specification requires. The floor is not as durable as the floor we requested.				
C.3.f. Body sides to be 1/8" 150,000 PSI was the specification requirements, the bidder stated the				



body sides met our specification, but the bidder's published specification advises their truck provides 10 ga. 100,000 PSI which is not as strong as what we requested.

- C.10. Our specification stated hopper opening must be 103"x 83" wide minimum, the bidder stated their hopper opening met specification, but the published for this truck stated the hopper opening would be 80 ½" x 101", which is smaller than our required hopper opening. The opening is smaller than the cans currently in usage in Sanitation. The size of this opening could possibly prevent all the trash from the cans from being properly dumped into the truck, and thereby leaving unwanted trash and debris on the ground or on the truck to blow away and litter neighborhoods and roadways once the truck is moving, as well as complaints from Sanitation customers and DeKalb County constituents
- F.2. Our specification required tailgate shall be constructed of minimum 1/8" AR450 180,000 PSI steel. The bidder stated the tailgate construction met our specification, but their published specification states the tailgate for the truck that was bid is 10 ga 100, 000 PSI which is a weaker metal than we requested.
- F.3. Our specification required that hinges on body shall be constructed of ¼" 80,000 PSI yield (80K) steel. The bidder stated their hinges on the body met specification, but the published for this truck stated they were ½" 100,000 PSI which is weaker steel. The hinges we requested were stronger than they can provide for this truck.
- G.2. Our specification required that an M2 tooled Steel scraper must be provided. Although the bidder states they met this specification on the bid document, during the demo for the truck the bidder stated the scraper in the truck they bid is not a tooled steel scraper, but rather a stainless steel scraper. Our required steel (tooled) is stronger than stainless steel. This is critical because it is necessary for the tooled steel scraper to cut steel burrs off the ejector cylinders to prevent from failing and leaking. The replacement cost for this part would be approximately \$1,500 \$2,000. We have not had to replace any ejector cylinders since we started using the M2 tooled steel scrapers that our trucks are currently equipped.
- G.2. Our specification required wear shoes shall be replaceable without removing the packer panel. Although the bidder states they met this specification on the bid document, during the demo for the truck the bidder stated the wear shoes were not bolt on shoes that could be replaced without removing the packer panel, but rather shoes that were welded on and the packer panel would have to be removed in order to be cut off the wear shoes if replacement was needed.
- H.5. Our specification requested that bearing caps attached with (4) ¼ inch Grade 8 bolts per cap, be horizontal in position. It was noted during our demo inspection of the bidded truck that the bolts were in a vertical position, not horizontal. This is critical because when the arms are lifting it puts pressure in a downward motion on the pillow blocks which will caused undue wear and tear on the pillow blocks, and thereby the eventual failure of them. 0The cost to repair this failure is approximately \$3,000 \$4,000.
- I.15.d. Our specification required that an M2 tooled Steel scraper must be provided. Although the



bidder states they met this specification on the bid document, during the demo for the truck the bidder stated the scraper in the truck they bid is not a tooled steel scraper, but rather a stainless steel scraper. Our required steel (tooled) is stronger than stainless steel. This is critical because it is necessary for the tooled steel scraper to cut steel burrs off the ejector cylinders to prevent from failing and leaking. The replacement cost for this part would be approximately \$1,500 - \$2,000. We have not had to replace any ejector cylinders since we started using the M2 tooled steel scrapers that our trucks are currently equipped with.

- J.1. Our specification states a minimum compaction poundage (800 lbs.) to be met, and asked the bidder to state the minimum compaction poundage this truck was capable of providing. The bidder only stated yes, they did not advise the minimum compaction poundage for their truck.
- J.2. Our specification states a maximum compaction poundage (1000 lbs.) to be met, and asked the bidder to state the maximum compaction poundage this truck was capable of providing. The bidder only stated yes, they did not advise the maximum compaction poundage for their truck.

In addition to the items we noted above, we have concerns about Cherokee Trucks ability to provide reliable and timely service and maintenance for these vehicles. We submitted a vendor complaint against another vendor (Kenworth MHC) who had contracted Cherokee Trucks to complete wet kit installations and battery cable modifications for a group of road tractors we purchased. We had several recurring issues with the quality of the contracted work performed by the Cherokee Truck service department. The issues we had cause a significant about downtime for critical Sanitation trucks.

Finally, the bidder provided us with two (2) customer references. We reached out to both, and both customers advised they had purchased EZ Pack trucks through Cherokee Truck, but neither utilized Cherokee Truck for service.

The bid by Peterbilt Truck (Bid# 1C) is not acceptable as is does not meet our specifications for the following reasons:

The bidder states "comply by design" on multiple specification items throughout the bid. This does not equate to complying with the requested specification item, but rather the opposite — this statement is an exception to each item. For each instance where they have stated "comply by design" the bidder is stating that what they offer to fill that specification requirement is going to be different from our requested specification item. It is the opinion of the bidder that what they are offering will be equivalent to our request. That is not acceptable because they are not clear on what they are offering as a substitute for what we required, therefore we don't know what we would be paying for or receiving. Below is a list of all the item numbers where the bidder stated they would "comply by design." Every other vendor who bid on this truck provided details when they took exception to any particular item. They provided information on their substitute for our requested item. This vendor's usage of "comply by design" is a means to make us think they can provide the truck we are requesting, only to reveal after they receive a purchase order that they are not capable of building a truck the way we require it to be built. The bidder took exception to 48 of our specification items and essentially stated, through the usage of "comply by design," they would



build us a truck with mystery measurements and undisclosed parts from undisclosed manufacturers. This is not acceptable.

Instances of "Comply by Design"					
1	II.C.3		25	II.I.10	
2	II.C.3.a		26	II.I.11	
3	II.C.3.b		27	II.I.12	
4	II.C.3.c		28	II.I.13	
5	II.C.3.d		29	II.I.14	
6	II.C.3.e		30	II.I.15.d	
7	II.C.6		31	II.J.1	
8	II.C.7		32	II.J.2	
9	II.C.8		33	II.J.8	
10	II.C.9		34	II.J.9	
11	II.C.10		35	II.J.10	
12	II.C.11		36	II.J.11	
13	II.D.1		37	II.J.13	
14	II.D.2		38	II.J.15	
15	II.E.1		39	II.N.2.d	
16	II.F.1		40	II.N.2.g	
17	II.F.2		41	II.Q.3	
18	II.F.3		42	III.B.1	
19	II.G.1		43	III.D.1	
20	II.G.2		44	III.D.2	
21	II.H.5		45	III.D.3	
22	II.I.5		46	III.D.4	
23	II.I.6		47	III.D.5	
24	II.I.8	[48	III.D.6	

The bid by Peterbilt Truck (Bid# 1B) is not acceptable as is does not meet our specifications for the following reasons:

- H.1. Our specification states the arms of the front loading refuse body must be capable of lifting 10,000 pounds, gross load, but the bidder took an exception to the requirement and advised the truck being bid was only capable of lifting 8,000 lbs. A 2,000 lb difference is a great difference and it not acceptable. Sanitation has to have all trucks capable of lifting the same load capacity.
- H.3. Our specification requires the lifting arms shall be one-piece box type welded steel construction and bolted to the torque tube flange using a minimum of three (3) grade 8 bolts per arm, but the bidder took exception advising they were only able to provide two (2) 7/8" grade 8 bolts and lock



nuts. This is not a heavy duty, durable option for the application in which this truck will be used.

- I.1. Our specification requires a fixed displacement gear pump with hydraulic overspeed control. The bidder took an exception to this requirement and offered a Denison Single Vane pump. This is a pump that is not standard to our fleet. A fixed displacement gear pump is a standard gear pump and it is throughout our fleet. The fixed displacement gear pump is easy to rebuild, whereas the Denison Single Vane pump is very difficult to rebuild and typically it is easier to buy a new one which would be an additional expense that we are not accustomed to incurring. While the fixed displacement gear pump is easy to rebuild, it has presented no need to rebuild it because we have not had one to fail so we have not had a need to either rebuild, or replace any of the fixed displacement gear pumps we use.
- I.15d. The bidder offered a cylinder that does not meet our specification. The Infinity Series Cylinder that is offered uses a floating wear strip as its method to keep the cylinder clean. This floating wear strip is inadequate for keeping the cylinders clean, as it will allow food, trash, debris to contaminate the hydraulic system. Resulting in a failure of valves and/or pump. Cost to repair this part would be approximately \$1,500 \$2,000.

Robert Hordon 8-13-10

Department Director Date

6