

**Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors of the  
Sunshine Fire Protection District**

**July 14, 2020**

Call to Order

The meeting was held at Fire Station #1.

The meeting was called to order at 7:34 PM and quorum was established.

Attendance

Board Members Present: Alan Kirton, Jean Gatzka, Dick Smith, Cathy Shoenfeld, Dan Fischer

Board Members Absent:

Others Present: Chief Michael Schmitt, Deputy Chief Henry Ballard

Approval of Minutes

- Minutes from the June Board meeting were reviewed.

MOTION: To approve June Board Meeting Minutes was seconded and carried unanimously.

Treasurer's Report

- Treasurer's report was reviewed. D. Fischer provided an overview of the financial reports and budget key items.
- Key transactions were for annual chipping, tires for 4501.
- Received tax revenue from Boulder County.
- Board recommended raising the daily limit for Chief and Deputy Chief credit cards to avoid difficulties in the future.
- **For follow-up:** workman's comp system for firefighters; research for another interest CD; unallocated funds on Balance Sheet.

MOTION: To approve Treasurer's Report. Motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Fire Chief's Report

- Update on RFP for new truck.
- Switching suppliers for foam to procure a more environmentally friendly product. Will need to change out product from the trucks, determining how to dispose. C. Shoenfeld will supply bottles to the chief.

Other Business

1. Review work done and suggestions regarding 2020 Community FEST. Discussed approach – we could use more information about what the donations fund. Describe new equipment to outfit the new truck. Consider holding it on Mistyvale instead of CR83.

2. Officially appoint a DEO for the November election.

MOTION: to appoint Daniel Fischer as DEO Designated Election Official. Motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

3. Review meeting with lawyer and ballot language.

A Kirton and D Fischer had a call with attorney Michelle Ferguson. Questions included:

Confirm that election would only address the district's general fund "by general levies" and not wildfire protection funds.

Ensure if the legislature approves a de-Gallagher repeal, we would be aligned with that new approach or still ok if that doesn't happen. Some concern was expressed about proposed language but confirmed that this language has been used by other districts to achieve this goal.

Other potential outcomes of the legislature. Language indicates we are authorized but not required.

Question if Sunshine has de-Bruiced revenues. A. Kirton will research if 4.48 mills from very early. If the voters haven't already repealed TABOR for the district we might consider doing so in this election.

Information for board members and community should be prepared before the ballot language is finalized and filed per rules.

Update included: A. Kirton notified Boulder County that the district will participate in this election. D. Fischer completed analysis of potential loss of tax revenues based on County Data demonstrating the need for de-Gallagher initiative.

4. Review proposals and supplier selection for the 4502 replacement.

- Board discussed evaluation of RFPs of Rosenbauer and Pierce engines. One proposal was dropped immediately due to significant difference from required specs.
- Rosenbauer scored significantly better in several aspects.
- Discussed next steps for moving ahead with the purchase. Discussion included:
  - What community engagement should be done
  - Affordability based on current unknowns on the effect of Gallagher (analysis shows we can afford the new engine regardless of the success of the de-Gallagher initiative.
  - Optics of an engine purchase with the upcoming de-Gallagher ballot initiative

Documents – Proposal Evaluation Process and Scoring.docx,  
Sunshine FPD Capital Replacement 20200709.docx

MOTION: to move forward with the purchase of the Rosenbauer Urban Interface Engine per Proposal dated June 8, 2020. Motion seconded and carried unanimously.

5. Work on the project to install a fire cistern at 1462 CR 83 is continuing:
  - Survey has been completed
  - Still waiting on title determination
  - Still working to get easement signed
  - Working with tank supplier and BOCO transportation to determine if they will be able to deliver tank to cistern location. Tank is 10' diameter by 35' long and gets delivered by tractor trailer.
  - Application submittal date for the Limited Impact Special Use Review is August 13<sup>th</sup>
  
6. Contractor selection has been made for the shaded fuel break along the shared driveway at 3701 SCD. Contract has been signed and the contractor will begin work based on availability

Adjourned at 9:30 PM

**Attest:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jean Gatz, Board Secretary



Sunshine Fire Protection District  
311 County Rd 83  
Boulder, CO 80302  
[www.sunshine-fpd.org](http://www.sunshine-fpd.org)

---

### Chief Report, Board Meeting 07/14/2020

#### 1. New Truck Update.

## Calls

| <u>Incident</u>                   | <u>Units</u>  | <u>Problem</u>                 | <u>Response Date</u> |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| <a href="#">BCFD200611-006188</a> |   | FIINFR-Fire Information        | 6/11/2020 10:25      |
| <a href="#">BCFD200612-006216</a> | 4561,<br>4566,<br>4662,<br>A29,<br>AMRB,<br>BR1,<br>FM2,<br>SS3 | EMSR-Medical Call              | 6/12/2020 4:55       |
| <a href="#">BCFD200612-006247</a> |   | FICAMR-Illeg/Unattend Campfire | 6/12/2020 21:18      |
| <a href="#">BCFD200613-006279</a> |   | FICONR-Controlled Burn         | 6/13/2020 17:55      |
| <a href="#">BCFD200614-006311</a> | 4566,<br>4661, A1,<br>AMRD,<br>FM2,<br>SS2                      | EMSR-Medical Call              | 6/14/2020 10:43      |
| <a href="#">BCFD200620-006528</a> |   | FICONR-Controlled Burn         | 6/20/2020 19:02      |

|  |   |                                       |                 |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <a href="#"><u>BCFD200620-006536</u></a> |   | FICONR-<br>Controlled<br>Burn         | 6/20/2020 20:06 |
| <a href="#"><u>BCFD200620-006544</u></a> |   | FICAMR-<br>Illeg/Unattend<br>Campfire | 6/20/2020 21:18 |
| <a href="#"><u>BCFD200620-006546</u></a> |   | FICAMR-<br>Illeg/Unattend<br>Campfire | 6/20/2020 22:05 |
| <a href="#"><u>BCFD200621-006569</u></a> | 3121,<br>3161,<br>4161,<br>4561,<br>4566,<br>4603,<br>4652,<br>4661,<br>4665, A7,<br>AMRD,<br>BES3,<br>FM3,<br>GH1,<br>SL1, SS1   | FISTR-<br>Structure Fire              | 6/21/2020 16:54 |
| <a href="#"><u>BCFD200621-006570</u></a> |   | FISTR-<br>Structure Fire              | 6/21/2020 16:59 |
| <a href="#"><u>BCFD200623-006621</u></a> | 4654  | FIODOR-<br>Odor Inv<br>Outside        | 6/23/2020 9:34  |
| <a href="#"><u>BCFD200623-006622</u></a> | 1950,<br>3151,<br>3155,<br>3161,<br>3162,<br>BES3,<br>FRRD2,<br>RMR1,<br>RMR2<br>2301,<br>4561,<br>4566,<br>4632,<br>5463, A8,<br>AMRD,<br>BES3,<br>FM2,<br>GH3,<br>SS3<br>3124,<br>4632,<br>4661,<br>5402, | RELOSR-<br>Rescue Lost<br>Party       | 6/23/2020 9:44  |
| <a href="#"><u>BCFD200626-006718</u></a> | A23,<br>AMRC,<br>BES3,<br>ESU2,<br>GH3  | INACCR-<br>Injury or<br>Rollover      | 6/26/2020 11:38 |
| <a href="#"><u>BCFD200630-006907</u></a> |   | REWATR-<br>Water<br>Rescue            | 6/30/2020 16:13 |

[BCFD200711-007434](#)

FICAMR-  
Illeg/Unattend  
Campfire 7/11/2020 19:55

[BCFD200712-007455](#)

GH1

FIASSR-Fire  
Assist 7/12/2020 12:18

## **Board Meeting July 13<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

In person meeting at Station 1

### **Agenda**

#### **Review/Approve Minutes from June Meeting**

#### **Review/Approve Treasurer's Report**

#### **Review Chief's Report**

#### **Other Business**

1. Review work done and suggestions regarding 2020 Community FEST.
2. Officially appoint a DEO for the November election.
3. Review meeting with lawyer and ballot language.  
Document – Ballot Language and Call with Michelle Ferguson
4. The Notification of Intent to participate in the election has been filed with Boulder County Elections
5. Review proposals and supplier selection for the 4502 replacement.
  - Discuss next steps for moving ahead with the purchase. Open questions are:
    - What community engagement should be done
    - Affordability based on current unknowns on the effect of Gallagher
    - Optics of an engine purchase with the upcoming de-Gallagher ballot initiative
  - Documents – Proposal Evaluation Process and Scoring.docx,  
Sunshine FPD Capital Replacement 20200709.docx
6. Work on the project to install a fire cistern at 1462 CR 83 is continuing:
  - Survey has been completed
  - Still waiting on title determination
  - Still working to get easement signed
  - Working with tank supplier and BOCO transportation to determine if they will be able to deliver tank to cistern location. Tank is 10' diameter by 35' long and gets delivered by tractor trailer.
  - Application submittal date for the Limited Impact Special Use Review is August 13th
7. Contractor selection has been made for the shaded fuel break along the shared driveway at 3701 SCD.  
Contract has been signed and the contractor will begin work based on availability
8. Other business??

## 4502 Replacement Summary of RFP and Proposal Evaluation

### Apparatus Committee

Chief Michael Schmitt, Deputy Chief Henry Ballard, Fire Marshall Bruce Honeyman, Eric Bader

### Request for Proposal

RFP was sent to six manufacturers over the span of two weeks from April 30<sup>th</sup> to May 15<sup>th</sup>. Proposals were due on June 12, 2020. The distributors/manufacturers that were sent the proposals are given below:

| Manufacturer                 | Distributor                | Contact      | Email  |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|--|
| SVI Trucks                   | SVI Trucks                 | Jason Kline  | <a href="mailto:jasonk@svitrucks.com">jasonk@svitrucks.com</a>               |
| Pierce Manufacturing         | Front Range Fire Apparatus | Jason Byrne  | <a href="mailto:jasonb@frontrangefire.com">jasonb@frontrangefire.com</a>     |
| Spartan Emergency Response   | Mile Hi Fire Apparatus     | Sharon Sells | <a href="mailto:sharon.sells@milehifire.com">sharon.sells@milehifire.com</a> |
| Boise Mobile Equipment (BME) | Boise Mobile Equipment     | Bill McCain  | <a href="mailto:bill@bmeffire.com">bill@bmeffire.com</a>                     |
| KME Fire Apparatus           | KME Fire Apparatus         | William Gray | <a href="mailto:wgray@kmeffire.com">wgray@kmeffire.com</a>                   |
| Rosenbauer Minnesota, LLC    | Max Fire Apparatus         | Pete Leizer  | <a href="mailto:pleizer@maxfire.com">pleizer@maxfire.com</a>                 |

### Responses

Three of the six manufacturers decided not to respond to the RFP. Their reasons for not responding are summarized below:

| Manufacturer                 | Distributor            | Contact      | Notes   |
|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---|
| SVI Trucks                   | SVI Trucks             | Jason Kline  | Felt that there were too many modifications required to their standard design for them to respond   |
| Boise Mobile Equipment (BME) | Boise Mobile Equipment | Bill McCain  | There was an internal mix-up in terms of responsibility for responding. They asked if we could extend deadline and we declined.                                   |
| KME Fire Apparatus           | KME Fire Apparatus     | William Gray | Did not response because their current production time for commercial fire apparatus was in excess of 480 days which far exceeded our 365 requirement in the RFP. |

Proposals were received from Pierce Manufacturing, Spartan Emergency Response and Rosenbauer Minnesota LLC. The Apparatus Committee reviewed the proposals and a proposal comparison spread sheet was created that compared the three proposals bids relative to the specifications in the RFP.



## Apparatus Proposals Evaluation

The decision was made to use a decision matrix to evaluate the three proposals. Criteria were established within five groupings; Supplier/Cost/Delivery; Chassis/Size/Maneuverability; Water Tank/Pump/Foam/CAFS/Intakes/Discharges/Pre-Connects/Hose Beds; Cab; Body. As a group the Apparatus Committee decided on the weighting for each of the criteria and then scored each of the proposals. Early in the process it was decided that the proposal from Spartan ER would be dropped from consideration. The proposed engine from Spartan had a wheelbase that was 29" more than the other two proposals and total length that was 30" longer than the next longest engine. The engine would literally be too long to fit into Station 2 and the size and turning radius would make it too unwieldy to respond to calls in the district. The remaining two engines from Pierce and Rosenbauer were evaluation using the decision matrix.

|   | <b>Weighting Factor</b> | <b>Rosenbauer Type 1 4x4 WUI Engine</b> | <b>Front Range Fire Apparatus Pierce 750 Gallon - CAFS</b> |
|---|-------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Supplier/Cost/Delivery</b>   |                         |   |  |
| Cost  | 5                       | 3.5                                     | 4.5  |
| Delivery schedule/Penalties for late delivery   | 3                       | 3.5                                     | 2.5  |
| Inspection Trips  | 3                       | 2.5                                     | 3.0  |
| Other departments experience with supplier in terms of ease of doing business, build quality, timeliness of delivery, warranty service , etc. | 5                       | 4.5                                     | 3.0  |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>  | <b>16</b>               | <b>58.0</b>                             | <b>54.0</b>  |
| <b>Chassis/Size/Maneuverability</b>   |                         |   |  |
| Chassis Manufacturer/Model  | 4                       | 5.0                                     | 5.0  |
| Wheelbase, total length   | 4                       | 3.5                                     | 4.0  |
| Turning Radius (based on chassis manufacturer)  | 4                       | 3.0                                     | 3.0  |
| Engine, transmission, max speed capability  | 4                       | 4.0                                     | 3.0  |
| Angle of Approach/Departure   | 3                       | 4.5                                     | 3.5  |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>  | <b>19</b>               | <b>75.5</b>                             | <b>70.5</b>  |
| <b>Water Tank/Pump/Foam/CAFS/Intakes/Discharges/Pre-Connects/Hose Beds</b>  |                         |   |  |
| Water Tank, Foam Tank   | 4                       | 5.0                                     | 5.0  |
| Pump type , pump capacity, panel location, pump and roll capability, priming system   | 5                       | 4.5                                     | 3.0  |
| Foam System, CAFS (includes capability and discharges that are Foam/CAFS capable)   | 4                       | 4.5                                     | 4.0  |
| Monitor, Hose Reel  | 3                       | 4.5                                     | 4.0  |
| Intakes, discharges, back pack filler valve   | 4                       | 4.0                                     | 4.0  |
| Hose beds, pre-connects, hose bed covers  | 5                       | 4.0                                     | 2.5  |
| Direct tank fill, automatic tank fill   | 4                       | 3.5                                     | 3.5  |

|  |           |              |              |
|--|-----------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>Sub-Total</b>   | <b>29</b> | <b>124.0</b> | <b>105.5</b> |
| <b>Cab</b>   |           |              |              |
| Seated positions and doors                                     | 5         | 5.0          | 5.0          |
| Seats  | 3         | 5.0          | 5.0          |
| Rear cab console   | 1         | 5.0          | 5.0          |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>   | <b>9</b>  | <b>45.0</b>  | <b>45.0</b>  |
| <b>Body</b>  |           |              |              |
| Battery charger, auto eject, air compressor for brakes         | 3         | 3.0          | 4.0          |
| Cabinet volume (total space), SCBA storage                     | 5         | 5.0          | 3.5          |
| Cabinet Access (clear door area for accessing cabinet storage) | 5         | 5.0          | 3.5          |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>   | <b>13</b> | <b>59.0</b>  | <b>47.0</b>  |
| <b>Total Score</b>   | <b>86</b> | <b>361.5</b> | <b>322.0</b> |

Weighting factor range is from 1 to 5 in increments of 1

Scores range from 0 to 5 in 0.5 increments

**Supplier/Cost/Delivery – Weighted Score R58/P54**

Scoring R-Rosenbauer, P-Pierce

**Cost R3.5/P4.5** – Rosenbauer \$489,063 vs Pierce \$465,899 which is 4.9% difference in cost

**Delivery schedule/Penalties for late delivery R3.5/P2.5** – Rosenbauer 395 days vs Pierce 425 days.

Rosenbauer agreed to a \$100/day in late delivery fees after 395 days vs Pierce agreed to a \$100/day penalty after 460 days.

**Inspection Trips R3.0/P2.5** – Rosenbauer specified 2 inspection trips, Pierce specified 3 inspection trips

**Other departments experience with supplier in terms of ease of doing business, build quality, timeliness of delivery, warranty service, etc. R4.5/P2.5** – We have anecdotal evidence from surrounding districts that have bought Pierce equipment who have stated that they will never buy Pierce again. Primarily issue was build quality.

**Chassis/Apparatus/Maneuverability – Weighted Score R75.5/P70.5**

**Chassis Manufacturer/Model R5.0/P5.0** – Both vendors specify Freightliner 108SD as specified in RFP

**Wheelbase, total length R3.5/P4.0** - wheelbase equal (205”), Rosenbauer length is 369”, Pierce is 351” (18” delta)

**Turning Radius R3.0/P3.0** – equivalent. Note: turning radius is based on data from chassis manufacturer. While curb to curb is equivalent the wall to wall would be less for Pierce since it is has less front overhang.

**Engine, transmission, max speed capability R4.0/P3.0** - Both proposals have same engine specification.

Rosenbauer specified 6 speed transmission (per RFP); Pierce specified 5 speed transmission. Rosenbauer, top speed is governed to 68 mph but we can sign waiver to get top speed of 75mph. Pierce is limited to 68 mph because of 5 speed transmission.

**Angle of Approach/Departure R4.5/P3.5** – Rosenbauer is at 22°/21° vs Pierce at 20°/16°; RFP was 20°/20°.

**Water Tank/Pump/Foam/CAFS/Intakes/Discharges/Pre-Connects/Hose Beds – Weighted Score R124/P105.5**

**Water Tank, Foam Tank R5.0/P5.0** - Rosenbauer and Pierce are equivalent with 750 gallon water tank and 30 gallon foam tank

**Pump type, pump capacity, panel location, pump and roll capability, priming system R4.5/P3.0 –**

Rosenbauer pump is 1250 GPM @150 psi and has a high pressure side that is 100 GPM @600 PSI. Pierce is 1000 GPM Waterous single stage pump (RFP was 1250 GPM). Rosenbauer pump is superior while Pierce pump did not meet RFP requirements.

Rosenbauer pump panel is at rear of vehicle and Pierce is on left side at approximately mid-line. The rear pump panel location allows the engineer to view both sides and rear of scene. Left side pump panel only allows the engineer to view one side of the scene which depending on truck placement can be an issue.

Rosenbauer priming system is positive displacement double piston, belt driven from pump and Pierce priming system is Trident compressed air powered, venturi based AirPrime System. Priming viewed as equivalent

**Foam System, CAFS R4.5/P4.0** - Rosenbauer uses Pneumax Model 200-P, 200 SCFM. CAFS discharges are front bumper 2.5" Crosslay and the (2) front of body 1.5" Speedlays. (Monitor and hose reel are not compatible with CAFS because their feed is off of the high pressure side of pump.

Pierce uses Hercules, 140 CFM, CAFS discharges are (2) 1.5" front crosslays, 2.5" hose bed pre-connect, front bumper turret, front bumper 2.5" discharge. Rosenbauer scored higher based on higher CFM (RFP specification was 200 CFM)

**Monitor/Hose Reel R4.5/P4.0** – Components are equivalent but Rosenbauer has the monitor and hose reel connected to the high pressure side of the pump so have 100 GPM @600 PSI available which will provides greater range for both monitor and hose reel.

**Intakes, discharges, back pack filler valve R4.0/P4.0** - Equivalent

**Hose beds, pre-connects, hose bed covers R4.0/P2.5** - Rosenbauer has a 2-1/2" x 200' pre-connect, crosslay in front bumper, (2) 1-3/4" x 200' pre-connect crosslays (speedlays) mid-body ~shoulder high, and 4" x 1200' running lengthwise at top of body

Pierce has 2-1/2" x 200' pre-connect running lengthwise at top of body, (2) 1-3/4" x 200' pre-connect crosslays at mid-body ~8' high and 4" LDH x 1200' at top of body.

Rosenbauer's 2-1/2" hose bed in front bumper meets RFP and is a significantly better than Pierce's top of body running lengthwise. Rosenbauer's 1-3/4" crosslays are at a lower, more manageable, height and are located in pull out trays that make packing much easier. 4"LDH hose beds are equivalent.

**Direct tank fill, automatic tank fill R3.5/P3.5** - Equivalent

**Cab – Weighted Score R45/P45**

**Seated positions and doors R5.0/P5.0** - Equivalent

**Seats R5.0/P5.0** - Equivalent

**Rear cab console R5.0/P5.0** – Equivalent

**Body – Weighted Score R59/P47**

**Battery charger, auto eject, air compressor for brakes R3.0/P4.0** – RFP specified a specific model of charger and air compressor. Rosenbauer proposal specified an air compressor that had a lower CFM and maximum pressure rating. Pierce met RFP requirements, Rosenbauer did not.

**Cabinet volume (total space), SCBA storage R5.0/P3.5** – Rosenbauer had a total cabinet volume of 167.1 cubic ft., Pierce cabinet volume was 144.7; a 15% difference in volume.

**Cabinet Access (clear door area for accessing cabinet storage) R5.0/P3.5** – Rosenbauer clear door area is equivalent to the area of each of the cabinets. Pierce clear door area is 67.8% of the cabinet area; so there is a significant amount of hidden space behind the doors as well as a need to unload equipment that is in the way in order to retrieve the equipment you want.

### **Summary**

The engine proposed by Rosenbauer was significantly better than the engine proposed by Pierce. The features and functionality came closer to meeting the requirements as outlined in the RFP and far outweighed the difference in cost, especially when considered across a 25 year life span.