

Washington, DC

From: Vlcek, John - Chicago, IL
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2005 4:09 PM
To: SupplierOmbuds
Cc: Infanger, Maria R - Chicago, IL; Schech, Mike - Chicago, IL
Subject: FW: Response to JCI's Response to Ombudsman's Draft Decision

USPS Supplier Ombudsman:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on JCI's 27 page response to your draft decision.

The most recent JCI response generally restates certain past allegations, provides technical sketches and product information they deem relevant to defend their position, and accuses you of basing the draft decision on incorrect factual understandings. I do not agree with their position and basically reiterate again all of our previously provided comments as part of this response.

Attached to this memo please find comments provided by the project's Mechanical Consultant, KJWW Engineering Consultants, dated November 14, 2005, summarizing the project history as well as providing additional information relative to their past contacts with JCI regarding the BACnet compatibility on this project, as well as on past HVAC control projects. Our consultants' sole focus was to provide a design meeting USPS standards and the particular requirements of the project. This office is also focused on those goals, but, additionally, we are entrusted with the responsibility of providing the best value for the Postal Service.

It should be noted, as set forth in KJWW's letter of November 14, 2005, that a JCI representative told KJWW that their system is not fully BACnet compliant. JCI now says in this latest response that their system is BACnet compatible. This is not what their representative, Jim Procknow, said to KJWW. Either JCI is changing their position or they are now playing a game of semantics. Because their second representative, Greg Acklerson, indicated that JCI's fully BACnet compliant system would not be coming out until December 2005 or January 2006, it would appear that they are playing a game of semantics. A system is either 'partially' compliant or 'fully' compliant and the Postal Service's Standard Design Criteria requires a fully compliant system. While JCI may now be saying that they have a BACnet compliant system, they do not currently have a 'fully' compliant BACnet system.

In another example of the semantics they are playing, JCI's response attempts to make Andover Controls system architecture look like it is a lesser system, and, by implication, that it also fails to comply with our requirements by stating that its router "can handle **only** BACnet commands." [Emphasis is theirs.] JCI has previously argued that their system is better because it can also communicate with LonWorks commands. We don't care if JCI's system can also communicate using LonWorks or not. That is beyond our requirements. We only care that they can communicate with BACnet, at all levels of control, because that is what our Standard Design Criteria requires.

A few final comments: It should be noted that JCI has continually stated that their system is non-proprietary and among the more open systems available. If their system is as non-proprietary as they claim, one would think that it wouldn't be necessary to stamp every page of every communication to the Ombudsman "PROPRIETARY & CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION - PLEASE DO NOT DISCLOSE OUTSIDE THE USPS." None of the other interested parties felt it necessary to do that. Also, JCI's self-centered opinion that our intention all along has been to exclude them from the project, could not be farther from the truth. We recognize their international prominence as a manufacturer of HVAC controls. But, because of our responsibility to provide best value to the Postal Service while following our Standard Design Criteria, we wanted to include every manufacturer we could identify as meeting our requirements, and to exclude all who couldn't. As JCI themselves have pointed out, they are not the only major manufacturer to have been excluded from this project for failing to meet the requirements.

It is my opinion that the conclusions stated in your draft decision are correct and the JCI disagreement should be denied in its entirety.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide these comments.

11/23/2005

John A. Vlcek
Contracting Officer
Manager - Design & Construction
USPS Great Lakes Facilities Service Office
62 Stratford Drive
Bloomington, IL 60117-7000

Phone 630-295-6244
FAX 630-295-6262
email john.vlcek@usps.gov



Engineering Consultants

Mechanical • Electrical • Structural • Technology

November 14, 2005

Mr. John A. Vleck
Contracting Officer
USPS Great Lakes Facilities Service Office
62 Stratford Drive
Bloomington, Illinois 60117-7000

RE: Re: Comments of Johnson Controls, Inc. to Draft Decision
Milwaukee P&DC Facility DDC Controls
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
USPS Solicitation No. 162640-05-A-0156
KJWW #: 305086

Dear Mr. Vleck:

We have reviewed the Johnson Controls, Inc. (JCI) comments to the draft decision of USPS Supplier Ombudsman to the solicitation 162640-05-A-0156 disagreement dated November 9, 2005. We have summarized the history of the project and the development of the specifications for your reference and information.

During the investigation portion of the project, we discussed the design criteria and goals of the United States Postal Service (USPS) in the replacement of the HVAC control system at the Milwaukee GMF. We discussed the USPS request for a system that would allow future growth and expandability with no limitations and meet the USPS design criteria AS-503. The conclusion of these discussions is summarized from an excerpt from our 10% design report dated March 7, 2005:

"The new HVAC control system will provide complete electronic climate control of the building, including heating, cooling, dehumidification, and ventilation. The system will be designed per the requirements of the September 17, 2004 USPS Handbook AS-503, Standard Design Criteria for P&D facilities.

A fully BACnet compatible direct digital control (DDC) system with non-proprietary communications will be installed, conforming to ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 135-1995 as required by the 2004 USPS design standards for P&D facilities. The BACnet standard defines the rules, or "language", which are to be used for communications between controllers. The system will use the BACnet protocol at all levels of communication. BACnet is a national standard developed by ASHRAE (an international HVAC engineering organization) and is established and proven in the industry.

802 West Broadway, Suite 312
Madison, Wisconsin 53713
(608) 223-9600 FAX (608) 223-9601

Quad Cities / Des Moines
Madison / Chicago
St. Louis

The intent is that a BACnet compliant controller from any manufacturer can be installed in any BACnet compliant system without the need for a "translator", otherwise known as a "gateway". In practice, there is still extra programming time associated with mixing different manufacturers' products on the same control system, since the internal programming (the "brains") of each controller remains proprietary. In addition, allowing too many different manufacturers on site makes stocking spare parts and coordinating service more difficult. However, opening future work up to manufacturers other than the one that provided the original system allows for competitive bidding, which should reduce the cost of future control system additions and modifications.

Quality installation and support are critical to a successful control system installation. Several reputable manufacturers with local sales and service representation are capable of meeting the BACnet standard, including:

- Alerton
- American Automatrix
- Andover
- Automated Logic
- KMC

A number of major manufacturers (Johnson Controls, Siemens, Honeywell, and Trane) currently conform to the BACnet protocol for portions of their systems, but not at all levels. Several use the Lon protocol for device controller communication, which is another non-proprietary communication standard developed by a private organization. Some of these manufacturers may provide BACnet compliant systems in the future as the control industry continues to evolve."

Our investigation of the USPS objective dates back to our research of DDC systems done in 2004 for USPS Solicitation 162640-04-A-0075 for the Madison GMF/VMF HVAC control system replacement. At this time, we contacted JCI, along with several other control manufacturers, to obtain information of their systems and BACnet compatibility. On May 18, 2004, we spoke with JCI representative Jim Procknow, who informed us that JCI is not fully BACnet; they require communication to BACnet controllers via Ethernet NAE or via BACnet integrator. We felt this method of control communication did not meet the USPS objective. During design for Solicitation 162640-05-A-0156, we contacted JCI to discuss system updates or changes from the previous year. On July 11, 2005, we spoke with JCI representative Greg Acklerson, who informed us that JCI was releasing a new BACnet system in December 2005 or January 2006 that would utilize BACnet MS/TP communication at the application specific controller level. This change would meet the requirements of the project established by the project specifications, however, since the system was not planned to be available until after bids were received, we had concerns of project delay if the system's planned release was delayed.

We reviewed JCI's Metasys Extended Architecture structure available in their product bulletin available online at their web site. This diagram is included under Tab 2 of JCI's comments letter dated November 9, 2005 as Figure 9. In this diagram, there is not a BACnet MS/TP connection on the input side of the NAE. Based on this information and in our discussions with JCI as noted previously in this response, it is our understanding that JCI utilizes LonTalk or N2 protocols to gather information from secondary control devices and then translates that information to BACnet at the primary network level. With this design of their system architecture, JCI does not use BACnet protocol to communicate to application specific



Mr. John A. Vlcek
November 14, 2005

KJWW #305086
Page 3 of 3

controllers.

With that system design, JCI does not meet the requirements of the project specifications, specifically section 15900, paragraph 2.3.A.8. Again, the specifications were developed after discussion with the USPS on the objectives to the project and therefore should be the basis of the DDC system design for Solicitation 162640-05-A-0156.

Sincerely,



Kristine A. Cotham, P.E.
Senior Engineer

KAC/bnm
H:\305\305086\Corr\kac1114ltr.doc

