

VIA E-mail
June 6, 2017

Beverly Hills Unified School District
255 South Lasky Drive
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Bid No. 16-17/004

Attn: Michael Dobrotin,

Re: Informational – Referencing and Rebutting SprintTurf Substitution Request

Dear Michael,

Please see the attached bullets by Brock refuting the substitution request:

*We believe based on market knowledge that Sprinturf may have submitted a pad Enplast Shockwave as an equal to project specifications for Beverly Hills High School – Synthetic Turf Replacement project. We believe this due to the large gap between our bid and their bid. We also suspect this due the closeness of the third place bidder to our bid as well. As you will see below, if they are submitting this pad product they are putting the athletes and students that utilize the field at a **higher Safety risk vs the project specified product.***

- 1. Our specification calls for a virgin expanded Polypropylene material. This is a proven material for both durability and recyclability. The proposed alternate product is made of post-consumer tires, which cannot be recycled and does not meet the material content of our specification.*
- 2. The specification calls for a product thickness of 25mm. The proposed alternate product is 11mm in thickness and consequently does not meet the same performance and safety criteria as the product outlined in our specification. **Refer to warranty section 1.04.B.C referring the HIC Testing requirement over the lifetime of the warranty.***
- 3. The goal of our specification is to gain the highest critical fall height on the turf system in order to mitigate the risk of traumatic brain injuries. Product thickness is key to fulfill this criteria. The proposed alternate product does not meet the same safety criteria as the product outlined in our specification.*
- 4. Based on new ASTM standard test method F-355-16 using the E missile, we believe the critical fall height for a sports surface should be a minimum of 1.3 meters for the warranty period of the turf as recommended by the International One Turf Concept. The alternate product proposed will not meet this criteria. **Refer to section 2.05.E.3 HIC Testing of 1.4 meters.***
- 5. We require a 25-year product and performance warranty, which will cover the warranty period of 3 artificial turf life cycles. **The manufacturer of the alternate product proposed offers a 1 year warranty with unacceptable restrictions and exclusions.***
- 6. We require that the manufacture demonstrate successful artificial turf replacements over their underlayment systems. The manufacturer of the proposed alternate product does not meet this criteria.*

7. *We require a Gmax guarantee for the field to be included in the product warranty. The proposed alternate product warranty does not have this provision. We will not accept a rewrite of the warranty of the proposed alternate product for the purposes of this spec.*
8. *We require a warranty that, in the event of underlayment failure, the company will cover not only the replacement cost of the underlayment, but also cover the cost to repair or replace the turf. The proposed alternate product warranty does not contain this important provision. We will not accept a rewrite of the warranty of the proposed alternate product for the purposes of this spec.*
9. *Product must demonstrate the ability to protect against lower extremity injuries by maintaining consistent surface stiffness. Independent biomechanical research is required to support this performance property. The manufacturer of the proposed alternate product has not provided the required research.*
10. *We will require that all testing, including environmental testing to be representative of the material delivered to the site prior to installation. Because the material of the proposed alternate is made up of variable downcycled content, and the chain of custody for the raw material of the product is not controlled, this presents an unacceptable risk to the client in their ability to complete the field in the desired schedule in the event of test failure.*
11. *We will require that the manufacturer provide an endorsed \$1,000,000 product liability insurance certificate to the field owner. The certificate must be issued by a U.S. insurance company. The manufacturer of the proposed alternative product has not demonstrated the ability to fulfill this provision.*
12. *We require that that the manufacture demonstrate at least 10 million square feet (approx.120 fields) of successful installations in the United States of America. The manufacturer of the proposed alternative product does not fulfill this provision.*
13. *To ensure product durability, we will require accelerated aging test results to meet or exceed the specified product. The proposed alternative product does not fulfill this requirement.*
14. *To ensure product stability, we will require a product coefficient of linear thermal expansion to be equal to or less than the specified product. The proposed alternative product does not fulfill this requirement.*
15. *We are concerned about infill displacement and reduction in infill depth over time. This may represent a safety issue in the event a player impacts the surface in exposed areas. **The product in our specification demonstrates a Gmax of under 100 and a critical fall height of >1.2m even if the infill is completely displaced in areas on the field. The proposed alternate product has shown to produce safety impact values far inferior to this criteria. This represents an unacceptable health and safety risk to our client.***

16. *We require the highest vertical and lateral transmissivity in the underlayment for storm water management. The proposed alternate product does not produce the same water flow characteristics as the underlayment outlined in our specification.*

17. *To avoid a future disposal liability and cost for the facility owner, the specified product is EPEA Cradle to Cradle certified for environmental compatibility and closed-loop recyclability. Down-cycling, landfill disposal and incineration of the product are not acceptable end-of-life solutions. The proposed alternative does not fulfill these requirements.*

18. *We require a material with a proven history of recycling in the USA. We have not seen evidence of this process occurring with the proposed alternate product in the United States.*

19. *We require the underlayment manufacturer to provide field assessment services to be performed by certified technicians to our client. The proposed alternate product and company offers no such service.*

20. *Brock provides its clients with a safety guarantee in regard to GMAX. Brock ensures the field will not exceed 120G's for the lifetime of the field installed. Please see our attached safety guarantee. Enplast does not offer any safety guarantee.*

We appreciate the re-reviewing the project specifications for the underlayment to fully understand that not many substitutions will meet the SAFTEY and performance values that were established for the project specifications. Again, this is an assumption that Sprinturf utilized this product in the bid due to the large gap between our bid and Shaw's bid that was in third place.

Based on the conclusions stated above, we respectfully request that the Beverly Hills Unified School District consider Asphalt, Fabric & Eng., Inc. as the lowest responsible and qualified bidder to complete the removal and replacement of the synthetic turf football field. Please contact me at any time to further discuss these items or any part of the bid.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey J Fenton: Sr. Project Manager

Asphalt, Fabric & Engineering, Inc.

2683 Lime Ave., Signal Hill, CA 90755

Phone (562) 997-4129 | Fax (562)997-4109 | jfenton@asphaltfabeng.com