

# Proposal #090521-C Exterior and Interior Cameras

June 23, 2009

## SUMMARY:

This item requests approval of a proposal to place exterior and interior security cameras at all campuses. Twenty proposals were received (refer to sheet titled Tab). The proposal will be for a term of one year ending June 30, 2010, with the option to extend it if circumstances warrant, upon governing body approval, up to three additional one year terms.

## BOARD GOAL:

VI Growth & Change...review and adjust policies and procedures effectively to address the challenges of rapid growth and changing demographic characteristics while maintaining and enhancing our strong sense of community.

## PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION:

Approval of 2007 Bond Project 49: Security

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The 2007 Bond Project 49 (6.6.1) includes funds to place security cameras at 16 elementary schools, Calhoun, Crownover, McMath, Strickland and Fred Moore High School.

The 2004 Bond has funds to place cameras at Nelson, Paloma, Blanton and Stephens.

The intention of the bond committee was to insure that every campus has security cameras. The high schools already have cameras as well as several administrative buildings.

The cameras, with operating software system already in place, are proprietary. The district wanted to find out what other options might be available. The project was bid by asking vendors to propose the solution that the vendor believed would best meet the long term needs of the district.

## SIGNIFICANT ISSUES:

Twenty proposals were received as listed on the tabulation sheet. There were several solutions proposed. The evaluation committee including Ernie Stripling, Michael Bernstein, Paul Address, Chad Ingram, and Kathy Arrington reviewed each proposal and discussed the different solutions. Basically, there were three types of solutions proposed.

1. Keep the existing system and add the same brand of cameras at the new locations.
2. Keep the existing camera system and add an additional system giving the district two systems.
3. Purchase a completely different system for the bond project locations along with the replacement of the existing system with the new brand of cameras as well.

Within the approach of replacing all cameras there were two sub approaches recommended, a campus based approach, and a centralized approach.

With a campus based approach the server resides at the school while the actual management is done at the central server location (Technology building). With a centralized approach the servers are located at the central location with a redundant site. The district provides Enterprise level backup and support systems to its' centralized network operations center at the Technology building. That level of support and network redundancy for this camera system cannot be properly supported with a campus based server.

The committee then grouped the proposals into five groups (refer to the Approach Group sheet). After examining the different approaches, the committee was most impressed with two groups.

1. Group 2 that recommended keeping the existing cameras and adding the same brand of camera at the other locations so that there would be a single system to monitor with a centralized approach.
2. Group 5 that recommended the purchase of Cisco cameras for the bond project locations, and replace the older existing system with Cisco cameras as well, which would also give the district a single system to monitor with a centralized approach.

The committee then looked at the difference in pricing between the two groups. The committee noticed that the three Cisco proposers, #3, #11 and #19, did not use the same quantity of cameras to determine their pricing. They were each then given the exact number and asked to adjust their pricing (refer to the Adjusted for Quantities sheet).

When the proposers were then ranked according to cost, servers required and products used, the proposal submitted by #19 TFE \$751,255.27, contained the best over-all quality products, and the best price which would replace all existing cameras along with adding the new cameras for \$51,345.27 over the highest ranked group 2 proposer #14 QCTV \$699,880.00.

**FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:**

This project will be funded from 2007 Bond Project 49 6.6.1 in the amount of \$697,500.00, and from 2004 Bond Projects # 35, 36, 37, and 38 \$100,000.00 making the total budget \$797,500.00.

The final price submitted by TFE is \$751,255.27.

**BENEFIT OF ACTION:**

This will allow the district to replace and/or add cameras at all campuses with non-proprietary cameras, and have the ability to manage everything from the central technology network location.

This will also allow the district to add cameras at all buildings as budgets will allow, and the new schools included in the 2007 bond over the contract term.

**PROCEDURAL AND REPORTING IMPLICATIONS:**

None

**PUBLIC COMMENT RECEIVED:**

None

**ALTERNATIVES:**

No alternative actions are proposed.

**OTHER COMMENTS:**

The top five ranked proposers are, #1 TFE, #2 INX, #3 Calence, #4 QCTV, and #5Divcom EMS (refer to sheet titled Ranking).

The replaced cameras still have some value, and will be offered for sale through an on-line auction.

**SUPERINTENDENT’S RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the proposal submitted by TFE in the amount of \$751,255.27, be accepted for a term of one year ending June 30, 2010 with the option, upon governing body approval each year, to extend the contract for up to three additional one year terms.

**STAFF PERSONS RESPONSIBLE:**

- Ernie Stripling, TIO
- Debbie Monschke, Executive Director of Administrative Services
- Michael Bernstein, Director of Technology Networking
- Paul Andress, Director of Maintenance
- Chad Ingram, Networking Engineer
- Kathy Arrington, Purchasing Agent

**ATTACHMENT:**

Cameras 2009 Tabulations (Ranking, Tab, Approach Groups, Adjusted for Quantities)

**APPROVAL:**

Signature of Staff Member Proposing Recommendation: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Divisional Assistant Superintendent: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Superintendent: \_\_\_\_\_