

TO:	Members, Board of Education Dr. Carol Kelley, Superintendent
FROM:	Jim Hackett, Safety and Security Manager
SUBJECT:	Phase-Two MS Camera Refresh
DATE:	April 7, 2020

Background

On August 13, 2019, Michael Arensdorff and I presented the IP Security Camera Upgrade Project (Phase-One) to the BOE, which the BOE approved. This was the first phase in a multi-year/multi-phase plan to address the security camera needs of the district. The phase-one project replaced the Video Management System and 108 cameras that were either non-functioning, never installed, or non-compliant with the selected VMS. The budgeted amount for this project was \$150,000, and the final costs totaled \$148,049.73. Phase-One provided a significant step forward for the security of the school, but we knew that it was not complete. We detailed this when we presented the project to the BOE. At that time, our thoughts were to allocate \$50,000 towards security camera upgrades in FY21 to replace all the remaining cameras from the original system as a 1:1 swap, and another \$50,000 in FY22 for relocating/adding to the deployment to provide better coverage of the interior public spaces of Brooks and Julian Middle Schools.

Research

To provide direction and guidance during the assessment of interior solutions for both Brooks and Julian, I needed to hear the thoughts and concerns of those who use the system daily. Throughout the year, I consulted with Principals, Assistant Principals, Executive Coordinators, and both SROs about the new camera system. The takeaways from those conversations are summed up as follows:

- 1. It is nice to have a camera system that works and allows us to provide a safer school for the students.
- 2. The image on the new cameras is so much better than the image of the older cameras. Do you plan on replacing more of the older cameras?
- 3. Several areas in the school don't have coverage. Could we add some cameras to get better coverage?

RFP Development

To address the comments/concerns, I decided to reevaluate the FY21 and FY22 allocations and combine them into one final project. Using this thought process as the basis, I developed an RFP (<u>link to RFP</u>) with the following goals:

 Evaluate current camera deployment and provide a solution to achieve better coverage of interior public spaces, including areas not currently covered.
Current camera locations should not dictate the location of the proposed

2. Current camera locations should not dictate the location of the proposed cameras.

3. The proposed camera make/model must meet minimum specifications as described.

4. Additional licensing should be kept to a minimum—ideally, the solution would fit the current Genetec license allocation.

Bid Process

On March 13, 2020, the RFP was disseminated per the advertisement and bidder notification requirements that are spelled out in Section 10-20.21 of the School Code and board policy 4:20 (Purchases and Contracts). A mandatory walk-through was held on March 17, 2020, and a virtual public opening of the bids was completed on March 30, 2020. We received five bid proposals for this project. Each proposal was evaluated based on the cost of services, completeness/quality of the proposal, prior experience with the school district, service quality, and technical expertise. Completion of the evaluation process revealed that the lowest qualified bidder was Pentegra Systems in the amount of \$122,714. This bid addresses every item in the RFP and does so without additional camera licensing.

Projections

In total, the security cameras were slated to be a 3-year project with a budget of \$250,000. Budget numbers were approximations based on projects completed in surrounding districts. The numbers were also created without having an accurate count of the cameras in our schools (unable to accurately audit until a functioning VMS was implemented--meaning unable to discern whether the camera was not working because of the VMS or a defect with the camera). The completion of the Phase-One project in our district allows for more accurate projections based on the unique design qualities of our buildings and a detailed camera audit. Based on this, I feel the costs to implement this next phase are justified and represent the most cost-effective way to address the security camera project moving forward. Combining the Phase-One project costs (\$148,049.73) with the proposed FY21 project costs (\$122,714) results in a combined project cost of \$270,763.73.

Implementation of the FY21 proposed project will not increase the FY21 Safety & Security Operating Budget. This project will finalize the bulk of the security camera

upgrade project for the next ten years. Minimal costs for years 3-5 would include the replacement of seven exterior school cameras (estimated to be \$7500 and includes Brooks-2, Julian-1, Beye-1, and Mann-3), the refreshment of the seven cameras deployed at the District Administration Building (estimated to be \$7500), year-to-year maintenance costs that may arise, and the 5-year license renewal (the current Genetec Advantage license will expire September 30, 2024). Based on our current rates and current deployment, the FY25 license renewal costs are projected to be \$35,000-\$45,000 for a 5-year renewal. Licensing rates vary significantly from vendor to vendor. For the current project alone, prices ranged from \$171.50-\$270 per license.

Recommendation

The Administration will be seeking a motion that the Board of Education of Oak Park District 97 accepts the proposed bid at the April 21, 2020 meeting.