

**CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
Procurement and Contracts Division**

Date Received

NON-COMPETITIVE BID PURCHASE JUSTIFICATION

Required for all sole source acquisitions in excess of \$3,000.00.

This justification document consists of (2) pages. All information must be provided and all questions must be answered. **Department Head approval is required.**

Requesting Department Information

Department El Dorado County Sheriff's Office	Index Code 241,140
Contact Name Phil Dold	Sub-Object Code 6,042
Telephone 621-6044	User Code _____ Fax _____

Required Supplier/Vendor Information

Vendor/Supplier Name Watch Guard, inc	Vendor/Supplier Address 415 Century Parkway
Contact Name Fran Judge	Allen, TX 75013
Estimated Purchase Price \$448,000 plus tax, fees	Vendor/Supplier E-Mail fjudge@watchguardvideo.com
Telephone 800-605-6734	Fax _____

Provide a brief description of the acquisition, including all goods and/or services the vendor/supplier will provide
 This purchase is for the replacement of an In-car Video System for all marked patrol units within the Sheriff's Office. This specialized computer hardware and software works with multiple cameras, audio recorders and vehicle instrumentation to record critical incidents during law enforcement activities. It includes specialized software for the storage and retrieval of all recorded video while documenting and preserving evidentiary integrity.

Department Head _____
 Signature _____ Date _____

Purchasing Agent _____
 Signature _____ Date _____

Board of Supervisors	Buyer Assignment
Date _____	Assigned To _____
Item _____	Date _____


**CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
Procurement and Contracts Division**

Complete responses must be provided for all of the following items.

A. THE GOOD/SERVICE REQUESTED IS RESTRICTED TO ONE SUPPLIER FOR THE REASON STATED BELOW:

1. Why is the acquisition restricted to this goods/services supplier?

(Explain why the acquisition cannot be competitively bid. Explain if this is an emergency purchase or how the supplier is the only source for the acquisition.)

Department personnel conducted a market analysis of available systems to determine which system designs met department specifications. Five vendors were invited to install test systems for evaluations. (Coban, Panasonic, Visucop, WatchGuard, and Digital Patterler) This vendor is the only one to meet the functional requirements. The vendor does not have resellers. 

2. Provide the background of events leading to this acquisition.

Existing system is failing and the company no longer can repair failed units. Approximately half of the funding required for the full project is in the present year approved budget.

3. Describe the uniqueness of the acquisition (why was the goods/services supplier chosen?)


Numerous functional requirements were considered during the live, in-field testing period. Each was evaluated on ease of use, functionality of in-car as well as "back-end" storage, quality of image and audio recordings, and integration with the vehicle. This vendor excelled in each area but most notably in image capture, officer interface, independent operation from the in-car CAD system, and integration of body worn camera.

4. What are the consequences of not purchasing the goods/services or contracting with the proposed supplier?

The present In-car system must be replaced because of failures. Not recording critical incidents exposes the department and county to greater liability. (There are presently 20,000 recorded incidents in the archive.)

5. What market research was conducted to substantiate no competition, including evaluation of other items consider?

(Provide a narrative of your efforts to identify other similar or appropriate goods/services, including a summary of how the department concluded that such alternatives are either inappropriate or unavailable. The name and addresses of suppliers contacted and the reasons for not considering them must be included OR an explanation of why the survey or effort to identify other goods/services was not performed.)

As mentioned in #1 above, five vendors were invited to participate with in-field testing. The vendors were selected to participate after research conducted at CopsWest conference, online, consultation with allied agencies in the region, and with references to IACP recommendations. One vendor withdrew because they could not meet minimum requirements. Two vendor were eliminated for weak features and functions compared with the remaining systems. The last competing system was eliminated for poor picture quality and weak evidentiary integrity. 

B. PRICE ANALYSIS

1. How was the price offered determined to be fair and reasonable?

(Explain what basis was used for comparison and include cost analysis as applicable.)

The price offered is consistent with that offered to allied agencies in the area. El Dorado compared pricing offered to several other agencies including Elk Grove, Placer, Arizona Public Safety, and Palo Alto and determined that the price is at or below allied agencies. The price offered is consistent with the cost of the system it is replacing. Competing vendors have similar pricing structures.

2. Describe any cost savings or avoidance realized (1 time or on-going) by acquiring the goods/services from this supplier

The primary purpose of this system is avoidance of legal liability.