



Council Agenda Correspondence

DATE: December 10, 2024

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Greg Hermann, Deputy City Manager

Prepared by: Josh Erquiaga, IT Manager

VIA: Whitney McDonald, City Manager

SUBJECT: ITEM 5I – AWARD CONTRACT TO MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS FOR BODY-WORN CAMERA, IN-CAR VIDEO HARDWARE, AND CLOUD SERVICES

Staff received the following questions from a Council Member regarding the Council Agenda Report for Item 5I on the Consent Agenda. The questions are below with staff's response shown in *italics*.

1. Can you explain in a little more detail why we are bypassing the usual bid process?

The decision to bypass the formal RFP process for this hardware purchase aligns with standard practices when the City maintains an ongoing relationship with a vendor. The City has relied on Motorola (formerly WatchGuard) for its body-worn and in-car camera systems for many years. This decision is based on the proven performance of their products, the staff's familiarity with the technology, and the potential cost savings from avoiding a platform transition.

City purchasing policy allows competitively bid contracts to be used in lieu of the City running its own bid process. Large organizations bid on these contracts on behalf of many stakeholders, and they are heavily used in information technology to purchase commodity goods and services. The City generally could not negotiate better terms independently due to its much smaller purchasing power. Examples of contracts are Omnia Partners, the National Association of State Procurement Officials (NASPO), and Sourcewell.

2. How do the costs for the first year equate to \$300,000 if the full 5-year cost is \$567,723.75?

Staff have discovered an oversight in the Fiscal Analysis table. A total of \$300,000 was budgeted in the IT Replacement Fund in the 2023-25 Financial Plan to replace body-worn and in-car camera systems. The total first-year cost in FY 2024-25 is \$188,113.75 and covers the initial hardware purchase and the first year of subscription service from Motorola. Staff have proposed using the budgeted amount to also cover the FY 2025-26 subscription costs as well. The five-year breakdown is as follows:

*FY 2024-25: \$188,113.75 (hardware + subscription)
 FY 2025-26: \$94,775 (subscription)
 FY 2026-27: \$94,858 (subscription)
 FY 2027-28: \$94,944 (subscription)
 FY 2028-29: \$95,033 (subscription)
 Total: \$567,723.75*

The corrected table in the report should read as follows:

Funding Sources	Total Budget Available	Current Funding Request	Remaining Balance	Annual Ongoing Cost
General Fund				\$94,945
IT Repl Fund - LRM	\$300,000	\$282,888.75	\$17,111.25	
Total	\$300,000	\$282,888.75	\$17,111.25	

As the City has seen systems move from up-front capital purchases to subscription services, we have adjusted the policies and procedures that govern the use of the IT Replacement Fund. The IT Replacement Fund is used for capital purchases. As subscription services are not capital purchases, ongoing subscription costs are being moved out of the IT Replacement Fund to the department's operating budget using the service. In this case, subscription services for years three through five will move to the Police Department's operating budget.

3. As to process, why would we ask for the remainder of the funds as an SOBC instead of just budgeting for the cost in the 25-27 Financial Plan?

In previous years, the City purchased body-worn and in-car camera systems as on-premise systems, meaning all of the servers and data storage that made up the systems resided within the City's facilities and were treated as capital purchases. In recent years, all comparable systems have shifted to the cloud with an associated annual subscription cost. As the subscription cost was not previously a part of the Police Department's operating budget, an SOBC is the appropriate way to request a change to the Police Department budget to include that line item in the second year (FY 2026-27) of the 2025-27 Financial Plan.