Contracts and Purchasing Board County Administration Building, 4th Floor April 16, 2012 11:30 AM

I. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 11:35 AM

II. Review and Approve Minutes: The minutes were approved as written, Stan Kosilesky abstained

III. Public Comment: There was no public comment

IV. Contracts and Awards

A. Tabled Items

| Item | Requestor | Description | Board Action |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| CPB2012- 325 | County Prosecutor | Recommending to employ Brett Horton and the law firm of Horton & Horton Co., LPA, in the amount not-to-exceed \$1,900.00 for legal services in connection with employment matters for Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court, in accordance with Ohio Revised Code Section 305.14(A). Funding Source: 100% General Fund | Approve Disapprove X Hold |
| CPB2012- 333 | Court of Common Pleas/ | What is the product/service that you seek to acquire? CML-6 certified mailer | |
| | Juvenile Court Division; Clerk of Courts; and Department of Public Works | 2. Will this purchase obligate Cuyahoga County to this or any other vendor for future purchases, for example, maintenance, licensing or continuing need? Yes, the Ohio Rules of Civil procedure mandates service via certified mail. 47,913 summons were issued in 2011 and sent via certified mail as required by the Rules of Civil procedure. There will be a continuing need for the foreseeable future. | |
| | | 3. Why do you need to acquire these goods or services? First, this mailer is the least labor intensive mailer that the court is aware of. Second, In order to print what the clerk's office requires to be printed on the form, it would require multiple forms if we picked another mailer. Whereas now, the clerk's office can utilize just one form. Next, I-Case (the court information system) was designed to use that mailer. If the clerk's office uses another mailer, then software would need to be changed. Currently, the court does not have another contract with any vendor to support our information system. | |
| | | 4. Why are the requested goods/services the only ones that can satisfy your requirements? The CML-6 mailer is the only certified mailer available to the court that allows automated laser printing of data from I-Case onto PS Form 3811 as part of a pre-printed | |

certified mail envelope which holds tip to 20 pages single folded the inch length. Mailers patent# is 5,901,903.

5. Were alternative goods/services evaluated? If yes, what were they and why were they unacceptable? Please be specific with regard to features, characteristics', requirements, capabilities and compatibility. If no, why were alternatives not evaluated?

Alternative certified mailers have been reviewed. All of the other mailers of which we are aware are more labor intensive in that the certified mail receipts must be separated after printing and then manually affixed to the envelope. In addition, many do not allow more than a few pages to be inserted into the envelope. The mailer has all of the certified mail forms already part of and affixed to the envelope which holds up to 20pages in the envelope. Most of our mailings contain multiple pages. If another mailer were to be used, significant software modifications would have to be made to our 1-Case Information System. We do not have a maintenance agreement, nor sufficient I.T. staff to make the necessary modifications. An additional cost would be incurred to make such software modifications.

6. Identity specific steps taken to negate need for sole source provider.

No efforts have been made to identity and or locate alternative goods/services because our case management system is currently designed to accommodate the CML-6 mailers. If other mailers are utilized, a design change would be required for our system which may incur additional costs and affect work productivity. However, we shall consult with our IT Department to explore other alternatives.

7. Has your department bought these goods/services in the past? If yes, who was the contractor/supplier and was the requirement competitively bid or sole source? What was the last date and price paid for goods/services?

Ferrarelli, Inc. was the supplier and they are sole source. The last date of purchase was August 12, 2011. The purchase price was \$11,867.79.

8. What efforts have been made or are being made to reduce the Department's reliance on a sole source provider for these goods/services in the future?

| Currently, no efforts are being made due to the Ohio Rules of Civil procedures, which mandate service via certified mail. However, we shall consult with our IT department to explore other alternatives. This will be an on-going need. Utilizing these mailers have proven to be a cost- effective method of complying with the mandate, which also assists in maintaining adequate work productivity. | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9.What efforts were made to get the best possible price? The court was able to receive mailers at a lower cost due to the quantity ordered. The cost would have been substantially higher if a lesser quantity would have been ordered. In addition, the vendor has always answered the courts inquires as to the features, functions, and assistance with the mailers after purchase. Why Is the price for this purchase considered to be fair and reasonable? | |
| The cost of completing the U.S.P.S. forms and envelopes manually would be \$41,092 for salaries and benefits, plus \$4,734 for envelopes and printing cost; versus \$19,251 expended for the number of Ferrarelli mailers used in 2011. 10. Amount to be paid: \$24,470.00 | XApprove Disapprove Hold |
| | of Civil procedures, which mandate service via certified mail. However, we shall consult with our IT department to explore other alternatives. This will be an on-going need. Utilizing these mailers have proven to be a cost- effective method of complying with the mandate, which also assists in maintaining adequate work productivity. 9.What efforts were made to get the best possible price? The court was able to receive mailers at a lower cost due to the quantity ordered. The cost would have been substantially higher if a lesser quantity would have been ordered. In addition, the vendor has always answered the courts inquires as to the features, functions, and assistance with the mailers after purchase. Why Is the price for this purchase considered to be fair and reasonable? The cost of completing the U.S.P.S. forms and envelopes manually would be \$41,092 for salaries and benefits, plus \$4,734 for envelopes and printing cost; versus \$19,251 expended for the number of Ferrarelli mailers used in |

B. Scheduled Items

| Item | Requestor | Description | Board Action |
|-----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| CPB2012- 358 | Department of Development | Submitting a contract with C.B. Mullins Construction Company, Inc. in the amount of \$3,300.00 for Lead Remediation of property located at 5417 Orchard Street, Maple Heights, in connection with the FY2010 Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control and Lead Hazard Reduction | |
| | | Demonstration Grant Program for the period 4/16/2012 - 6/15/2012. | XApprove |
| | | Funding Source: 100% US Dept. of HUD Lead Hazard Remediation Grant | Disapprove Hold |
| CPB2012- 359 | Department of Development | Requesting approval to apply for and accept grant funds from Ohio Department of Transportation, Office of Aviation in the amount of \$175,000.00 for the FY2013 Ohio Airport Grant Program for the period 10/1/2012 - 12/31/2013. | |
| | | Funding Source: 100% Ohio Dept. of Transportation, Office of Aviation, for FY2013 Ohio Airport Grant Program | XApprove Disapprove Hold |
| CPB2012- | Department of | Community Initiatives Division/Office of Early Childhood, | |

| | | - | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 360 | Health and Human Services | submitting an agreement with Cuyahoga Community College District in the amount not-to-exceed \$2,872.60 for rental of meeting space and related services for the Invest in Children Program Visioning event to be held on 4/19/2012. | XApprove |
| | | Funding Source: 100% Private donations and HHS levy dollars | Disapprove |
| CPB2012- 361 | Juvenile Court | Submitting contracts with various municipalities for the Community Diversion Program for the period 1/1/2012 - 12/31/2012: | |
| | | a) City of Brecksville, Brecksville in the amount not-to-exceed \$2,400.00. | |
| | | b) City of Broadview Heights in the amount not-to-exceed \$1,200.00. | |
| | | c) City of Brooklyn in the amount not-to-exceed \$6,000.00. | |
| | | d) City of Brook Park in the amount not-to-exceed \$1,200.00. | |
| | | e) Village of Bratenahl in the amount of \$-0 | |
| | | f) Village of Brooklyn Heights, Brooklyn Heights in the amount of \$-0 | XApprove Disapprove |
| | | Funding Source: 100% General Fund | Hold |
| CPB2012- 362 | Department of Public Safety and Justice Services/Public Safety Grants | Submitting agreements with various municipalities for reimbursement of eligible expenses in connection with the FY2009 State Homeland Security-Law Enforcement Grant Program for the period 8/1/2009 - 3/30/2012: a) City of Painesville in the amount not-to-exceed \$296.82. | |
| | | b) City of Solon in the amount not-to-exceed \$769.50. | _XApprove Disapprove |
| | | Funding Source: 100% DHS through OEMA | Hold |
| CPB2012- 363 | Department of Public Safety and Justice Services/Public Safety Grants | Submitting an agreement with Orange Village in the amount not-to-exceed \$17,040.00 for reimbursement of eligible expenses in connection with the FY2009 Urban Area Security Grant Program for the period 3/20/2012 - 6/30/2012. | XApprove |
| | | Funding Source: 100% DHS through OEMA | Disapprove Hold |

| CPB2012- | Department of | Department of Public Safety and Justice Services/Public | |
|----------|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 364 | Public Safety | Safety Grants, submitting an agreement with Southeast | |
| | and Justice | Area Law Enforcement for the purchase of equipment, | |
| | Services/Public | valued in the amount of \$8,700.00, for the FY2009 State | |
| | Safety Grants | Homeland Security Grant Program for the period 8/1/2009 - 4/30/2012. | |
| | | | XApprove |
| | | Funding Source: 100% FY09 State Homeland Security | Disapprove |
| | | Funds through OEMA | Hold |
| CPB2012- | Department of | Submitting an agreement with City of Lakewood in the | |
| 365 | Public Safety | amount of \$37,000.00 for development, implementation | |
| | and Justice | and deployment of an automated interface system to link | |
| | Services/Cuyah | HTE Crimes Records Management System, Cuyahoga | |
| | oga Regional | County Regional Information System and Cuyahoga InJail | |
| | Information | application for the period 12/21/2011 - 12/20/2012. | |
| | System Section | | |
| | | Funding Source: 100% by the Cuyahoga Regional | XApprove |
| | | Information System, funded primarily by user fees and | Disapprove |
| | | moving violation fees | Hold |
| CPB2012- | Department of | Submitting a contract with Linking Employment, Abilities | |
| 366 | Workforce | & Potential in the amount not-to-exceed \$60,000.00 for | |
| | Development | training and employment related services to individuals | |
| | | with disabilities for the period 3/1/2012 - 6/30/2012. | XApprove |
| | | | Disapprove |
| | | Funding Source: 100% Federal WIA funds | Hold |

C. Exemption Requests

| Item | Requestor | Description | Board Action |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| CPB2012- 367 | County Sheriff | Vendor: St. Vincent Charity Hospital | |
| 307 | SHEIII | Description of Supplies or Services (If contract amendment, please identify contract term and/or scope change) Vincent Charity Hospital provides physicals for prospective new hires at the Sheriff's Office. | |
| | | 2. Estimated Dollar Value and Funding Source(s) including percentage breakdown Not to exceed \$10,000, 100% SH350272 – Sheriff's General Fund | |
| | | 3. Rationale Supporting the Use of the Selected Procurement Method The Sheriff's Office will be hiring upwards of 100 new deputies, protective services and corrections officers, and medical staff in 2012. Each prospective new hire is required to pass a physical. While it is the responsibility of the | |

| | | Sheriff's Office to pay for this service, it is the responsibility of Human Resources to order the physical. **The current process to order the physical: Human Resources confirms to the Sheriff's Office that the physical needs to take place for a certain candidate, a BuySpeed requisition then needs to be processed for the one candidate, OPD must then review and approve the requisition, a DO must then be processed, printed, and sent to the Auditor's Office for approval, upon approval of funds by the Auditor's Office, the service can then be ordered – total turn around time is approximately 10 – 21 days. In an effort to streamline and not further impede on the hiring process, the Sheriff's Office is requesting an exemption to allow Human Resources to automatically request a physical from St. Vincent's Charity Hospital for the Sheriff's Office prospective employee and for the BuySpeed/OPD process to take place upon receipt of the invoice. 4. What other available options and/or vendors were evaluated? If none, include the reasons why. n/a 5. What ultimately led you to this product or service? Why was the recommended vendor selected? n/a 6. Provide an explanation of unacceptable delays in fulfilling the County's need that would be incurred if award | |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | was made through a competitive bid. n/a 7. Describe what future plans, if any, the County can take to permit competition before any subsequent purchases of the required supplies or services. n/a | Approve Disapprove X Hold |
| CPB2012- 368 | Department of Health and Human Services | Vendor: Emerald Development & Economic Network, Inc. 1. Description of Supplies or Services. Requesting an Exemption from the RFP process as provided in Ordinance No. 02011-0046, 3.03 G. RFP Exemptions, on behalf of EDEN, Inc. In 1993, Cuyahoga County applied for and was awarded the first of many Shelter Plus Care (S+C) grants from the U.S. | |
| | | Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD). S+C provides a rent subsidy to homeless persons with long term and serious disabilities. The community "matches" the rent dollars with in-kind behavioral health care services. | |

The initial grant application was a collaborative application with the Mental Health Board, EDEN, and the County. Only Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) or Units of Local Government are eligible applicants under the S+C Program regulations. The Mental Health Board had requested that the County submit the application because of this requirement. EDEN was identified in the grant application as the agency that would administer the rent subsidies because it is the nonprofit housing arm of the Mental Health Board. As such, EDEN had demonstrated expertise and capacity to manage eligibility determinations, rent payments, and linkages with mainstream systems serving mentally ill and chemically addicted disabled populations.

As a result of the 1993 S+C Application, Cuyahoga County was awarded \$9.9 million to Cuyahoga County for 316 units of housing for a five year term. The efficacy of providing permanent housing with supportive services for disabled homeless persons was confirmed through the implementation of this grant.

Based on this evidence, the County continued to apply for new S+C grant awards, maintaining the collaborative model with EDEN as the sub contract provider, and expanding the behavioral health partnership to include the Alcohol and Drug Board, the AIDS Task Force, and the VA. To date, over 1,400 S+C subsidized units exist throughout the county.

As the five year grant terms have expired, HUD has maintained funding through annual RENEWAL Grant Awards. Each year, the OHS manages an application process on behalf of the community which includes over 40 programs operated by various agencies. HUD recognizes this process as a "Consolidated" Grant Application. It includes projects for which the County is the direct applicant as well as projects for which other community providers are the direct applicants. All the projects seeking RENEWAL Funding are reviewed by a volunteer community Review and Ranking Committee. Projects not meeting established, objective review criteria may not be recommended for RENEWAL Funding. Final recommendations are approved by vote of the OHS Advisory Board.

This process is not an RFP, however, it does involve assessment of program performance, outcomes, fiscal management, consumer satisfaction, and consistency with nationally established HUD Program goals and objectives.

2. Estimated Dollar Value

This particular Shelter Plus Care Contract has a dollar value of \$10,116,156.00; the contract/grant award term is 4/15/2012 - 4/14/2-13.

3. Rationale Supporting the Use of the Selected Procurement Method

The funding for this activity was awarded by HUD to the County based on the identification of Emerald Development and Economic Network (EDEN) as the service provider in the Grant Application. It is consistent with the Grant Award to contract with EDEN to implement the program services. EDEN has consistently met all HUD, State, and local audits without Findings.

4. What other available options and/or vendors were evaluated? If none, include the reasons why.

Per the discussion in # 1, the Exemption is being requested based on the provider having been identified in a grant application, and then the County being awarded funding based on the provider's capacity to perform the grant activities., as judged by the funder, HUD.

- 5. What ultimately lead you to this product or service? Why was the recommended vendor selected?

 See Above
- 6. Provide an explanation of unacceptable delays in fulfilling the County's need that would be incurred if award was made through a competitive bid.

Contract funding is provided through a GRANT RENEWAL AWARD. This means that the Contract enables the provider to maintain monthly rent subsidies to private landlords on behalf of disabled and formerly homeless persons. Failure to expedite the approval of the Contract to the provider will result in rents not being paid and disabled persons being threatened with eviction. In addition, failure to move quickly in this situation would threaten the County's current good standing with the funder, the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD). Since HUD provides over \$25,000,000 annually to Cuyahoga County through homeless assistance grants, this would not be in the community's best interests.

7. Describe what future plans, if any, the County can take to permit competition before any subsequent purchases of the required supplies or services.

The OHS requests an EXEMPTION for this application and all

| | T. | | , |
|----------|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| | | other renewal applications, per Section 3.03 G. for this | |
| | | provider, EDEN, Inc. for this service, as well as the other | |
| | | providers funded through the annual McKinney-Vento | |
| | | Homeless Assistance Grant for which the County is identified | |
| | | as the APPLICANT. This would include the following | |
| | | | |
| | | providers: | |
| | | Salvation Army of Greater Cleveland | |
| | | West Side Catholic Center | XApprove |
| | | Domestic Violence Center | Disapprove |
| | | | Hold |
| CPB2012- | Human | OPERATING DEPARTMENT & ACTIVITY: | |
| 369 | Resource | The Human Resource Commission plans to contract by means | |
| 303 | Commission | of other than full and open competition with The Archer | |
| | Commission | · | |
| | | Company. | |
| | | | |
| | | 1. Description of Supplies or Services (If contract | |
| | | amendment, please identify contract term and/or scope | |
| | | change) | |
| | | Classification and compensation studies to include a salary | |
| | | survey for attorney positions in the Prosecutor's Office, and | |
| | | development of classification specifications and job | |
| | | , | |
| | | descriptions for support staff in both the County Prosecutor's | |
| | | office and the Public Defender's office. | |
| | | 2. Estimated Dollar Value and Funding Source(s) including | |
| | | percentage breakdown | |
| | | Approximately \$22,500: estimated \$9,000 to \$10,000 for | |
| | | salary survey for attorney positions in the Prosecutor's office, | |
| | | and estimated \$12,500 to develop classification specifications | |
| | | and job descriptions for support staff in both offices. | |
| | | and job descriptions for support stair in some sinces. | |
| | | 3. Rationale Supporting the Use of the Selected | |
| | | Procurement Method | |
| | | According to the Cuyahoga County Charter, the Human | |
| | | | |
| | | Resource Commission is responsible for administering a | |
| | | countywide classification and salary administration system. | |
| | | The Archer Company has conducted compensation studies of | |
| | | various County offices for over ten years, and has used their | |
| | | proprietary job evaluation system to establish pay grade | |
| | | structures for both the Prosecutor's office, and for those non- | |
| | | bargaining unit classified personnel who work in the County | |
| | | Executive's realm of authority. Utilizing the Archer Company | |
| | | | |
| | | to conduct these studies will enhance the consistency and | |
| | | standardization between in the classification and | |
| | | compensation systems used in various County offices. | |
| | | | |
| | | 4. What other available options and/or vendors were | |
| | | evaluated? If none, include the reasons why. | |

Other options were not explored primarily because Archer's proprietary system is already the foundation of the pay strategies in these two offices, and proprietary job evaluation systems differ in the definition and value of factors utilized to evaluate jobs, so using different systems can lead to different outcomes, supported by different rationales. Therefore, utilizing a new vendor with a different proprietary job evaluation system would not contribute to the Commission's goal of a standardized compensation and classification system. Also, other options were not explored because Archer's previous work in these organizations has provided them with an in-depth knowledge of the organizational structure and the history of compensation practices in these offices and the Commission expects this previous experience will expedite this work.

5. What ultimately led you to this product or service? Why was the recommended vendor selected?

The Archer Company is a nationally-recognized consulting company with experience in both public and private organizations, and has conducted compensation studies for numerous clients, including various agencies of Cuyahoga County. They have worked extensively with clients from various levels of the public sector, including cities, counties, states and federally-funded entities.

Also, the County's HR department requested approval of a contract with Archer for maintenance of the County's classification system for three years, and the HRC sees this as further justification for requesting that the same methodology be utilized for this work.

6. Provide an explanation of unacceptable delays in fulfilling the County's need that would be incurred if award was made through a competitive bid.

The rationale for this request is not a matter of timing; it is based on the HRC's position that utilizing a different vendor will not contribute to the HRC's mission of standardizing personnel practices across various County agencies.

7. Describe what future plans, if any, the County can take to permit competition before any subsequent purchases of the required supplies or services.

Utilizing one job evaluation system to support the classification and compensation systems of the County's various agencies will make a significant contribution to the HRC's goal of standardizing personnel practices across the County's various agencies. In the future, the County may

| | | consider open competition for vendors to complete salary | |
|----------|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| | | surveys, because proprietary systems are not typically utilized | XApprove |
| | | to analyze data or develop recommendations based on the | Disapprove |
| | | data collected. | Hold |
| CPB2012- | Information | Vendor: DELL/ASAP | |
| 370 | Services | | |
| | Center | 1. Description of Supplies or Services (If contract | |
| | | amendment, please identify contract term and/or scope | |
| | | change) | |
| | | (2) SQL Server Enterprise Processor 2008 | |
| | | (2) Windows Server Enterprise 2008 | |
| | | 2. Estimated Dollar Value and Funding Source(s) including | |
| | | percentage breakdown | |
| | | Total amount will not exceed \$38,616.72. | |
| | | 3. Rationale Supporting the Use of the Selected | |
| | | Procurement Method | |
| | | The ISC will give multiple vendors an opportunity to bid even | |
| | | if the product is on state term. | |
| | | 4. What other available options and/or vendors were | |
| | | evaluated? If none, include the reasons why. | |
| | | MNJ was also evaluated. | |
| | | 5. What ultimately led you to this product or service? Why | |
| | | was the recommended vendor selected? | |
| | | ISC had requested server licenses and DELL/ASAP met our | |
| | | requirements also was the lowest bid. | |
| | | 6. Provide an explanation of unacceptable delays in | |
| | | fulfilling the County's need that would be incurred if award | |
| | | was made through a competitive bid. | |
| | | Competitive bidding was applied in this request. | |
| | | 7. Describe what future plans, if any, the County can take to | |
| | | permit competition before any subsequent purchases of the | _XApprove |
| | | required supplies or services. | Disapprove |
| | | Receive more quotes from different vendors. | Hold |
| CPB2012- | Information | Vendor: Sprint Solutions, Inc. | |
| 371 | Services | | |
| | Center | 1. Description of Supplies or Services (If contract | |
| | | amendment, please identify contract term and/or scope | |
| | | change) Amendment to County Wide Data and Voice Communication | |
| | | Amendment to County Wide Data and Voice Communication - CE 1000769 - with Sprint Solutions, Inc. Original Contract | |
| | | was for \$1,200,346.00 amended 8/1/11 | |
| | | for \$147,643.07 or a contract total of \$1,347,989.07 | |
| | | 1 101 9 1 17 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 | |

| 2. Estimated Dollar Value and Funding Source(s) including percentage breakdown | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Amendment is for service at the Department of Children and | |
| Family Services (100% of amendment to CF 135509 0287 HO | |
| 2198) Cost of amendment \$432,069.66, total cost of contract will now be \$1,780,058.73. | |
| 3. Rationale Supporting the Use of the Selected Procurement Method | |
| Sprint was awarded the contract after informal bid of vendors in State of Ohio TSR (Technology Service Request) pricing system. Sprint bid was the lowest and lower than list pricing) Sprint also gave the county \$105,000.00 service credit and a \$200,000.00 for in-building coverage enhancements. Sprint | |
| was by far the lowest and best vendor.4. What other available options and/or vendors were evaluated? If none, include the reasons why. | |
| Bids were only accepted from TSR System vendors. | |
| 5. What ultimately led you to this product or service? Why was the recommended vendor selected? Sprint was by far the lowest and best vendor bidding on service. | |
| 6. Provide an explanation of unacceptable delays in fulfilling the County's need that would be incurred if award was made through a competitive bid. | |
| N/A - this is an amendment - CFS needs the additional service | |
| for their caseworker in the field, they need the service ASAP. | |
| 7. Describe what future plans, if any, the County can take to | |
| permit competition before any subsequent purchases of the | XApprove |
| required supplies or services. Will go out to bid again in 2014 | Disapprove Hold |

D. Consent Agenda

Scheduled Consent Items

| Item | Requestor | Description | Board Action |
|----------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| CPB2012- | Department of | Submitting an amendment (Subsidiary No. 2) to Contract | |
| 372 | Public Works | No. CE1100207-01 with Fabrizi Trucking & Paving Co., Inc. | |
| | | for improvement of Stumph Road from Snow Road to | |
| | | Pearl Road in the Cities of Parma and Parma Heights for a | |
| | | decrease in the amount of (\$46.73). | |
| | | | XApprove |
| | | Funding Source: 70% Ohio Public Works Commission | Disapprove |

| | | (Issue 1), 15% County (\$5.00 Vehicle License Tax fund), 15% Municipalities | Hold |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| CPB2012- 373 | Department of Public Works | Submitting an amendment to Contract No. CE1100532-01 with Karvo Paving Company for resurfacing of Harvard Road from Green Road to Camp Forbes in the Village of Highland Hills for a decrease in the amount of (\$44,516.94). | XApprove |
| | | Funding Source: 100% Cuyahoga County, using funds from the \$7.50 License Tax fund | Disapprove Hold |
| CPB2012- | Office of | Presenting BuySpeed purchases for week of April 16, 2012 | |
| 374 | Procurement | | XApprove |
| | and Diversity | | Disapprove |
| | | | Hold |
| CPB2012- | Department of | Presenting voucher payments between April 5, 2012-April | V |
| 375 | Development | 11, 2012 | XApprove |
| | | | Disapprove |
| | | | Hold |

V. Other Business

VI. General Business

VII. Public Comment

VIII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 12:29 PM