

JACKSON PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT

Jackson, Mississippi
Date: March 07, 2023

**Board of Trustees
Jackson Public School District
Jackson, Mississippi**

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Presented for your review on the attached page(s) are the bid tabulations for the formal bid proposals which were received in response to the bid solicitations indicated below. Bids were publicly advertised and opened according to all legal requirements (Mississippi Code of 1972, §31-7-13). All bids were tabulated, analyzed and based upon compliance with the specifications; the "lowest and best" bids were determined. Recommendations concerning the award of bids received for each bid category are contained on the attached page(s). Please consider recommendations for the following:

Bid Number	Opening Date	Bid Name
Bid 3216	02-15-23	Renovations at Wells APAC
RFP 2022-19	06-30-22	Hosted Voice Over IP Phone System

It is recommended that the following action be taken by the Board of Trustees:

A. **AN ORDER** be adopted ratifying the prior solicitation of bid proposals for the equipment, supplies, commodities and/or services in each bid category indicated above.

B. **AN ORDER** be adopted authorizing the Chief Operations Officer or his designee to issue purchase orders and/or execute contracts and all related documents on behalf of the Board of Trustees to the vendors deemed to have submitted the "lowest and best" bids as indicated on the attached pages.

C. **AN ORDER** be adopted to reject the bid of bidders who failed to comply with bid requirements, for the reason(s) indicated with each bid category, on the attached pages.

D. **AN ORDER** be adopted to authorize the informal purchase of items according to all legal requirements and to the extent allowed under the law (Mississippi Code 1972, Annotated, §31-7-13(b)) for which no formal bids were received as indicated in the detailed support documentation on file in the Business Office.

Submitted by:
Mr. Earl Burke
Chief Operations Officer

Recommendation approved by:
Dr. Errick L. Greene, Superintendent
Superintendent of Schools

Information about the Content and Formatting of the Attached Bid Tabulation Sheet(s)

Pursuant to the legal requirements as outlined in the Mississippi Code 1972, Annotated, §31-7-13(d), all bid proposals received were compared to the written bid specifications and the recommendation to purchase or for rejection is indicated on the following pages, as per the manner prescribed below.

Recommendation to Purchase:

The recommendation to purchase from or award a contract to any vendor, is indicated on the attached tabulation sheet(s) by placing "Low Bid" to the right of the vendor's name/pricing and bolding the information.

Rejection of an Item or an Entire Bid:

The law requires that the District clearly state why in each instance that the lowest bid received is not the recommended "lowest and best" bid. The specific reason that an item or service, or a vendor's entire bid proposal, must be deemed "irregular" or "non-compliant" with the written bid specifications and therefore cannot be recommended for purchase, is indicated on the attached tabulation sheet(s) by drawing a line through the vendor's name/pricing and indicating the rejection reason beside the item.

Unit Price Differences Between the Lowest and the "Lowest and Best" Bid:

The unit price of all items is indicated and a difference between the bid unit price of the proposed item being rejected and the unit price of the item being recommended for purchase as the "lowest and best" can easily be computed from the data on the following pages. For each item, please see the attached tabulation sheet(s) for the bid name and number and opening date, item description, unit of measure, quantity purchased, and the unit or total pricing submitted by all vendors offering bid proposals.

Minority Vendor Participation in the Bid Process:

At the direction of the Board, all minority and women owned and operated vendors offering bid proposals are identified on the attached tabulation sheets, for informational purposes only. The following coding has been used:

- "M" Minority (Male) owned and operated business
- "W" Women (Non-minority) owned and operated business
- "B" Minority (Women) owned and operated business
- "N" Non-Minority owned and operated business

Bid 3216 (02-15-23) – Renovations at Wells APAC

Funding Source: 3914-900-5600-000-450-066 and 2598-900-5900-021-066

Recommendation: Lena Franklin and Sandra Robinson

	Vendor	Location	Base Bid	Alternate #1
N	Conerly Construction	Clinton, MS	\$413,000.00	\$848,000.00
W	Big Construction	Brandon, MS	\$635,000.00	\$1,065,000.00

RFP 2022-19 (06-30-2022) Hosted Voice Over IP Phone System

Funding Source: District Maintenance

Recommendation: Mrs. Erin Mason

	Vendor	Location	Amount
N	Telepak Networks, Inc. dba C Spire Business	Ridgeland, MS	\$140,639.28
N	Voxo	Hattiesburg, MS	\$143,880.00
N/ A	Communication Square, LLC	Sheridan, WY	\$110,890.00
N	Vonage Business, Inc.	Holmdel, NJ	\$246,022.08
N/ A	Intlx Solutions, LLC	Canton, MA	\$310,700.00
N	ENA Services, LLC	Nashville, TN	\$143,449.92
N	8x8, Inc.	Campbell, CA	\$199,318.00
N	UniVoxx, Inc.	Sterling Heights, MI	\$179,030.26
N	CDW Government, LLC	Vernon Hills, IL	\$213,458.05
N	RingCentral, Inc.	Belmont, CA	\$335,467.50
N	In-Telecom	Slidell, LA	\$356,258.00
N	Business Communications, Inc (BCI)	Ridgeland, MS	\$226,100.88
N	AT&T, Group	Jackson, MS	\$250,127.16
N	Granite Telecommunications, LLC	Quincy, MA	\$404,181.00
N	Total Communications	Brick, NJ	\$218,123.40

As part of the RFP, the District asked vendors to provide the cost for both purchasing and leasing phones if available. Also, as part of the RFP,

vendors were asked to submit both a “Year One Cost” and a “Year Two and Beyond Annual Cost” for the committee to evaluate.

During the review process, the District made the decision to lease the phones. Also, due to the complexity of both the project and the responses, and for the purposes of equitable comparison, the amount listed in the bid tab is the amount for the phone leasing, installation, implementation, support, and services for only year one for each vendor.

The solution proposed by Communication Square LLC requires the District to purchase Microsoft A5 licensing that the District does not currently purchase. This would add at minimum, an additional \$105,000 annually to the cost of the phone service.

The committee determined that the solution proposed by CSpire did not offer as many of the feature sets and phone system options as available in the solution proposed by ENA. Specifically, the CSpire solution did not offer a management platform that could give the District live access to our phone system tenant and give us the ability to use our phone system data for “just-in-time” decision making purposes.