



**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
CAMP RANDALL**

INITIAL BID ANALYSIS – VIDEO AND SCORING PACKAGE

**From: Frank Moraski, Principal
Anthony James Partners
3900 Westerre Parkway
Richmond VA 23233
914-441-6606**

August 17, 2012



INTERNAL DOCUMENT – NOT FOR PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION

1.0 GENERAL

Two bids were submitted for the Camp Randall LED Video and Scoring Package. The purpose of this document is to provide an overview of the bids and an objective evaluation of the best options.

2.0 FINANCIAL COMPARISONS

The base bids are as follows:

YESCO	DAKTRONICS
\$2,673,157	\$3,375,904

Both bids are under AJP's projections. With the wide disparity in price, both bidders were invited to make presentations and answer a series of questions posed by the committee and to review bids for compliance with the specifications, voluntary alternates and for any potential bidding errors.

3.0 PRODUCT OFFERING COMPARISONS

The following items were noted as points of significant consideration in the evaluation of both bids:

- **LED Supplier and Model**

The bidders have several choices in suppliers of LED's when a display is manufactured. The LED's represent the largest cost in the manufacturing of the display and thus the biggest opportunity for a bidder to reduce costs. The reduced cost comes with a large impact on quality, especially over the long term. Therefore, AJP specified that only a Nichia or Cree LED would be acceptable for this project. Nichia and Cree are recognized throughout the world as the top LED suppliers. Both bidders are using Nichia for this project.

In addition to the LED supplier, the model or series the bidder intends to use can further identify the quality of the LED. AJP does not typically specify this, but asks for verification of the model being used and includes as a contract requirement. Our specifications call out very stringent performance criteria that prevent the use of a low grade model. Daktronics will be using the Nichia GS series in their displays. Yesco will be using the Nichia KS series. The KS series is the Nichia recommended diode for your application. However, we have viewed several Daktronics video screens using the GS series LED and have found them to be acceptable.

We would give a slight edge to Yesco in this category; however we do not believe this to be a significant difference. Both are using high quality diodes and we believe the performance specifications listed in the RFP will be met by both. We are only addressing this in this document because both bidders made bold statements about their competitor's choice of LED.

- **Pixel Counts**

Due to slight differences in pixel spacing the total pixels provided in each bidder's displays are different, although both are supplying 20mm displays (16mm for the section A display).



Across the three displays, Daktronics is supplying 28,558 more pixels or approximately 2.5%. At a cost of \$1.35 per pixel from the bid from submitted by Daktronics; this has a "value" of \$38,553.

However, if we compare the Daktronics's HD15 product which is their flagship outdoor display, the valuation reverses. Daktronics has offered to provide the HD15 in lieu of the 20mm at no additional cost. If Daktronics was the choice for this project, this is the product AJP would recommend. Athletics made this choice as well for the fascia project. In terms of pixel counts, the HD 15 has 11% fewer pixels than their 20mm, thus providing approximately 93,000 less pixels than the Yesco 20mm (value of \$125,000).

- **Power Supply Redundancy**

Daktronics made a point in the interview that they were supplying 100% power supply redundancy in their displays – meaning every power supply has its own back-up. Daktronics claimed this was per the RFP, which is false. It is not part of the AJP specification and never has been as this is over-kill for a component that does not have a high failure rate and limited impact on the overall display when it does fail.

Yesco addresses this issue by designing their system so that an adjacent power supply serves as backup should one power supply fail.

Yesco has a more efficient design (based on our understanding), but as both are providing power supply redundancy, there is no discernible advantage for the end user.

- **Operating System**

Daktronics uses their Show Control system to control the displays and Yesco is offering the Click Effects system. Both systems are in numerous high profile sports facilities and are highly regarded in the industry. Both will perform all required functions for this project and we have no reservations with either. The two differences to consider are that Show Control is a Daktronics supplied product and Click Effects is a third party supplier to Yesco. The other is that Show Control will be in use to control the new LED ribbon boards. A decision to go with Yesco will mean that there will be two different control systems for the production team to operate. As there is currently a Click Effect Crossfire in the Kohl Center control room this should not be an issue. If desired, Yesco did offer to include an additional Click Effects Blaze controller to run the Daktronics ribbon at no additional costs. Coordination with Daktronics will be necessary to assure this can work, but this has been done in other facilities.

- **Operating System Redundancy**

Daktronics claimed to have provided a complete back-up system for each of their three operating systems provided in the bid. A total of 6 servers. Total cost for these units per the bid form is \$86,385. If they are able to configure their system to have one back-up system for the three primary systems (as Yesco offered), there is a potential savings of approximately \$30K.

- **Cladding**

This was discussed due to the large price difference in the bid form for this line item. Both bidders confirmed they were meeting the specifications outlined in the RFP. Daktronics confirmed that they included all secondary steel in the cladding line item rather than in the secondary steel line item. When these two line items are put together for each bidder the difference is not as great - \$632K vs. \$561K.



- **Extended Warranty**

Yesco has offered to include game day support through year 2, parts and labor through year 3 and parts through year 5 at no additional cost. For equivalent service from Daktronics this will cost \$86,209. Daktronics did state in the meeting that these costs did include the new displays recently purchased. Removing those displays from the numbers brings the difference down to \$68,684 (based on pricing provided in the bid form).

During the interview, Daktronics indicated that the difference in bid price was much closer than it appeared due to their bid meeting the letter of the RFP, but exceeding what Daktronics believes is needed. AJP has addressed each of the items Daktronics stated, plus others, and we do not see it the same way. The table below puts the quantifiable items side by side in order to make a value adjustment to the bids.

Category	Yesco	Daktronics 20mm	Daktronics HD15
Base Bid	\$2,673,157	\$3,375,904	\$3,375,904
Pixel Count		-\$38,553	+\$125,000
Operating System Redundancy		-\$30,000	-\$30,000
Extended Warranty		+\$68,684	+\$68,684
Remove Requirement for fiber innerduct*		-\$30,000	-\$30,000
Discount with Audio package		-\$67,518	-\$67,518
Value Adjusted Bid	\$2,673,157	\$3,278,517	\$3,442,070

*Yesco will include the fiber innerduct for \$10,000. Daktronics stated that they may be able to reduce their cost by \$30K by removing the requirement.

The net impact with the 20mm is about a \$100K reduction and with the HD15 is actually an increase of \$67K. Removing the pixel count valuation, the impact for either display is a reduction of \$62K to Daktronics pricing.

4.0 RECOMMENDATION

The \$700,000 price difference is just too great to not recommend Yesco for award of this project. We understand that Athletics and Daktronics have a long history together and that the relationship is a very good one. We do not take that lightly in making the recommendation, however based on our experiences with Yesco on other projects we believe they will deliver a great product, on-schedule and will follow up with excellent service.

In addition, based on the bid criteria for award, AJP finds no reason to eliminate the low bidder. Yesco has met all specifications and in the interview clarified that they have the complete scope of work included in their bid. Yesco has also included additional scope at no cost with the installation of fiber for the audio vendor, sharing crane time, and providing additional Click Effects units. We simply believe Yesco has won this bid. In fact, we are greatly concerned that an award to Daktronics at this point will lead to a bid protest.

We would like to further recommend that Athletics take advantage of the aggressive pricing and upgrade to the 16mm video screen. Doing this will provide a true HD video screen with a higher



quality image. The vertical resolution will increase from 624 to 800 (28% increase) and the total pixel count will increase to over 1.5M from 928,000 (61% increase). The Yesco offer price of \$425K is a fair price for the upgrade.

Right now in the Big 10, we know of at least 3 schools with HD video screens in their football stadiums (Ohio State, Michigan State, Michigan). It will not be long before all or most of the Big 10 schools upgrade to an HD video screen.

We are not aware of all the financial goals of this project, so we can only speak to what we do know. The following table is based on the financial workbooks that we have provided throughout this process.

Item	Budget/Projection	Bid/Award Amount	Savings
2012 LED Fascia Project	\$1,413,165	\$1,155,815	\$257,614
2013 LED Video Project	\$3,617,202	\$2,673,157	\$994,045
2013 Audio Project	\$1,050,000	\$1,100,477	(\$50,477)
Contingency and Bond*	\$467,647	\$100,000	\$367,647
Total	\$6,548,014	\$5,029,449	\$1,518,565
16mm Upgrade	0	\$425,626	-425,626

*Bond costs are included in bid/award amount. \$100,000 is shown as a recommended contingency hold.

This does not include the engineering and primary structure costs carried by GC. AJP projections were \$600K. Actuals undetermined.

Based on these figures, the project can easily afford the upgrade to the 16mm as well as any additional needs for the audio system. All the while saving close to or more than \$1M off the budget.

END