



West Fargo Special City Commission Meeting
West Fargo City Hall Commission Chambers
2515 6th St E, West Fargo 58078
Friday, April 10, 2026 10:00 AM

Meeting Items

A. Call to Order

The West Fargo City Commission meeting was held in the City of West Fargo Commission Chambers on Friday, April 10, 2026.

B. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

C. Roll Call

Commissioner Rory Jorgensen – present (virtually via teams); Commissioner Amy Zundel – present; Commissioner Bernie Dardis – present; Commissioner Brad Olson – present; Commissioner Roben Anderson – present (virtually via teams). All Commissioners were present, there were no Commissioners absent from the meeting.

D. Approve Order of Agenda

Commissioner Olson moved and Commissioner Zundel seconded to approve the order of agenda. Commissioners Jorgensen, Zundel, Dardis, Olson and Anderson voted aye. No Commissioners present voted nay, the motion to approve the order of agenda, was declared carried.

Regular Agenda

1. Request to Award Contract – Security Camera and Door Access Improvements -- Haider Howitzer, Director of Information Technology

City Attorney Katie Schmidt presented her review of the item. Her remarks are attached as an appendix to these minutes.

Commissioner Zundel moved and Commissioner Olson seconded to approve. Commissioners Jorgensen, Zundel, Dardis, Olson and Anderson voted aye. No Commissioners present voted nay, the motion to, was declared carried.

2. Non-Agenda Items

3. Adjourn

Commissioner Olson moved and Commissioner Zundel seconded to adjourn. Commissioners Jorgensen, Zundel, Dardis, Olson and Anderson voted aye. No Commissioners present voted nay, the motion to adjourn, was declared carried.

Bernie Dardis, Commission President

Dustin T. Scott, City Administrator



**Appendix 1:
Transcript of remarks from City Attorney, Katie Schmidt**

1 Thank you, Commission President and Commissioners.

2

3 Since our meeting on Monday night, I've had an opportunity to review the RFQ, the proposals
4 that were submitted in response to the RFQ, and additional information submitted by ETS
5 following the meeting. I've also met with City staff to discuss the RFQ and reviewed
6 correspondence between City staff and proposers that occurred before, during, and
7 following the RFQ evaluation period.

8

9 From that review, I understand the following:

10

11 1. Prior to the issuance of the RFQ in February, there were existing relationships
12 between the City and two of the proposers, including ETS, for the City's current
13 access door and camera systems. City staff utilized quotes received from these
14 companies to determine the budget request amount for the CIP and additionally
15 informed the companies that the City later planned to issue a public request for the
16 work.

17

18 2. The City issued the RFQ on February 2, 2026, with an original deadline for proposals
19 to be submitted 3 weeks later on February 23. On February 19, City staff issued an
20 addendum extending the deadline for submission for 2 additional weeks, making
21 them due by March 2. City staff communicated the extended timeline to prospective
22 proposers, including to ETS on February 18; City staff also posted the addendum on
23 the City's website and published it in the paper. ETS submitted its proposal to the City
24 on February 27, the Friday before the Monday, March 2, deadline.

25

26 3. During the time that the RFQ was open, City staff received and fielded various
27 questions from prospective proposers and encouraged them to visit the City's
28 facilities, which ETS and another prospective proposer did. If City staff missed
29 responding to any questions from prospective proposers during this time, it does not
30 appear to have been intentional or in bad faith.

31

32 4. In response to the RFQ, the City received 3 proposals. The RFQ set forth that the
33 proposals would be considered on 7 qualifications: technical compliance and
34 functionality; alignment with Genetec security center requirements; vendor
35 experience and qualifications; implementation approach and timeline; cost-



- 36 5. effectiveness and pricing clarity; support and maintenance offerings; and scalability
37 and long-term value. City staff met on March 10 to begin evaluating the proposals
38 and found 1 of the proposals received to be non-responsive and did a thorough
39 evaluation of the other 2 proposals based on the RFQ evaluation criteria, including
40 telephoning both of those entities that day to ask for additional information during the
41 evaluation, as authorized by the RFQ.
42
- 43 6. ETS has raised a concern about not knowing that cameras over the 4 MP threshold
44 needed to be replaced. The RFQ, however, did not include a MP threshold for the
45 cameras and was instead drafted more broadly and indicated that approximately 140
46 cameras across all of the City's locations would need replacement, leaving the
47 specifics as to what the City needed for the system to the discretion of the proposers.
48
- 49 7. ETS additionally contends it would have submitted a lower price if it had known about
50 a 4 MP threshold before submitting its proposal. City staff, however, asked ETS about
51 its pricing for these items while it was still evaluating the proposals, and even if ETS's
52 pricing for these items would have varied from its submitted proposal, the evaluation
53 criteria were much broader than just pricing.
54
- 55 8. Overall, it appears that City staff very seriously considered ETS's proposal, as well as
56 the other proposal, and ultimately recommended the other proposer based on the
57 RFQ evaluation criteria.
58

59 I am available for any questions that you may have.

