

# Addendum Number 1

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
FOR INMATE TELEPHONE AND VIDEO VISITATION SYSTEM  
FOR THE  
COLUMBIA COUNTY JAIL

## Questions from Vendors

This Addendum Number 1 is issued in response to questions submitted via email by the vendors who attended the Mandatory Proposal Conference on September 13, 2016. Proposers are not required to provide written acknowledgment of receipt of Addendum Number 1.

1. In order to provide our best possible offer, it is very important to have historical call volume information for all call types. Call volume data is necessary to estimate costs as well as potential revenues. The current vendor has access to this information, so distributing the information to other vendors in a timely fashion will ensure a level playing field for all bidders. Please provide as much data as possible from the following chart:

Call Category	# of Calls Per Month	# of Minutes Per Month	Total Revenue Per Month
LOCAL – Collect			
INTRALATA – Collect			
INTERLATA – Collect			
INTERSTATE – Collect			
LOCAL – Debit			
INTRALATA – Debit			
INTERLATA – Debit			
INTERSTATE - Debit			
International - Debit			
LOCAL – PrePaid Collect			
INTRALATA – PrePaid Collect			
INTERLATA – PrePaid Collect			
INTERSTATE – PrePaid Collect			

**Call volumes and breakdown by Call Type and Bill Type for 2015 were already provided in the RFP. You did not specify what month you wanted the call breakdown, but you can divide by 12 to get the average monthly figures, which would allow for monthly fluctuations throughout the year. Specific figures for a**

specific month, if previously specified, would not allow for fluctuations throughout the year.

The following is a breakdown of the revenue and commissions for 2015, by month:

2015	Revenue	Commissions
Jan	\$ 2,841.89	\$ 1,046.92
Feb	\$ 2,967.51	\$ 1,036.23
Mar	\$ 3,246.13	\$ 1,198.71
Apr	\$ 4,184.89	\$ 1,642.71
May	\$ 4,041.20	\$ 1,658.22
Jun	\$ 4,275.35	\$ 1,789.21
Jul	\$ 3,777.80	\$ 1,566.32
Aug	\$ 3,752.96	\$ 1,598.98
Sep	\$ 5,586.40	\$ 2,482.44
Oct	\$ 4,244.74	\$ 1,843.40
Nov	\$ 5,678.52	\$ 2,298.68
Dec	\$ 5,632.38	\$ 2,267.27
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$50,229.77</b>	<b>\$ 20,429.09</b>

- Also, in order to help us evaluate call volumes and recognize additional revenue potential, it is very helpful to have the rates currently being charged to called parties under the current contract. Please provide the following information:

Call Category	Rate for First Minute	Rate for Each Additional Minute
LOCAL – Collect		
INTRALATA – Collect		
INTERLATA – Collect		
INTERSTATE – Collect		
LOCAL – Debit		
INTRALATA – Debit		
INTERLATA – Debit		
INTERSTATE - Debit		
International - Debit		
LOCAL – PrePaid Collect		
INTRALATA – PrePaid Collect		
INTERLATA – PrePaid Collect		
INTERSTATE – PrePaid Collect		

Call volumes were already provided in the RFP and revenues were provided in Question #1. The County strongly encourages all Bidders to develop and offer their own solutions and corresponding rates, separate from those currently offered or will be offered by other Bidders. The County requires that Bidders comply with FCC-mandated or allowed rates.

3. Will the County please outline the fees that are being charged by the current vendor:
  - a. Bill Statement Fee
  - b. PrePaid Account Funding Fee via Web
  - c. PrePaid Account Funding Fee via IVR
  - d. PrePaid Account Funding Fee via Live Operator
  - e. Fees for Instant Pay Calls

**The County does not have that information. The County would require that bidders comply with FCC-allowed fees.**

4. Please provide a copy of the current inmate phone service agreement(s).

**The process is to request the current agreement through the Freedom of Information Act. In the interest of time, however, the County is providing the current inmate phone service agreement.**

5. Please provide the commission percentage currently received on inmate telephone revenue, an average of monthly commissions received over the past year from the current vendor, and copies of commission statements from the last six months.

**Commission percentage currently received is 48%. Effective February 2014, the County ceased receiving commissions on interstate calls. Commission numbers in 2015 were provided in Question #1, and are indicative of \$0.00 commissions for interstate calls.**

2015	Revenue	Commissions
Jan	\$ 2,841.89	\$ 1,046.92
Feb	\$ 2,967.51	\$ 1,036.23
Mar	\$ 3,246.13	\$ 1,198.71
Apr	\$ 4,184.89	\$ 1,642.71
May	\$ 4,041.20	\$ 1,658.22
Jun	\$ 4,275.35	\$ 1,789.21
Jul	\$ 3,777.80	\$ 1,566.32
Aug	\$ 3,752.96	\$ 1,598.98
Sep	\$ 5,586.40	\$ 2,482.44
Oct	\$ 4,244.74	\$ 1,843.40
Nov	\$ 5,678.52	\$ 2,298.68
Dec	\$ 5,632.38	\$ 2,267.27
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$50,229.77</b>	<b>\$ 20,429.09</b>

6. As specified in RFP Section 8.9, the County requires a proposal security in the amount of 10% of the total estimated revenue. Will the County please specify an exact amount for the security, or clarify how the amount should be calculated? E.g., XX% of current annual commissions based on call data provided in the RFP; or XX% of projected annual commissions for the new contract; or some other method?

**See section 8.9**

7. In lieu of RFP Section 8.9, did the County also intend to require a performance bond in addition to the security? If so, could the County please specify an exact amount for the performance bond and any other requirements for the bond?

**A performance bond is different from a proposal bond or proposal security, and it is not in lieu of the proposal bond or proposal security. The proposal bond or proposal security is also known as a bid bond, and is intended to keep frivolous bidders out of the bidding process by assuring that the successful bidder will enter into the contract and provide the required performance bond, if the County, at its option, requires the performance bond. If the awarded bidder fails to honor these commitments, the County is protected, up to the amount of the bid bond, usually for the difference between the awarded bid and the next most responsive bid. The performance bond, on the other hand, secures the contractor's promise to perform the contract in accordance with its terms and conditions. The County may require this at its option, and is subject to negotiation of the final details with the awarded Bidder. Refer Section 8.9 in the RFP:**

8. Based on discussions at the pre-bid, the County indicated 32 phones are currently installed; however, the RFP states that there are 31 phones. Can the County please clarify the quantities required for all equipment, including inmate phones? **For each facility**, please fill out the following table with quantities of equipment required and/or desired.

<b>Equipment</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Required or Desired?</b>
Standard inmate telephones	<b>31</b>	<b>Required</b>
Visitation phones (monitored/recorded)	<b>8</b>	<b>Required</b>
Pay (coin) phones	<b>1</b>	<b>Required</b>
TDD/TTY devices	<b>2</b>	<b>Required</b>
Cart phones	<b>1</b>	<b>Desired</b>
Hands-free inmate phones	<b>4</b>	<b>Open</b>
Portable cordless phones	<b>Open</b>	<b>Desired</b>
Enclosures	<b>Specify Enclosure for what service?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Pedestals	<b>Need to Specify Enclosure for what service?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Workstations with printers	<b>REFER TO RFP SECTION 3.3.7, which requires 1 complete workstation</b>	<b>Required</b>
Laptop computers	<b>Specify what for?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Inmate kiosks	<b>REFER TO RFP SECTION 3.8.2; Number of kiosks: Open, based on site walk-throughs and Bidder's offer</b>	<b>Required</b>
Handheld devices	<b>Need to specify the application</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Cell phone detection devices	<b>REFER TO RFP SECTION 3.8 – VALUE-ADDED SERVICES</b>	<b>Open</b>
Other?	<b>REFER TO RFP SECTION 3.8 – VALUE-ADDED SERVICES</b>	<b>Open</b>

9. Requirement 3.6.14 states that the County would like to have visitation phones installed and monitored. Could the County please confirm that there are 8 visitation booths that will need visitation phones installed?

**Confirmed.**

10. Commissary Integration – Please provide the name and contact information for the current commissary vendor.

**Commissary: CFM, Ted Hanby, thanby@cfm-inc.com**

11. Jail Management Integration – Please provide the name and contact information for the current JMS vendor.

**JMS Vendor: ATIMS (transitioned from Golden Eagle) Felix Rabinovich, FelixR@atims.com**

12. Please provide the name and contact information for the current banking system vendor.

**Commissary: Tiger Commissary, Keith Reed, kreed@tigercommissary.com**

13. In order to provide a significant cost savings while also saving space and energy costs at the facility, is the County willing to remove the current commissary ordering kiosks so that space can be used to install multi-functional video visitation kiosks that also allow commissary ordering? Hosting the commissary ordering on the multi-purpose video kiosks – as was discussed at the pre-bid meeting – could potentially result in a better financial offer, as we would not need to install additional conduit for video visitation kiosks.

**This will be considered, factoring in efficiencies and effectiveness, as well as current contractual obligations.**

14. The RFP requires implementation of the Video Visitation within 45 business days of contract award. However, the infrastructure for the video visitation system must be previously in place in order to meet a 45-business day implementation plan. Therefore, will the County allow a more realistic installation timeframe for all bidders, such as 90 days, with no negative impact to scoring of the Proposed Project Plan or financial penalties?

**The VVS Bidder will need to provide a detailed Implementation Plan and valid reasons as to why the 45-business day implementation timeframe cannot be met for the size of the County; and the VVS Bidder will propose their installation timeframe. No VVS Bidder will be arbitrarily penalized by a negative impact to scoring just by the virtue of exceeding the 45 business-day implementation timeframe. The VVS vendor who proposes the most efficient and effective solution to be implemented in the most expeditious, yet realistic implementation timeframe will receive maximum points in the evaluation scoring, relative to the rest of the bidders.**

**The County's Project Manager will work with the VVS Vendor awarded the bid, to work on the awarded Vendor's proposed timeframe. If the timeframe goes beyond the proposed and agreed-upon timeframe due to circumstances beyond the Vendor's control, no financial penalties will occur. If, however, the timeframe goes beyond the proposed and agreed-upon timeframe due to circumstances within the Vendor's control, financial penalties will be applied.**

15. The RFP requires implementation of the Inmate Telephone System within 30 business days of contract award. Only the incumbent vendor can meet a 30-day requirement, since any new vendor will have to order new circuits from the Local Exchange Carrier, who usually requires a minimum of 30 days' notice to install circuits. Therefore, will the County require the more realistic installation timeframe for all bidders, of 60 days, with no negative impact to scoring of the Proposed Project Plan?

**Time is of the essence, and 30 business days is realistic and very doable. The County also understands the limitations of working with the LECs and/or CLECs in expediting network access. The ITS Bidder will need to provide a detailed Implementation Plan and valid reasons as to why the 30-business day implementation timeframe cannot be met for the size of the County; and the ITS Bidder will propose their installation timeframe. No ITS Bidder will be arbitrarily penalized by a negative impact to scoring just by the virtue of exceeding the 30 business-day implementation timeframe. The ITS vendor who proposes the most efficient and effective solution to be implemented in the most expeditious, yet realistic implementation timeframe will receive maximum points in the evaluation scoring, relative to the rest of the bidders.**

**The County's Project Manager will work with the ITS Vendor awarded the bid, to work on the awarded Vendor's proposed timeframe. If the timeframe goes beyond the proposed and agreed-upon timeframe due to circumstances beyond the Vendor's control, no financial penalties will occur. If, however, the timeframe goes beyond the proposed and agreed-upon timeframe due to circumstances within the Vendor's control, financial penalties will be applied.**

16. At the pre-bid, the County stated that **on-site** video visitation is **not** required, and only remote video visitation will be required. However, RFP Section 4.3.1 specifically requires both on-site **and** remote video visitation, "allowing visitors to video conference with inmates/prisoners whether visitor is located at a designated jail property and/or at a remote location." Please clarify whether on-site video visitation is required. If onsite video visitation is required, how many visitor units are required by the County, and where would these visitor units be installed?

**Both onsite and remote video visitation are required. The number of visitor units will be determined by the Bidders as part of their VVS solution, and included in their proposals. The rationale for the number of visitor units as well as inmate to VVS unit ratios shall also be included in the proposal.**

17. Section 3.14.4 states that the first year of the MAG payment is non-recoverable. Please confirm that the MAG is non-recoverable only so long as the facility remains open and continues to provide inmate phone service to roughly the same number of inmates as today. In the event that the facility closes and phone revenue is no longer available to recuperate the selected vendor's equipment investment, it would be fair and reasonable to provide the vendor with a pro-rated reimbursement of the MAG for the difference in inmate population.

**The MAG for the first year is non-recoverable, and variations of the verbiage/language will be negotiated with the Vendor awarded the bid.**

18. Who is trust fund vendor?

**Section 1, Page 1 of the RFP – CFM contract with Tiger**

19. With tablets how many hours will inmates have them?

**The inmates could have them from 6:00 am – 10:00 pm**

- a. How many hours will the inmates be able to use the tablet for calls?  
**Open. It is not a requirement in the RFP to use the tablets for calls, but the County is open to cost-effective and efficient solutions.**

20. Will you please supply a floor plan?

**Due to security purposes, the floor plan cannot be provided. The Vendor awarded the bid will be given another opportunity to do another site tour prior to implementation.**

21. Vendor requests the contact names and numbers of the commissary vendor. Is the vendor allowed to replace the kiosks that are currently installed?

- a. Also please provide the contact information for the commissary provider for integration questions.

**Refer to response to Question #13 for replacement of kiosks currently installed. There are 10-11 inmate kiosks currently installed under the Commissary agreement. Refer to response to Question #10 for Commissary Vendor contact information.**

22. Is a vendor allowed to use rack space at the facility for onsite hardware?

**If there is available rack space, yes; otherwise, the vendor will need to provide its own rack.**

23. Will you allow a specific dollar amount in lieu of a percentage of estimated cost for the bond? If yes, what dollar amount is acceptable?

**Please refer to responses to Questions 6 & 7.**

24. Would the customer be open to video recording storage less than 5 years if the vendor provides an adequate alternative solution?

**Yes – if providing an adequate alternative solution to less than 5 years of video recording storage, provide the detailed technical aspects, feasibility statistics, and contingencies of proposed alternative solution.**

Addendum Number 1 was e-mailed to all those who attended the Mandatory Proposal Conference, and was posted on the Columbia County Sheriff's Office website on September 23, 2016.

Lt. Brooke McDowall  
Columbia County Sheriff's Office  
503.366.4645 or brooke.mcdowall@co.columbia.or.us