



miamidade.gov

PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT  
111 NW 1<sup>ST</sup> Street • Suite 1300  
Miami, Florida 33128 - 1974  
T 305-375-5289 F 305 375-4407 305 372-6128

**ADDENDUM NO. 5**

DATE: September 20, 2013  
TO: ALL PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS  
SUBJECT: Pay Phone, Pay Phone Services, Pay Phone Subscription Services, and Jail Management Services  
RFP No. 847

**NEW PROPOSAL DUE DATE: October 11, 2013** (the time remains the same as stated in the RFP)

This addendum becomes a part of the subject RFP No. 847.

- A. The revised proposal due date is October 11, 2013 (the time remains the same as stated in the RFP).
- B. Addendum No. 4 was inadvertently forwarded without the list of Questions presented by potential proposers with County Responses. The County Responses reference the Attachments that were included in Addendum No. 4 (please refer to Addendum No. 4 for the Attachments referenced in the Questions and Responses attached herewith). We apologize for any inconvenience. We have extended the due date as stated in "A" above to allow more time.

**All other information remains the same.**

Miami-Dade County

*Andrew Zawoyski, CPPO*  
Chief Negotiator

cc: Clerk of the Board  
Miguel Gonzalez, Assistant County Attorney

Attachment: Questions and County Responses



Q1. Could the County please clarify and/or provide further explanation/examples of what they are trying to achieve with forms that are generated from other systems such as the County's IPS, Omnilink, and Aramark? Does the County desire the OMS to capture or copy the forms as an attachment?

A1: IPS functionality should be included as part of the new JMS. The forms were included in RFP to give examples of what functionality and data is needed.

Q2. Please provide context for interfacing with the current JMS while proposing a new JMS.

A2. MDCR does not have a JMS.

Q3. Can agency further define the PIR application in the interfaces section (#4) on page 46?

A3. The monthly Performance Indicator Report (PIR) is an auto-calculating MS Excel spreadsheet that consolidates and summarizes data manually entered by the various units within MDCR to provide management with a picture of trends and hot spots.

Q4. Inmate Tracking Requirement #295 – Can agency further define the QMS system?

A4. Queue Management System(QMS) is a .Net application that tracks an arrestee from the time he enters the jail until the end of the intake process. The arrestee is tracked using a barcoded armband that is scanned at each station of the intake process. There are 10 intake stations equipped with workstations and barcode scanners: Check-In, Pre-Medical Screening, Arrest Form/Jail Number Assignment, Mugshot and Pat Down, Automated Fingerprint Information System (AFIS), Medical Screening, Personal Property, Practitioner Screening, Psych Evaluation, Check Out.

The JMS inmate tracking will then continue to track the arrestee/inmate while he is jail custody. All arrestee/inmate location history should be available in the JMS application including those from QMS.

Q5. Will the County provide a list of all vendors that registered to receive the RFP?

A5. Please see Attachment 1 to this Addendum.

Q6. Section 4.2 states that there will be a total of 1000 points assigned to this RFP and broken down in 5 main areas. Using the matrix below and solving for X, Y and Z, how many evaluation points will be allocated to Public Payphones, Inmate Telephones and JMS?

	Public Phones	Inmate Telephones	JMS	Total
Technical Criteria #1	X	Y	Z	=200
Technical Criteria #2	X	Y	Z	=150
Technical Criteria #3	X	Y	Z	=500
Technical Criteria #4	X	Y	Z	=50

Pricing X Y N/A =100

A6. The County is looking for an overall solution including all three Parts and does not have a further breakdown.

Q7. Can vendors propose alternative solutions in addition to responding to the RFP?

A7. Please see Section 1.3 of the RFP.

Q8. Does the County have a preference as to whether the County hosts the hardware or the vendor does?

A8. The County prefers a County host solution to ensure continuity of operations during emergency events.

Q9. Beginning with requirement 2.8.2, desirable functional requirements beginning with item 69 through 508 and Visitation from requirement #1 through 29 are listed with instructions to complete as Y, C, M or N. How many evaluation points are allocated to each of these items? What, if any, difference in point totals are assigned to responses with a Y? C? M? or N?

A9. The County is looking for an overall solution including all three Parts and beyond what is stated in Section 4.2 does not have a further breakdown.

Q10. Can you advise if a decision has been made to revise the due date; and if not when one will be forthcoming?

A10. The due date has been changed to October 4, 2013.

Questions Q11. through Q24. pertain to Appendix A to Proposer Information Document.

**Fault Tolerance / Failover**

Q11. #9-14 – Will on-going administration of fault tolerance and redundancy be that of the Proposer or the County?

A11.

**9. Fault tolerance at the Web-server level:** Yes, if the chosen solution is just another application that can run on the County's enterprise Web-server infrastructure. If the solution is hosted by the vendor, and not on the County's enterprise Web-server infrastructure, then the vendor must answer this question.

**10. Fault tolerance at the application-server level.** Yes, if the chosen solution is just another application that can run on the County's application-server infrastructure. If the solution is hosted by the vendor, and not on the County's enterprise application-server infrastructure, then the vendor must answer this

question.

**11. Fault tolerance at the component level.** What is the definition of “component”?

**12. Redundancy/fault tolerance (automatic failover) features.** Yes, if the chosen solution is just another application that can run on the County’s enterprise production Internet/Intranet infrastructure. If the solution is hosted by the vendor, and not on the County’s enterprise production Internet/Intranet infrastructure, then the vendor must answer this question.

**13. Fault tolerance at the session level.** This is dependent on how the application chosen handles sessions.

**14. Ability to cluster servers for the purpose of load-balancing and fault tolerance using NetScalers.** Yes, if the chosen solution is just another application that can run on the County’s enterprise production Internet/Intranet infrastructure. If the solution is hosted by the vendor, and not on the County’s enterprise production Internet/Intranet infrastructure, then the vendor must answer this question.

#### General Requirements

Q12. #31 – Does respondent need to include the cost for these unspecified interfaces in our proposal?

A12. Proposer’s solution must have the capability of interfacing with both legacy mainframe applications such as CJS which uses an IDMS database as well as with modernized applications such as those which use .NET framework and SQL Server databases. The solution must have the capability of publishing and consuming web services. Any such costs should be taken into consideration when preparing response to Form B-1 wherein a percentage return to County is requested.

Q13. #33 – Where all are barcodes used?

A13. Requirement #33: The requirement is as stated in #33 – basically that the solution provides for the ability to manually enter any barcoded number or search key value. Detailed analysis would have to be performed by the Proposer to determine where the barcodes would be used.

Q14. #34 – Does this mean the ability to manually enter data that comes also received via an interface?

A14. Yes. For example, if the JMS gets data from another application and the link between the two applications is down, then MDCR should be able to manually enter the data that would normally be retrieved.

#### Reports

Q15. #38 - Will on-going administration of data replication be that of the Proposer or the County?

A15. If solution is hosted and maintained at ITD, the County will be responsible for on-going administration, otherwise, the proposer will be responsible.

Q16. #69 – Please provide the specifications for each two-way interface.

A16. We do not currently have detailed specifications. For high level specifications, refer to Interface Specifications (page 46 of the RFP)

Q17. #70 – Who is County current mug shot vendor?

A17. DataWorks.

Q18. #73 – Besides the Jail Card, how else will fingerprints be used within the JMS?

A18. For display purposes on an inmate profile screen as well as forms.

#### **Boot Camp**

Q19. #80 & 82 – What percentage of the data recordation occurs with manual forms versus an automated system?

A19. Currently, 90% recordation is manual. See forms which were attached as part of RFP for Boot Camp for examples of data that is recorded manually. Also MDCR has an in-house developed application that records data. Please see attached blank form (Attachment 2) containing all of the fields which Boot Camp currently records for the in-house developed application. Also, the interface between CSB and Boot Camp is not automated. Requirement 82 is to automate the interface.

Q20. #81 – What functions are to be automated with barcode and signature devices?

A20. The first #81 under section: Desired Functional Requirements under General Requirements/Hardware references electronic signatures and barcode scanners. Details of which functions require barcode scanners and signature pads are within the Desired Requirements in Appendix A.

#### **Food Services**

Q21. #184 – Please provide the governing SOP.

A21. Please see Attachment 3.

### **Incident Reporting**

- Q22. #211 – Please provide DSOP 10-003.
- A22. Please see Attachment 4.

### **Medical - Medical Services**

- Q23. #326 – Does respondent need to include the cost for these unspecified interfaces in our proposal?
- A23. These should be taken into consideration when preparing response to Form B-1 wherein a percentage return to County is requested.

### **Monitored Release**

- Q24. #472 - What percentage of the data recordation occurs with manual forms versus an automated system?
- A24. 80%

END QUESTIONS (specifically to) APPENDIX A.

- Q25. Just to clarify: Is it the County's expectation that the proposed JMS will be the "system of record" for inmate data and as such it will be the key control point for inmate data entry and for data being sent to/received through interfaces to the county's other inmate related data systems?
- A25. Yes, except for Arrest/Booking data.
- Q26. What is the implementation timeframe for inmate phones?
- A26. Proposer shall state how long it will take to complete after any award.
- Q27. What is the implementation timeframe for the Jail Management System?
- A27. Proposer shall state how long it will take to complete after any award.
- Q28. What is the implementation timeframe for payphones?
- A28. Proposer shall state how long it will take to complete after any award.
- Q29. Please provide a count, including location of all payphones.

A29. Current count is 881 Payphones. See Attachment 5 listing address of public payphones

Q30. Please provide a full telephone count, at operating capacity, by institution, including number of cart telephones and TTY phones.

A30. See Attachment 6 pertaining to call type of public payphones.

Q31. Please provide six months of calling information broken out by call type and the method by which the call was placed (collect, pre-paid collect, debit).

A31. See Attachment 7.

Q32. Please provide current call rates collect, pre-paid collect, and debit calls.

A32. Current payphone rates: coin, credit card or collect, no pre-pair or debit

**Coin**

\$.50 local

\$1.00 anywhere in the country for up to 5 minutes

\$1.00 anywhere in the world for up to 3 minutes

**Operator Connect Charges**

**Automated**

**Live**

Calling Card

\$1.75

\$1.75

Credit Card

\$1.75

\$1.75

Collect/3<sup>rd</sup> Party

\$1.75

\$1.75

Person to Person

\$3.25

**Mileage**

**First Minute**

**Each Additional Minute**

1-9999

\$0.30

\$0.30

**Inmate Telephone Service questions:**

Q33. In order to provide our best offer, it is 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 proposers. Please provide as much data as possible from the following chart:

Call Category Inmate Phones	Call Type	# of Calls Per Month	# of Minutes Per Month	Total Gross Revenue Per Month
Local	Collect	196805	3422702	
IntraLATA	Collect	1517	22107	
InterLATA	Collect	28109	32922	
InterState	Collect			
International	Collect			

Local	Debit			
IntraLATA	Debit			
InterLATA	Debit			
InterState	Debit			
International	Debit			
Local	PrePaid			
IntraLATA	PrePaid			
InterLATA	PrePaid			
InterState	PrePaid			
International	PrePaid	80	650	

Q34. 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	Call Type	Per Call Charge	Per Minute Charge	Other Charges
Local	Collect	2.25	-----	
IntraLATA	Collect	1.75	.30	
InterLATA	Collect	1.75	.30	
InterState	Collect	4.42	.89	
International	Collect			
Local	Debit			
IntraLATA	Debit			
InterLATA	Debit			
InterState	Debit			
International	Debit			
Local	PrePaid			
IntraLATA	PrePaid			
InterLATA	PrePaid			
InterState	PrePaid			
International	PrePaid	Variable, based on country		

Q35. Please provide a copy of the current inmate phone service agreement(s).

A35. Copy attached as Attachment 8.

Q36. Please provide as much information as possible for all non-commissionable revenue produced by incumbent ITSP. Would it be possible to require each Vendor to Sign a Guarantee, or Pledge, to the County that all Fees have been disclosed in the solicitation process?

Fee Category	Charges	Indicate Per Call Fee or Per Deposit/Call Transaction Fee
PrePaid Account Set Up Fee	N/A	

(Live Representative)		
PrePaid Account Set Up Fee (IVR)	N/A	
PrePaid Account Set Up Fee (Web Site)	N/A	
Refund Fees	\$5.00	
Minimum Account Balance Fees	N/A	
Monthly Recurring Account Balance Fees	N/A	
Cellular Cost Recovery or Equivalent Fees	N/A	
Billed Cost Recovery Fees	\$3.49 Single Bill Fee	Per month per distinct LEC-billed BTN
Technological or Biometric Cost Recovery Fees	N/A	
Damaged Equipment Cost Recovery Fees	N/A	
Administrative Fees Associated with USF	N/A	
List all Regulatory Administrative Fees or Percentages associated with any Tax Collections	N/A	
List percentage of ITSP revenue per transaction generated from Lobby Kiosk	N/A	
If Managed Access System is proposed list Fee that will be charged to Called Party or Inmate	N/A	

Q37. Please provide a full count and listing of addresses for all Public Payphones and any historical call volume or gross revenue information that the County has received for the past year. If possible, please include the minutes of talk time along with the gross revenue.

A37. See Attachment 9.

Q38. Please provide the commission percentage currently received from inmate and public payphone revenues, an average of monthly commissions received over the past year from the current vendor, and copies of commission statements (if available).

A38. See Attachment 9 and 10.

Q39. Is the required irrevocable line of credit amount based on the County's historical gross revenue/commission data with incumbent ITSP or the Selected Proposer's anticipated revenue and commission amount?

A39. The amount anticipated by Selected Proposer.

Q40. What is more important to the County, better rates and inexpensive fees or higher commission to the County?

A40. All of the above.

Q41. Are there specific concerns with the incumbent ITSP that the County would like to see resolved with the selected proposer?

A41. Only as already may be expressed in the RFP.

Q42. Is the request for the source code only applicable to the JMS?

A42. The stated requirement is: "Whether the solution is hosted by vendor or by ITD, the County is entitled to access data for data mining or reporting at no charge" which refers to data not code.

Q43. It would be helpful if you could provide a count of the current equipment that has been provided by the vendor for each of the different facilities:

Facility	# of Inmate Telephones	# of TDD/TTY Devices	# of and Size of Cart Phones	# of Hands Free Phones	# of Cordless Phones	# of Workstations & Printers	# of Visitation Phones
MLK Office Plaza	0	2 spares	0	0	0	1 of each	0
Women's Detention Center	46	2	5	---	---	---	---
Pretrial Detention Center	355	2	15	---	---	---	---
Security & Internal Affairs	---	----	----	---	---	20 of each	---
MetroWest Detention Center	283	3	19	---	---	---	---
Training & Treatment Center	151	2	1	---	---	---	---
Boot Camp	5	1	1	---	---	---	---
Turner Guilford Knight Corrections Center	115	7	9	----	---	---	---

JMH

1

1 TTY

---

---

---

---

---

Q44. Please confirm that the County does not intend for Visitation phones to be integrated into the Inmate Telephone System. If it does, then please include the phone count for both sides in above chart.

A44. Visitation phones are not a part of this RFP.

Q45. Please confirm that the Inmate Telephone System must be 100% independent of the County's network.

A45. The Inmate Telephone System is completely independent and must stay that way.

Q46. Please confirm that the inside network wiring to the incumbent's provided workstations is now property of the County.

A46. The network wiring to their workstations was installed by the Inmate Telephone System vendor and remains their property.

Q47. Please provide additional detail into Mobile Collect Call Inmate telephones.

A47. Not currently used by MDCR.

Q48. Due to the complexity of the RFP response, and due to the FCC Proposed Rulemaking (FCC 13-113), is it possible for the County to extend the RFP due date by at least one month?

A48. Please see response to Q10.

Jail Management Software – questions:

Q49. Could the agency please elaborate on what information is stored in each application? There are some examples; however we are requesting all the types of information regarding the inmates, which is stored in those ancillary applications in order to give an accurate response to the RFP.

A49. This would be accomplished during detailed analysis.

Q50. The agency makes references to interfacing with various third party applications; however are there objections by the agency to have JMS that can provide that type of function within itself without any intervention from a third party application?

A50. MDCR has existing contracts for various third party applications, which will be honored, and therefore the interfaces specified in the RFP must be created by the JMS provider. However, upon expiration of any existing contract, if comparable functionality is already present but dormant in the JMS, MDCR and the JMS provider may consider activating such functionality, on a case by case basis.

Q51. The agency described in detailed a plan to automatically import an A Form from the arresting officer to populate JMS data to expedite the workflow. Can the agency provide answers to the following questions?

- a. What are the fields, sizes, and particulars from the automated A-Form that corrections wants imported into the jail record?

A51a. This would be accomplished during detailed analysis. High level: Jail number, name, race, sex, DOB, address, height, weight, hair color, eye color, SSN, booking date, arrest location, court case number, charges, charge description, etc.

- b. What program is the A Form written in?

A51b. Java

- c. Can we get a copy of each of the pages from the electronic A-Form?

A51c. The A-form is attached (Attachment 11).

Q52. The RFP references the ability to generate sequential values, such as incident report numbers, etc. What is the agency numbering system? Is it numeric or alpha numeric?

A52. Both Some values are numeric and some are alpha numeric.

Q53. "Ability to automate the Case Management process using extracted data from CJS and a questionnaire to determine the risk potential". Could the agency elaborate in what they require for the "automation"?

A53. The Case Management process would manage all aspects of offender processing and case management. The process would include an automated Risk Assessment tool to assist in case management, supervision and placement of the defendant in an appropriate program and eventually back into the community. MDCR also needs the capability of calculating recidivism automatically. See requirements 112-126 and forms for Case Management for more details.

Q54. "Ability to track Milestones". Can the agency explain what the milestones they wish to track?

A54. This is a function of project management. Milestones would include completion of analysis and design, completion of coding, completion of testing, implementation, etc.

Q55. "Ability to receive alerts when an inmate incident takes place with another "keep separates" inmate to trigger an immediate action." Can the agency explain the immediate action they are looking for?

A55. An email would suffice.

Q56. Could the agency clarify the Functional Requirements Tab of the Tech Biz Arch spreadsheet? This portion makes mention of GIS capabilities. Was this intentional or residual information from a previous RFP.

A56. There are standard requirements for any solution that will be hosted by ITD. The requirements regarding GIS in the Tech Biz Arch spreadsheet are only if the solution will be hosted by ITD.

Q57. Please confirm the average stay for inmates or the number of inmates booked per year.

A57. Bookings are currently running at 85,000 per year. Average daily population has been between 4,850 and 5,200. Average LOS is updated daily on the MDCR web site at MiamiDade.gov.

Q58. Does the current inmate phone provider currently take any deductions from commission revenue, if so what are the deductions and how much?

A58. No.

Q59. Please provide the list of current fees charged.

A59. See response to Question 36.

Q60. What is the average size of a monthly commission check received by the county? Can the County provide 24, or even 12, months of commission check amounts?

A60. See response to Question 38.

Q61. What are the current call rates?

A61. Collect: Local \$2.25 flat  
IntraLATA \$1.75 surcharge plus \$0.30 per minute  
InterLATA \$1.75 surcharge plus \$0.30 per minute  
Interstate \$4.42 surcharge plus \$0.89 per minute

Q62. What is the historic call volume by month? Can the County provide 24, or even 12, months of call volume reports?

A62. See response to Question 31.

Q63. How many visits are used on an average month?

A63. MDCR does not currently have video visitation and it is not a part of this RFP.

Q64. How many visits are paid-for visits in an average month?

A64. Please see A62.

Q65. How many free video visits, and for what duration. Would the County allow each inmate per week?

A65. Please see A62.

Q66. How many tentative visits by bail bondsman and Public Defenders are expected in an average month?

A66. Please see A62.

Q67. What is the Gross dollar amount generated by the existing video visitation pricing in place?

A67. Please see A62.

Q68. Anticipated project start date?

A68. Please see A62.

Q69. Anticipate duration of overall project activities and each of the project parts A, B and C?

A69. Proposer shall state how long it will take to complete after any award.

Q70. Can the vendor interface with the existing medical system to satisfy the medical component needs?

A70. Yes, as long as all the requirements are met.