



SUBJECT: Amendment No. 1 to Request for Proposal No. 1901
DATE OF AMENDMENT: April 13, 2011
DATE OF RFP RELEASE: March 24, 2011
DATE AND TIME OF OPENING: May 4, 2011 @ 2:00 p.m.
AGENCY CONTACT: Ronda Miller, Senior Buyer

The following shall be a part of RFP No. **1901** for **Inmate Kiosks**. If a vendor has already returned a proposal and any of the information provided below changes that proposal, please submit the changes along with this amendment. You need not re-submit an entire proposal prior to the opening date and time.

The States abbreviation precedes the individual States answers.
Answers without State abbreviation applies to ALL States.

RFP REVISION:

Section 8.3.1; Part I: Technical Proposal is amended to Nine (9) identical copies. Additional copy to be sent to:

Arizona Evaluator

Denel Pickering, Chief Procurement Officer
Arizona Department of Corrections
1645 West Jefferson Street, Ste 4401
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Attached file is complete list of evaluators:



RFP 1901 LIST OF
EVALUATORS.pdf

*If you are unable to access the above inserted file,
please contact Nevada State Purchasing at
srvpurch@purchasing.state.nv.us
for an emailed copy.*

QUESTIONS:

1. Who is the Department of Corrections current Jail Management provider? Who is the DOC Jail/Inmate management system provider? If there is no third party provider how is information including inmate name, number and location managed and how would the kiosk software vendor access this information?

NV - Syscon Justice Systems.

OHIO - The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation & Correction (ODRC) uses its own web-based Department's Offender Tracking System with support from Diversified Systems, Inc. Depending on the information required, ODRC may provide a flat file via SFTP with relevant inmate data, such as inmate number, inmate name, dob, etc.

Virginia DOC provides in-house offender management for offenders sentenced to state-responsible sentences. We do not provide management to offenders in local jails.

WY - Internally developed.

2. Who is the current phone vendor?

AZ - Evercom Securus.

NV - Century Link /IC Solutions.

*ODRC – Global Tel*Link.*

VI - Global Tel-Link

WY – ICS.

3. Who is the current commissary vendor?

AZ- Keefe Commissary network.

NV – Self operated.

ODRC provides commissary services on-site at all but one facility, which is serviced by a neighboring institution. Application is CACTAS, by Cashless Systems, Inc.

VI - Keefe Commissary

WY - Cashless Systems Inc. (Cactus).

4. Will the DOC provide all necessary electric power and cabling for kiosks in each facility?
NV – Existing capabilities and needs will be determined on a site by site basis.

ODRC will provide electric power and cabling as necessary; however, wireless communication is preferred, and ODRC will not provide communication cabling.

VI - Yes

WY – Yes.

5. In Section 3.2.1.4 there is a requirement for the Ability to Translate information - what information is required to be translated?
NV – At minimum, instructions and directions must be available in English and Spanish, however, we are looking for vendors to provide additional creative solutions in this area.
- ODRC – any instructions / user interfaces that people would need to read in order to understand how to correctly operate / use the kiosk to accomplish their tasks.*
- WY - Instructions and directions must be available in both English and Spanish.*
6. In Section 3.2.1.6 there is a requirement for video visitation, does the DOC require this service to be offered on a separate/ stand alone kiosk from the other applications?
NV – The Department is seeking a wide range of options so the best solution for video visitation needs can be identified. Security concerns and convenience to the public will be key elements of importance for the DOC.
- ODRC may choose to have video visitation on separate kiosks from the other applications based on the number of kiosks per inmate and the facility design/layout, security, and available space.*
- VI - Not a requirement but we foresee a need for a kiosk dedicated to video visitation depending on the volume of the service*
- WY - Either alternative would be acceptable. WDOC would not require it at this time.*
7. Section 3.2.2 What is the operating system designated by the DOC for the kiosks application to run on?
NV – Linux, specifically SuSE for integration with our current network and Microsoft Windows.
- ODRC – kiosk O/S does not matter as long as it is secure, stable, kept up-to-date, and allows applications to interface.*
- VI - We have no specific designation but the system must be secure.*
- WY - Microsoft Windows.*
8. With all the varying types of kiosks, can a vendor respond with the types of kiosks they are able to provide?
NV – Yes; if a vendor has multiple kiosk solutions, please provide them. The Department is looking for the best combination of options available.
- ODRC – they can, with the understanding they may not be selected if other vendors are able to provide all types.*
- WY – Yes.*
9. Will winning this RFP mean that the company that wins can install kiosks in Nevada DOC right away to take payments?

No.

10. Is this contract binding for all the DOC's in the alliance?

No; each participating state will need to complete a participating addendum with the vendor(s), including Nevada. This is not a mandatory contract.

ODRC – No; depending on the contract, ODRC may choose to negotiate a separate contract, pull out of the project completely, or issue a separate solicitation.

WY – No.

11. How many housing units are at each facility?

NV – Exact configurations can be made available; each Institution/Camp is configured differently, however NDOC has approximately 125 housing units of 100 inmates each.

ODRC – Depends on the facility and definition of “unit”; varies from 2 to approximately 48 per facility.

VI - We do not have housing unit information at this time. This attachment shows a list of each facility and their population count in February 2011 and could be used to determine potential need.



VI Monthly
Population Summary.

*If you are unable to access the above inserted file,
please contact Nevada State Purchasing at
srvpurch@purchasing.state.nv.us
for an emailed copy.*

WY - WMCI – 15, WSP – 15, WWC – 9, WHF – 3, WHCC – 5.

12. Deposit Services - How many transactions does the DOC process now? • Money order • Phone • Web • Walk-in

NV – For the entire month of March 2011, we had a total of 9,286 transactions through lockbox and money transfers. The NDOC currently does not allow phone, web or walk-in deposits.

ODRC – Ave 65,000 / month; 60/40 split between money orders and other receipts.

**VI - Approx. 27,200 transactions a month come from the mail (money orders)
Approx. 4,600 transactions a month come from electronic funding vendors
Approx. 150 transactions a month come from visitors**

WY - 10,789 (via mail room only).

13. What is the total \$ amount of trust fund deposits?

NV- For the entire month of March 2011, our trust fund deposits totaled \$879,490.49.

ODRC – Ave \$3M/mo. Approx. \$2,045,000 is deposited into the Offender Trust fund on a monthly basis.

WY - \$998,786.79 (via mail room only).

14. Would the DOC eliminate taking money orders and allow vendor to provide lockbox services for money orders?
NV – Possibly; the NDOC currently has lockbox services, however we will look at all solutions presented through the RFP.

ODRC – Yes, but only if there is no additional delay in posting funds to inmate accounts and there is no additional charge to depositors, inmates, or ODRC.

VI - We would consider this option and would like to see the vendor provide a creative solution as to how this can be accomplished. The cost must be equitable for families.

WY – Maybe.

15. Does the DOC process Parole and Probation payments? If so how many transactions of each of the following? • Money order • Phone • Web • Walk-in
NV – Currently, payments are collected through our inmate payroll system. NDOC does not accept money orders, phone payments, web payments or walk-ins for P&P payments.

ODRC – No; those payments are processed by a contracted vendor, RMS. Number of transactions not available at this time.

VI - Those transactions are processed at each Probation and Parole district office. Information of that nature is not collected centrally.

WY - No.

16. What is the total \$ amount of trust parole /probation payments?
NV – Fiscal year to date (7/1/10 through 4/4/2011) \$95,204.58 Parole and Probation payments have been collected through the inmate payroll system.

ODRC – approximately \$66,000/month.

VI - Those transactions are processed at each Probation and Parole district office. Information of that nature is not collected centrally.

WY - N/A.

17. How many inmates are released per year?
NV – Average 5,580 inmates are released per year (465 per month)

ODRC – 25,000.

VI - Average 13,000.

WY – 778.

18. What is the average amount an inmate is released with?
NV - \$176.92

ODRC - \$103.00.

VI - The average parole/discharge check is approx. \$105

WY – Variable.

19. Does the DOC give inmates money upon release “gate money”?
NV – NDOC provides release assistance “gate money” for indigent inmates upon release.

ODRC – Yes, if the offender is released under certain circumstances.

VI - If the Trust balance funds do not total \$25.00, sufficient money will be added to reach that amount. This includes offenders that are being released from incarceration but are not going directly into the community. For offenders that will remain under incarceration such as being transferred to work release or being released to a detainer, the facility does not need to supplement offender funds to meet the \$25.00 discharge allowance.

WY - Yes - \$6/meal/travel period & bus fare.

20. How many electronic messages is the DOC receiving per year? • Incoming • Outgoing
NV – None; NDOC currently does not allow electronic mail.

ODRC – 25,000.

VI - None at this time.

WY – None.

21. How many paper photos does the DOC receive per year?
NV - Unknown

ODRC does not track that number.

Virginia DOC does not track this information.

WY - Do not record.

22. How many photos can each inmate have at one time?
NV - Unknown

ODRC – not limited.

VI - Offenders may receive no more than five (5) 4”x 6” photographs at any time. Offenders may have a reasonable amount in their personal property as long as they can be stored in their locker or cabinet.

WY - 40 in cell.

23. Video Visitation - Will the inmates allow families to visit remotely (from home)?
NV – This solution would be considered as long as the visit could be recorded. Security concerns will be measured along with convenience to the public in evaluation all proposals.

ODRC will allow visits from home as long as there is a “kill-switch” option that allows ODRC to immediately terminate the visit if necessary for security reasons.

VI - Not at this time – families participate in video visitation by a remote location in the community. See website for more information:

<http://www.vadoc.virginia.gov/offenders/prison-life/videoVisitation.shtm>

WY - Yes with permission and availability.

24. Will the DOC consider reducing their visitation to video only?
NV – No. A combination will be utilized but contact visitation cannot be eliminated.

ODRC – Not at this time.

VI - Not at this time

WY – No.

25. Does the DOC want inmate kiosks for visitation placed in housing units/pods or in separate area exclusive for Video Visitation?
NV – A combination; in disciplinary segregation units, the kiosks would be in the units with the capability to roll them to in front of the cell. In general population units, the kiosks could be located in visitation, the units is a program room, or another designated area.

ODRC – Depends on the institution and available space.

VI - In the housing units – may explore other locations depending on volume of visits.

WY – No.

26. Section 3, 2nd paragraph: As the procurement may result in more than one contract, would multiple vendors be selected to provide the same service(s) at the DOC or would awarded vendors be selected to provide only one or several services listed under the procurement?
NV – It will depend on the State and the service.

ODRC prefers to select a single vendor for the same or several services. However, if in the best interests of the state, ODRC may select different vendors for each service.

VI - N/A.

WY – Multiple.

27. Section 3, 3rd paragraph: As vendors may propose on one or more of the system requirements, will the DOC award individual services to different vendors? For example, will one vendor be awarded the email service and another vendor awarded the inmate banking service?

NV - Depending on the State and the service required. Each State may negotiate their own contracts.

ODRC – if an award is made, it will most likely be to a single vendor who can provide the services ODRC needs; however, it is possible multiple awards may be made if that result is most beneficial to the state.

VI - N/A.

WY – Yes.

28. Section 3, 4th paragraph: Can Participating States award the contract to a vendor that was not awarded the DOC contract?

NV - Depending on the State and the service required. This is not a mandatory contract.

ODRC – Yes, and states may choose to no longer participate.

VI - N/A.

WY - Maybe – it would require justification and approval from state purchasing.

29. Section 3.1.1: Is the DOC looking for a solution that incorporates each of the four kiosk types or one kiosk with all of these features? If the vendor’s solution combines all four types into one kiosk, how should this be represented in the Cost Proposal?

NV – Each kiosk type proposed should have an associated cost proposal; unless one kiosk could support a turnkey and an outside kiosk, however a stand alone may not contain the enclosure and the hardware only would not contain the software.

ODRC is looking for a solution that provides turn-key, stand-alone kiosks for interior use. For Ohio, therefore, proposing an outside, turn-key, stand-alone kiosk may be cost-prohibitive. If a bidder provides only one type of kiosk, it should be listed under each type of kiosk solution.

VI - One Kiosk type with all features.

WY - Each Kiosk type should be specified with an associated cost. If a single kiosk can provide all services then a breakdown of costs per service would be helpful since we wouldn’t necessarily want all of the services available and would not want to have to pay for things we aren’t using.

30. Section 3.2.1.2.2: Will the DOC accept a deposit kiosk solution that does not accept checks?

NV – We will look at all solutions presented through the RFP.

ODRC – Yes.

VI – Yes.

WY – Maybe.

31. Section 3.2.1.10, Application Architecture: Is the DOC looking for the vendor’s platform and whether or not the subsections apply?

NV –

3.2.1.10.1 is open architecture; yes, the DOC wants to determine if the vendor applications have open architecture.

3.2.1.10.2 is Documented Interface API and tool kit ad; yes, the DOC wants to determine if the vendor applications have documented Interface API and tool kit ad.

3.2.1.10.3 is Custom changes to the Interface API; yes, the DOC wants to know if the vendor can make custom changes, however at what cost?

ODRC – Yes.

VI - We are looking for a platform in which we can connect to other systems that we work with.

WY - This is what we would like to know for each subsection:

3.2.1.10.1 – applicable or not

3.2.1.10.2 – available for use by DOC and/or other vendors DOC uses for services.

3.2.1.10.3 – applicable or not and at what cost

32. Section 3.2.1.11.1 – Which DOC applications would the vendor need to interface with?

NV – NOTIS - Nevada Information and Offender Tracking System, inmate banking system, inmate stores system, and other applications as required by the Department.

ODRC – DOTS (Department’s Offender Tracking System), CACTAS (Cashless Commissary and Trust Accounting System), telephone system (GTL); all interfaces must be coordinated with appropriate current vendors. ODRC will not be responsible for any costs associated with the interface/s.

VI - We work with a number of systems from offender management, phones, commissary, to smaller stand-alone systems.

WY - Cashless Systems Inc. – Cactus, WDOC’s offender management system, other windows/web apps as the agency deems appropriate.

33. Section 3.2.1.12: Should the vendor propose the vendor’s preferred method of connectivity or is the DOC looking for the vendor to provide one or more methods?

NV - The vendor should provide creative connectivity solutions that will work with institutions, while maintaining security requirements. If multiple options exist, these should be separately identified.

ODRC – Propose vendor’s preferred method and include other methods vendor is able to provide.

VI - Web Services is our connectivity method.

WY - More than one option - Vendor to provide connectivity options that will work with their kiosks i.e. DSL, T1, etc.

34. Section 3.2.2: Would the DOC be open to the vendor's designating the kiosk's operating system as it is already proven in the field?

NV - The DOC will look at all solutions presented through the RFP.

ODRC – Yes.

VI – Yes.

WY – Maybe.

35. Section 3.2.3.9: Is the DOC looking to view this information on the vendor's system?

NV - Either on the vendors system or through a web interface.

ODRC would prefer to view the information through a vendor-supplied method. Whether that is on the vendor's system or using software supplied by the vendor and installed on ODRC systems matters only in that s/w installed on ODRC systems must be transferable to other ODRC systems by ODRC staff without requiring vendor intervention or assistance. Either method must allow ODRC 24/7 access to monitor kiosks.

VI - Yes, We want to understand all internal connections.

WY - Either on the vendors system or through some form of web interface.

36. Section 3.2.3.9: What offender management system does the DOC use? If it is not a proprietary system, will each party be responsible for their own integration costs?

NV – NDOC uses Syscon Justice Systems for their offender management system. It is a proprietary system.

ODRC uses the Department's Offender Tracking System, which is currently serviced by Diversified Systems, Inc. The vendor will be responsible for any and all integration costs.

VI - We have a proprietary system and we will be responsible for integration costs.

WY - Internally created.

37. Section 3.2.4.3: Is the DOC looking to customize just the text of the error messages or something else?

NV –The error message as well as any instructional and prompts be customized as needed.

ODRC – primarily text.

VI - We would like to have input for the text.

WY – Both.

38. Section 3.2.5.1: Is the DOC seeking to view the vendor’s remote management?

NV – Yes. We would like to see the vendor’s remote management system.

ODRC does not seek to view the vendor’s remote management; ODRC seeks to use the remote management tool to minimize the time its staff must spend managing the kiosks.

VI - Yes, we want to understand how this will take place.

WY - Only as necessary for the maintenance of security/control of access to the system by the inmates.

39. Section 3.3 Is the DOC willing to share network bandwidth with the vendor? Would the vendor be allowed to install additional bandwidth (i.e. T1)?

NV – The DOC has limited available network bandwidth; it varies by location. The awarded vendor will need to work with the DOC and the Department of Information Technology (DoIT) to implement a desired solution. Any proposal should not degrade existing network capabilities of the DOC.

ODRC prefers a wireless network be installed by the vendor. ODRC should be able to also use that wireless network as needed.

VI - We are willing to share network bandwidth and the vendor is not allowed to install additional bandwidth. DOC would be responsible for adding any additional bandwidth.

WY - WDOC will not be able to share. Vendor will need to install additional resources.

40. Section 3.7 If the vendor is a distributor (and not the manufacturer) of the MP3 player, can a shorter warranty period be proposed for the MP3 player?

NV – We will look at all solutions presented through the RFP, however if the warranty is not competitive, the vendor runs a risk.

ODRC – No; the vendor must be able to cover the player for the specified length of time.

VI – N/A.

WY – Maybe.

41. Section 8.3.3 / Attachment E: As only the State of Nevada receives a copy of the cost proposal and four Participating States are also evaluating the proposals, how is the evaluation process performed? Are each evaluator’s scores weighed evenly?

Nevada will provide the “Cost” to the evaluators upon completion of scoring the Technical Proposals.

42. Item #5 on the Sample Score Sheet is said to correspond to “Section 7, Project Costs.” However Section 7 is entitled “Payment.” Please clarify.

Item # 5 should correspond to “Section 6, Project Costs”.

- 43. Will you consider leasing the equipment over a two or three year period with end of term options of return, purchase for fair market value, or continue leasing at a reduced rental?
Yes.
- 44. Attachment D, question #1 refers to copiers. Please clarify.
Please provide attached document to your references.



Attachment D.doc

*If you are unable to access the above inserted file,
please contact Nevada State Purchasing at
svypurch@purchasing.state.nv.us
for an emailed copy.*

ALL ELSE REMAINS THE SAME FOR RFP 1901.

Vendor shall sign and return this amendment with proposal submitted.

NAME OF VENDOR _____
AUTHORIZED _____
SIGNATURE _____
TITLE _____ DATE _____

RFP 1901 Amendment 1

This document must be submitted in the “State Documents” section/tab of vendors’ technical proposal