



SPOKANE COUNTY

ADDENDUM NUMBER 2

DATED: March 1, 2019

PROJECT NO. P11092 Inmate Phone, Video Visitation and Visitation Administration Project

The additions, omissions, clarifications and corrections contained herein shall be made to applicable specifications for the project and shall be included in scope of work and proposals to be submitted. References made below to specifications shall be used as a general guide only. Respondent shall determine the work affected by Addendum items.

Respondent will acknowledge receipt of this addendum by completing Receipt of Addenda section in the response document.

ADDENDUM ITEM 1: Information to Bidders. **Bid Due Date: The bid due date has been changed to 3 P.M. on March 13, 2019.**

ADDENDUM ITEM 2: Information to Offerors. Changes have been made to Attachment G – Cost Proposal. The deletions are highlighted in red and stricken. Additions are in blue.

ADDENDUM ITEM 3: Information to Offerors. Changes have been made to RFP P11092 – Section 5.2 Evaluation Summary. The deletions are highlighted in red and stricken. Additions are in blue.

ADDENDUM ITEM 4: Information to Offerors. Changes have been made to RFP P11092 – Section 8.21 Formula Used To Convert Costs To Points. The deletions are highlighted in red and stricken. Additions are in blue.

ADDENDUM ITEM 5: Attached. RFP 11092. Replace RFP 11092 with the attached RFP 11092 updated 3-1-2019.

ADDENDUM ITEM 6: Embedded. Attachment A-G. Replace Attachment A-G with the embedded Attachment A-G updated 3-1-2019 (including the addition of Excel Spreadsheet within Section G) below (see Response to Question #12).

ADDENDUM ITEM 7: Response to Vendor questions submitted:

Question #1: Would the County please clarify whether the Offeror can include a cover letter and/or executive summary with our response due on March 6, 2019?

Response: All responses will comply with the page limit and formatting requirements as listed in the RFP document and within Attachments A-G.

Question #2: Would the County please clarify whether the Offeror is allowed to attach exhibits to our proposal response, so long as they conform to the rules set out in the RFP?

Response: See the Response to Question #1. No embedded documents will be allowed.

Question #3: Would the County please clarify whether Attachment H should be submitted in the offeror's response due on March 6, 2019 or during the Clarification Period beginning on April 12, 2019?

Response: No response to Attachment H is required.

Question #4: Page 27 – 8.25 Standard Contract Provisions –States that “the contractor will be required to sign and submit the attached County's Sample Agreement (Appendix C).....Objections to any of the provisions in Appendix C must me set out in the Offeror's proposal.”

- a) Would the County please clarify during what phase they would like the Offerer to submit this completed Appendix C?
- b) If we are to submit Appendix C in the response due on March 6th, are we allowed to add additional sections to the response document or would the County prefer it be included in an exhibit section?

Response:

- a) **The Agreement Contract will be signed once the contract has been awarded following Phase 2;**
- b) **See response to Questions #4 a). Any objections or additions to the Terms and Conditions will need to be addressed in Attachment B. Select "False" in the appropriate Certifications box and follow the instructions following Certification #26.**

Question #5: Throughout the requirements set out by the County in Attachment H, the County states "Recordings must be stored online for the entire contract period plus any extensions if necessary, while also allowing for the destruction of records based on their record retention period (timeframe to be identified by the County)."

The industry standard for phone call recording storage is typically from 3-5 years or up to the length of the contract with video visitation storage requirements ranging from 30-90 days. Since the Video Visitation recordings are quite large, longer term storage requirements increase costs. This results in cost implications for storing them for the length of this contract by way of reduced commissions. Would Spokane County consider lowering the Video Visitation recording storage duration to the industry standard ranges while still having the ability to download and store recordings indefinitely offline? We always store the Call Detail Records and Video Visitation Records for the life of the contract.

Response: Spokane County is in support of amending the Video Visitation recording to a 60-day storage requirement (after recording) with associated Video Visitation logs needing to still be a 60-month storage requirement (after incarceration ends). The ability to download copies of video recordings prior to destruction will still be necessary in support of court holds, long-term investigations, etc.

Question #6: Attachment C – Service Plan- The instructions for the how to properly complete this attachment state that the County would like a "brief chronological roadmap that describes, in major activities and task, how the offeror will meet the County's expectations as set forth in this RFP."

- a. Does the County want offerors to include a Gant Chart, which is commonly used to lay out timelines and milestones of the implementation process, as part of their submission of Attachment C for March 6, 2019?
- b. If the County does want a Gant Chart, can it be included as an exhibit to Attachment C?

Response:

- a) **The County has no direction as to what vendors offer within their proposal.**
- b) **See the Response to Question #2.**

Question #7: Can the County confirm that the RFP included all of the various calling types, ie: Collect, Debit Calling, Calling Cards, any others? The reason for the question, the average monthly spend per inmate per month based on the data provided was much lower than our other customer in the area and state. We want to ensure we have the most accurate data to provide the best value and offer to the County.

Response: Our commission payout document lists the options as Collect, Direct Billed, Prepaid Collect, Advance Pay and Debit. Detention Services is willing to consider new and different payment options depending on what is available.

Question #8: Is there any type of single pay call offered at either of the Spokane Detention facilities?

Response: Unclear what this question is asking.

Question #9: There is no mention of Video Visitation terminals for the public to conduct on-site video visitation, is there a plan to offer it or will all on-site visitation remain through the glass utilizing the required new Visitation Phones? If the County would like to offer on-site Video Visitation to increase available visitation times, while reducing staff involvement, vendors could include this in their proposal. Can you please provide the number of terminals which would be utilized for this at each facility?

Response: Response: Detention Services is open to all options relative to making visitation booths available to the public. There is limited space available in the Jail Visitation Lobby, where potentially 4-6 (depending on size/configuration) booths could be constructed and additionally, there is space available in the public visitation area of the Geiger facility for possibly 3-4 more booths to be constructed. We are also interested in options that would utilize remote locations, such as libraries or other public spaces, so that the public would not have to physically travel to the Jail or Geiger to conduct a remote visit.

Question #10: Due to the State requirement that any electrical work done within the facility be done by a WA State approved

contractor, does Spokane County have any preferred vendor to do electrical and conduit that may be needed for the additional services requested in the RFP?

Response: The following vendors have done work for Spokane County in the past. We do not comment on if they are or are not “preferred vendors”.

- Colvico
- Power City

Question #11: Would the County be willing to provide a month or more of commission reports with full inmate calling detail?



2019-01-08 - GTL
Phone Commission St

Response: See included 2018 Rate/Commissions

Question #12: Would the County please provide a copy of the RFP in Microsoft Word format to facilitate responding to the RFP specifications?



P11092 Attachment
A-G updated 3-1-2019

Response: WORD versions of Attachments A-G are attached.

Question #13: 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		

Response: See Response to Question #11

Question #14: 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

Please provide a copy of all current contracts and amendments pertaining to inmate phones.

Response: See included original contract and 2016 amendment



OMSContract.pdf



2016 amendment to rates and fees.pdf

Question #15: 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.

Response: See Response to Question #11

Question #16: Do commissions from this contract go to the Inmate Welfare Fund, the Sheriff's Office discretionary fund, or the County general fund?

Response: Yes, all commissions now go to the Inmate Welfare Fund

Question #17: Please provide the inmate capacity in each housing unit.

Response: Spokane County Detention Services has an approximate Average Daily Population in the 950 to 1000 inmate range. Future growth or reduction is difficult to gauge, so max capacity is outlined below.

Jail:

- 2 West – capacity ~100
- 2 East, 3 East, 4 East, 6 East, 6 West – All have a current capacity of 46, but could be retrofitted to support 92.
- 3 West, 4 West, 5 West, 5 East– All have a capacity of 92
- Annex - capacity of 92

Geiger:

- A1 – Capacity 48
- A2 – Capacity 74
- A3 - Capacity 74
- B1 – Capacity 25
- B2 – Capacity 74
- B3 – Capacity 74

Question #18: Please provide a breakdown of the inmate population, in percentages or actual numbers, by local, DOC, or other agency.

Response: As of recently the numbers are as follows –

Local = 825

US Marshalls = 107

Other = 9

DOC = 8

Question #19: In order to ensure a level playing field for all bidders, please confirm that the successful vendor must provide new equipment. Also, please verify that this applies to both new potential bidders and the incumbent provider.

Response: Response: New equipment is not required, as stated in Attachment H, Section I.

Question #20: Please provide the schedule in which the inmates have access to the inmate phones?

Response:

Jail – The schedule is 0815-1100 and 1300-1500 Monday through Friday in the housing modules. 2W and 2E are 7 days a week later until 2300.

Geiger (see attached) –

- **A-3, B-2, B-3 only have access to the phones during their yard times.**
- **A-1, A-2, B-1 inmates have phones on their floors and can access the phones during any non-lock down time.**



Geiger Site Yard
Schedule.pdf

Question #21: Does the County intend to continue any traditional face-to-face visitation once video visitation is implemented? If so, how many traditional visitation telephone sets (pairs) does the County require? Do you want these wired to the inmate telephone system for monitoring and recording?

Response: Spokane County will continue to support face to face visitation. Booths in the Jail currently utilize an intercom system (in pairs) that is not part of the existing phone system and will not be replaced. Additionally, Geiger utilizes a mesh wire screen to support booth conversation. We are not asking for this RFP to replace these existing solutions.

Question #22: Attachment H p. 24 states, “Video conferencing must allow Criminal Justice Agencies to screen share documents...” Please clarify, what is meant by “screen share documents”? What is the County’s intent for this feature?

Response: As stated in Attachment H, Section II, requirements 7 and 8, the County intends for a screen to be available to the inmate during their video visitation session that would allow them to see court documents that are being shared by other members of the video conference (the court, legal representation, prosecutor, etc.).

Question #23: Attachment A-G p. 16 states, “Please outline solution costs that demonstrate full commission vs., partial commission and no commission with reduced rates.” What does the County consider to be “full commission,” “partial commission,” and “no commission”?

Response: Full commission would be the maximum or 100% rate of commission you can supply to Spokane County. Partial commission would be a 50% commission with the other unpaid half going back into lower rates and no commission is 0% commission with the full commission amount going back into lower rates.

Question #24: The County does not require a response to Attachment H – Requirements, nor to Appendix A – Scope of Work. If an Offeror cannot meet any of the requirements in these documents, should they submit a list of exceptions and/or proposed alternatives? If so, where in the proposal should this information be placed?

Response: A response to the RFP must meet the minimum requirements in order to be responsive. Any alternative solutions would be addressed in the Attachment F.

Question #25: The County does not require a response to Appendix C – Sample Agreement. Some of the terms of this Sample Agreement would not apply to a contract of this nature, where the Inmate Telephone System is provided at no cost rather than purchased. If an Offeror would like to negotiate more suitable terms, should they submit a list of exceptions and/or proposed alternatives? If so, where in the proposal should this information be placed?

Response: See the Response to Question 4 b).

Question #26: The Proposal Format has a place where “value-added options or ideas” may be described (Attachment F). However, there is no similar section where the required technology should be described – e.g. features of the proposed inmate telephone and video visitation systems, tablet system, and visitation administrative system. Our understanding is that the County does not want this required technology to be described as part of the proposal and that, instead, such descriptions will be part of the interview / demonstration phase of this procurement. Is this understanding correct? If not, where in the proposal should Offerors include descriptions of the required services?

Response: Detailed technical information will be shared during Phase 2.

Question #27: The format of Attachment G – Cost Proposal (including the note that “Spokane County reserves the right to award to one vendor for all three services or individually”) implies that the County expects to pay for the video visitation, tablet, and visitation

administration systems separately, rather than having these systems provided at no cost as part of the inmate telephone system contract. Is this interpretation correct?

Response: Vendors are encouraged to show multiple pricing models where hardware, software, installation, implementation and maintenance fees for all solutions are broken out with:

- a) **No cost to Spokane County and are instead recouped by the vendor via some portion of the service fees collected.**
- b) **Some upfront costs paid by Spokane County to ensure that service fees are not burdensome to inmates and their families. Obviously, we do not know the threshold for “burdensome” so we would need to see costs outlined that we may choose to pay upfront and how that correlates to lower rates.**

A balance will be needed between low upfront costs and putting upward pressure (vendor’s recouping implementation costs) on service fee pricing that will be felt by inmates and their families.

In addition, the award will now be made to one vendor. See updated Attachment G – Cost Proposal

Question #28: In the Inmate Tablets section of Attachment G – Cost Proposal, Offerors are asked to provide pricing based upon the “Monthly Cost” of a “Tablet Subscription Package.” Some tablet services offer subscription packages, while others offer different types of pricing, such as per minute of usage. May Offerors propose alternative pricing plans under this section?

Response: See the updated Attachment G

Question #29: Section 6.8 on RFP p. 19 requires several forms to be submitted before award, including Spokane County Personnel Inventory Report, Affidavit and Certificate of Compliance with Spokane County Code 12.16, Statement of Compliance - Union or Employee Referral Agency Statement (if applicable) Spokane County Code 3.04.120 and Consultant Disclosure Form (if applicable), 504/ADA Disability Assurance of Compliance and Corrective Action Plan, and Equal Benefits Compliance Declaration Form. Since these forms have not been provided in the RFP packet, please confirm that they are to be submitted upon award notification and not as part of the proposal submission.

Response: Confirmed.

Question #30: Some vendors provide alternate payment options, such as the ability to purchase a one-time phone call using a credit or debit card, without the necessity of setting up a prepaid account. Providers that offer this option charge as much as \$14.99 for a single call. We have also found that many facilities were unaware that this type of call was being offered at their facility. In light of this information, we respectfully ask the County to consider disallowing this charging practice at the Facility.

Response: No question asked.

Question #31: Providers who offer the single call payment options described above typically pay little to no commission on this type of call. For example, providers who charge \$14.99 typically pay only \$0.61 in commissions (4.07%) to their clients because they categorize this call type as “bonus” and don’t pay the proposed commission rate on these calls. If these types of calls are allowed, please confirm that bidders will be required to disclose all associated rates, transaction fees, per call cost, and what part will be allocated to the County as commissions. Please also state how these costs and commissions will be evaluated as part of the Financial Offering.

Response: No question asked.

Question #32: Attachment G – Cost Proposal. So that all vendors have the same understanding of the County’s requirement, what is the County’s definition of half commission and full commission on the phone, tablets, and video visitation commission section?

Response: Response: Full commission would be the maximum or 100% rate of commission you can supply to Spokane County. Partial commission would be a 50% commission with the other unpaid half going back into lower rates and no commission is 0% commission with the full commission amount going back into lower rates.

See also the Response to Question #28.

Question #33: Attachment G – Cost Proposal. Is it the County’s intent that each of the 3 phone offers – no commission, half commission, and full commission also have a variation on the call rates?

Response: Yes, we are asking that call rates be driven down by applying the commission we would forgo, so rates should be different for all three commission structures.

Question #34: Attachment G – Cost Proposal - Inmate Tablets. Please clarify what the County means by “with guaranteed commission amounts”.

Response: Spokane county assumes that commissions along with a guaranteed amount (minimum commission dollar amount to be paid) are offered on inmate tablets, just like with inmate phones. If this is not the case, please clarify in your proposal response.

Question #35: Attachment G – Cost Proposal - Inmate Tablets. Will the County please clarify what they consider a “Subscription Package”?

Response: See the Response to Question #28.

Question #36: Attachment G – Cost Proposal - Inmate tablets. In order to make tablet programs more affordable and available for all inmates, including those who are only at the County for less than a month, will the County accept other cost models such as on a per minute model.

Response: The County is open to all cost models, please just be clear in your response.

Question #37: Attachment G – Cost Proposal - Inmate tablets. Is it the County’s intent that each of the 3 Tablet offers – no commission, half commission, and full commission also have a variation on the rates/fees?

Response: Yes, we are asking that tablet rates be driven down by applying the commission we would forgo, so rates should be different for all three commission structures.

Question #38: Attachment G – Cost Proposal - Video Visitation. Is it the County’s intent that each of the 3 Video Visitation offers – no commission, half commission, and full commission also have a variation on the rates/fees?

Response: Yes, we are asking that Video Visitation rates be driven down by applying the commission we would forgo, so rates should be different for all three commission structures.

Question #39: Attachment G – Cost Proposal – Visitation Administration. Is it the County’s intent to pay for the new Visitation Administration solution?

Response: Yes

Question #40: Attachment G – Cost Proposal – Section 2. Please clarify that the County would like for all items in Attachment F also be included in Section 2?

Response: Yes

Question #41: 5.2 Evaluation Summary – Price. How will the 200 points allocated for price be split between cost/fees vs. commission. In addition, how will the points be allocated per section – phone, tablet, video visitation.

Response: See Addendum Item 3 – Inmate Phone: 50% Video Visitation: 30% Visitation Administration: 20%

Question #42: 8.21 Formula Used to Convert Cost to Points. Will the proposals only be evaluated on the cost and not commission? If not, what is the formula for the commission.

Response: POINTS BASED ON COMMISSION
$$\frac{[(\text{Value of Highest Commission Rate}) \times (\text{Maximum Points for Commission})]}{(\text{Value of Each Lower Commission Rate})} = \text{POINTS}$$

Question #43: Appendix A – Timeline. Should vendors assume Inmate Phone System, Inmate Tablets, Video Visitation and Visitation Administration as part of the vendor Service Plan (Attachment C)?

Response: Yes

Question #44: 4.5 Service Plan, 4.6 Level of Expertise, 4.7 Risk Assessment Plan, and 4.8 Value Assessment Plan all indicate “template is provided in this document and must be used by all Offerors. Offerors are NOT allowed to re-create, re-format, or modify the template (cannot alter font size, font type, font color; add colors, pictures, diagrams, etc.).” Each of the above forms indicate,

“These instructions and the example below may be deleted from this form.” Can vendors modify the form or are no modifications allowed? As the forms are not setup as forms in the original PDF, can the County please send the form in Word so that vendors can appropriately respond on the form without converting as or converting to a form as that may modify/alter font size and font type.

Response: See Response to Question #12.

Question #45: As response to all questions are not due back to vendors until 2/27 and RFP response is due 3/6, allowing for only 4 business days will the County provide for a two-week extension? This will provide vendors time to fully evaluate, understand the clarifications, and finalize a response that is fully compliant with the requirements.

Response: The due date for proposals has been changed to 11 am March 13, 2017.

Question #46: Attachment H:I.1.1.3.e – Restriction interfacing to or from JailTracker data (alerts, etc.) is required. Please clarify, what specific data must be passed to/from JailTracker to the Inmate Telephone and/or Inmate Tablets system?

Response: Spokane team may need to discuss this further. If the inmate has phone restrictions, can the restriction simply be documented in the JailTracker system (incident/sanction) then set up in the phone/tablet system? Is there a compelling reason to interface the two? An option for this interface would be to set an alert in JailTracker when a restriction is set up in the phone/tablet system. An alert would need the following data.

Field	Req Y/N	Data Type	Description
ArrestNo	Y	Int, not null	Booking number identifier
CategoryID	Y	Int, not null	Alert category id, could be static
ExpirationDate	N	Datetime, null	Timestamp when alert expires
Details	N	Varchar(max), null	Details, notes or description

All responses to interface questions are made with the assumption that there will be a core interface between the JailTracker system and the phone/tablet/commissary/visitation system(s) that keeps an up to date list of basic inmate information including but not limited to inmate name, inmate cid (jacket) number, booking number, and booking date based on the vendor system requirements. Data fields listed are a ROUGH list of fields that could be required and are not intended to be an exhaustive list.

Question #47: Attachment H:I.1.1.5. - Inmate phone/tablet system should support Inmate Kite submissions. a. Interfacing to or from JailTracker data. Please clarify, what information must be provided by our request/kite tracking system to/from JailTracker?

Response: JailTracker has a Grievance module but no Kite module. Kites will be submitted as a category of grievance. Refer to the Grievance response for more information.

All responses to interface questions are made with the assumption that there will be a core interface between the JailTracker system and the phone/tablet/commissary/visitation system(s) that keeps an up to date list of basic inmate information including but not limited to inmate name, inmate cid (jacket) number, booking number, and booking date based on the vendor system requirements. Data fields listed below are a ROUGH list of fields that could be required and are not intended to be an exhaustive list.

Question #48: Attachment H:I.1.1.6. - Inmate phone/tablet system should support grievances. a. Interfacing to or from JailTracker data. Please clarify, what information must be provided by our request/kite tracking system to/from JailTracker?

Response: To some extent this depends on the grievance capabilities of the phone/tablet system and we would need to evaluate the capabilities of both the phone system and JailTracker grievance management modules. If the preferred solution would be to use JailTracker then the phone system would need to have configurable grievance categories and the following fields would be need to be sent from the inmate phone system to the JailTracker system to initiate a grievance.

Field	Req Y/N	Data Type	Description
Grievance ID	N	PK int, not null	Primary Key Unique identifier, auto generated
Booking Number	Y	FK Int, not null	Foreign Key associating the grievance with a booking
Category ID	Y	Int, not null	Grievance category
Complaint	Y	Text, not null	

All responses to interface questions are made with the assumption that there will be a core interface between the

JailTracker system and the phone/tablet/commissary/visitation system(s) that keeps an up to date list of basic inmate information including but not limited to inmate name, inmate cid (jacket) number, booking number, and booking date based on the vendor system requirements. Data fields listed are a ROUGH list of fields that could be required and are not intended to be an exhaustive list.

Question #49: Attachment H:I.1.1.7. - Inmate phone/tablet system should support Commissary ordering. a. Interfacing to or from JailTracker data. Is commissary ordering performed via JailTracker? If not, what information is required of the inmate tablet system to/from JailTracker regarding commissary ordering?

Response: The current commissary ordering processed is outlined below.

Current Inmate Commissary Order Process:

1. Commissary item menu/list and a bubble sheet for placing orders are provided to inmates on a weekly schedule by floor. Inmates fill in the bubble sheet and return them.
2. When Commissary staff are ready to process the orders the bubbles sheets are fed through a scanner which processes them and creates a DAT file containing order details. (NOTE: SHOULD WE PROVIDE A SAMPLE FILE AT THIS POINT?) Commissary staff processes the order in JailTracker by selecting the DAT file from the Commissary Import screen. Exceptions are handled at this time (example: inmate does not have sufficient funds for the order or item is out of stock)
3. Commissary staff batch prints order receipts which are used as a pick list for each order as well as for inmate signature acknowledging receipt of their items. Note that inmate signatures on the receipt could be collected on a tablet however this would require another interface to send the signature back to JailTracker on a per order basis.

Assuming the phone/tablet system has an inmate commissary ordering module/form the vendor system would need to have a configurable list of commissary items that inmates can order. The interface would need to send a list of items the inmate is attempting to order including the order date, booking number, item number(s), item quantity. The ideal solution would provide the ability to export the orders by floor to a DAT file in the same format currently being generated from the scantron machine.

Field	Req Y/N	Data Type	Description
Arrest/Book Number	Y	int, not null	Booking number
Order Date	Y	DateTime, not null	Date the commissary order was placed
Item Number	Y	int, not null	Commissary item ID
Item Quantity	Y	int, not null	Ordered item quantity

All responses to interface questions are made with the assumption that there will be a core interface between the JailTracker system and the phone/tablet/commissary/visitation system(s) that keeps an up to date list of basic inmate information including but not limited to inmate name, inmate cid (jacket) number, booking number, and booking date based on the vendor system requirements. Data fields listed are a ROUGH list of fields that could be required and are not intended to be an exhaustive list.

Question #50: Attachment H:III.1.17 - Allow system to interface (one way or two way) as needed with: a. JailTracker – Serves as our Jail Management System b. Jail Transport Notification System (JTNS) – Allows for transport requests to be submitted by different agencies that require inmates be transported to Court, etc. and for Detention Services staff to coordinate and track those movements Typically, video visitation systems receive inmate location and movement information from the JMS, in this case JailTracker. Please clarify, what information video visitation systems will need to receive and/or provide with the JTNS system?

Response: The goal here is to keep inmate friends/family from scheduling a visit when it is known in advance that the inmate will not be available. Unfortunately, this is difficult as the case as court dates, medical visits, etc are very dynamic. Both JailTracker and JTNS could provide some timeframes when the inmate would not be available due to scheduling conflicts appointments or court dates. The current visitation system uses 2 stored procedures to attempt to determine inmate availability by pulling scheduled transport data from the JTNS and flagging the conflicting visit with a red X to indicate a problem so reception staff is aware.

Procedure 1 (spJVInmateConflicts) takes a CID and returns a list of future transports scheduled for the inmate. Dataset returned includes

- Transport begin time
- Transport end time
- Transport description
- Transport reason
- Allow Jail Visit (flag to allow visit if being transported to the jail from Geiger?)

Field	Req Y/N	Data Type	Description
Transport Start Time	Y	Datetime, not null	Booking number
Transport End Time	Y	DateTime, not null	Date the commissary order was placed
Transport Desc	Y	varchar, not null	Commissary item ID
Transport Reason	Y	varchar, not null	Ordered item quantity
Allow Jail Visit	Y	Bit	Allow if transporting from GEI to SCJ

Procedure 2 (spJVUnavailableInmates) takes a facility code and datetime and returns a list of inmates where the provided datetime falls between the scheduled transport begin and end times.

Field	Req Y/N	Data Type	Description
CID	Y	Int, not null	Inmate identifier/jacket number
FloorCell	Y	Varchar, not null	Inmate cell/location
Inmate Name	Y	Varchar, not null	
ReasonDesc	Y	Varchar, not null	Scheduled transport reason

All responses to interface questions are made with the assumption that there will be a core interface between the JailTracker system and the phone/tablet/commissary/visitation system(s) that keeps an up to date list of basic inmate information including but not limited to inmate name, inmate cid (jacket) number, booking number, and booking date based on the vendor system requirements. Data fields listed are a ROUGH list of fields that could be required and are not intended to be an exhaustive list.

Question #51: The only question that we currently have is regarding the revenue generated by the current vendor inmate telephone system. Would it be possible to send revenue and/or commission statements from the current vendor for the same timeframe as the call volume in Attachment H of the RFP from January 2018 to October 2018?

Response: See Response to Question #11

Victor Leamer

Victor Leamer,
Senior Buyer