

RFP ADDENDUM  
RFP-18 Rev. 11/17/16  
Prev. Rev. 3/13/14

Kris Wohlgemuth  
Contract Specialist

860-713-5606  
Telephone Number

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT**  
*DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES*

PROCUREMENT DIVISION  
450 Columbus Boulevard, Hartford, CT 06103

RFP NO.:	17PSX0027
Proposal Due Date:	19 July 2017
Date Addendum Issued:	8 June 2017

**PLEASE NOTE:**

This document has been marked as "Returnable". Electronic submittal of this document indicates that your company has read and accepted any modifications to the RFP that are contained in this Addendum.

**RFP ADDENDUM #1**

DESCRIPTION:

**Wireless Inmate Tablet/Kiosks and Associated Infrastructure for Correctional Facilities**

FOR:

**Department of Correction**

**PROPOSERS NOTE:**

- Responses to Submitted RFP Questions
- Extend Proposal Due Date to 19 July 2017
- Inform Proposers that there will be a walk-through of CTDOC facilities schedule at a later date to get a better idea on the infrastructure. This walk-through is not a mandatory requirement but highly recommended, no site plans will be provided. More information will be forth coming in the future and Proposer's should check the Portal frequently.

# **RFP # 17PSX0027**

## **Addendum #1**

### **PROPOSER'S QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

#### **RFP Document Questions:**

Q1. Does CTDOC currently have an Inmate Tablet/Kiosk system?

**A1. No. CTDOC does not currently have an Inmate Tablet/Kiosk system?**

Q2. Has the State established a Contract Award date?

**A2. No, there is no date of Contract Award established.**

Q3. Has a date been established for response to RFP questions?

**A3. No**

Q4. Will presentations be part of selection criteria?

**A4: Information pertaining to the selection criteria can be found in the RFP "Selection Criteria"**

Q5. Can the State further clarify the contract award process and associated timeframes?

**A5. Please refer to form RFP-19 Standard RFP Terms and Conditions – Section "Award" or you can find additional information in the States' Regulations 4d 3-15. No timeframe has been established for this RFP**

Q6. Can Proposers make multiple financials offers?

**A6. Proposers can only submit one proposal, however in Exhibit 3 Product and Pricing the Proposers can submit different pricing models as long as it follows the pricing criteria.**

Q7. Will access be given for Proposers to have walk thru of proposed facilities to make assessment to scope wireless infrastructure needs and architecture?

**A7. Yes, schedule dates and facilities tours will be determined and posted in an Amendment.**

Q8. Can CTDOC provide specific information pertaining to each facility: number of pods/cells and building including inmate population for each facility?

**A8. Housing units by facility are as follows. Note that daily populations fluctuate. The following should be considered to by approximate numbers.**

<b>Facility</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>AVG</b>	<b>Total</b>
Bridgeport CC	12	120	38	69	774
Brooklyn CI	4	114	114	114	455
Cheshire CI	15	128	40	95	1,393
Corrigan/Radgowski CI	15	116	11	87	1207
Enfield CI	7	202	54	103	722
Garner CI	11	92	92	92	553
Hartford CC	13	128	10	50	955
Macdougall/Walker CI	21	120	95	101	1,966
Manson YI	11	70	20	50	573
New Haven CC	10	128	51	68	671

Northern CI	4	100	98	99	265
Osborn CI	9	260	175	215	1374
Robinson CI	10	180	70	148	1,453
Willard-Cybulski CI	10	118	110	114	1,144
York CI	24	112	12	59	996

**Q9.** Will Site Plans be provided for each facility proposed?

**A9. Due to security issues, site plans cannot be provided, but CTDOC will be providing site visits.**

**Q10.** What is the annual number of Video Visitations per facility?

**A10. Currently zero.**

**Q11.** What is the annual number of traditional Visitation per facility?

**A11. Annual Visitation by Facility is as follows:**

<b>FACILITY</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>Average</b>
BRIDGEPORTCC	10,942	5,968	3,435	6,782
BROOKLYN CI	8,928	8,743	8,433	8,701
CHESHIRE CI	26,591	26,954	28,371	27,305
CORRIGAN CI	8,441	7,904	6,813	7,719
ENFIELD CI	9,998	9,685	10,280	9,988
GARNER	5,284	5,247	5,824	5,452
HARTFORD CC	3,581	16,247	17,216	12,348
MACDOUGALL	30,673	29,126	29,143	29,647
MANSON YI	13,784	12,887	14,953	13,875
NEW HAVEN CC	15,047	13,462	14,428	14,312
NIANTIC ANNEX	8,156	8,055	28	5,413
NORTHERN CI	3,308	3,131	3,375	3,271
OSBORN CI	25,859	27,657	23,120	25,545
RADGOWSKI	9,962	9,085	9,897	9,648
ROBINSON CI	20,635	19,985	21,179	20,600
WALKER RC	9,013	7,897	9,536	8,815
WILLARD-CYBULSKI	2,235	5,067	16,425	7,909
YORK CI	15,310	14,430	14,814	14,851
	<b>227,747</b>	<b>231,530</b>	<b>237,270</b>	<b>232,182</b>

**Q12.** How many Video Visitation Stations are proposed for each facility?

**A12. Proposer must provide their estimate of what is needed based on CTDOC's inmate population and facility data.**

**Q13.** How many In pod Only Stations are proposed for each facility?

**A13. Proposer must provide their estimate of what is needed based on CTDOC's inmate population and facility data.**

**Q14.** How many inmates are housed in each pod/cell on average at each facility?

**A14. Housing units by facility are as follows. Note that daily populations fluctuate. The following should be considered to by approximate numbers.**

<b>Facility</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>AVG</b>	<b>Total</b>
Bridgeport CC	12	120	38	69	774
Brooklyn CI	4	114	114	114	455
Cheshire CI	15	128	40	95	1,393
Corrigan/Radgowski CI	15	116	11	87	1207
Enfield CI	7	202	54	103	722
Garner CI	11	92	92	92	553
Hartford CC	13	128	10	50	955
Macdougall/Walker CI	21	120	95	101	1,966
Manson YI	11	70	20	50	573
New Haven CC	10	128	51	68	671
Northern CI	4	100	98	99	265
Osborn CI	9	260	175	215	1374
Robinson CI	10	180	70	148	1,453
Willard-Cybulski CI	10	118	110	114	1,144
York CI	24	112	12	59	996

Q15. Is CTDOC looking to consolidate their existing infrastructure to one vendor?

**A15. CTDOC is not looking to consolidate their infrastructure to one vendor at this time.**

Q16. RFP states integration with current and future systems, please provide further details regarding how this would be facilitated if exiting phone contract and wireless infrastructure comments are in place??

**A16. It is expected that the selected vendor shall work with CTDOC’s current vendors to develop interfaces with CTDOC’s current systems and access agreements as necessary and appropriate to provide the required level of service.**

Q17. Please provide further insight regarding governance (rules of engagement) for Proposers working with current contracted Proposers?

**A17. CTDOC has identified its current vendors and contracts. CTDOC cannot provide any further guidance regarding how private companies negotiate their business arrangements. CTDOC expects all of its current vendors to operate in a reasonable and fair manner, however CTDOC’s influence over its current providers extends only so far as its current contracts allow.**

Q18. Will all facilitating [facilities] need to have monitoring capabilities or will monitoring be centralized?

**A18. CTDOC requires both individual facility monitoring capability and centralized capability.**

Q19. What is the criteria for scoring?

**A19. Information pertaining to the selection criteria can be found in the RFP “Selection Criteria”**

Q20. Is their itemization for scoring points for each feature / functionality identified on page 13?

**A20. Yes, but the State does not provide this information.**

**Q21.** What percentage of inmate population currently have tablets?

**A21. Currently 0%.**

**Q22.** Are inmates allowed to place phone calls on current tablets?

**A22. CTDOC does not currently have a tablet program.**

**Q23.** Is tablet sharing up for consideration?

**A23. All business models are open for consideration.**

**Q24.** How many hours are tablets available to inmates during a 24-hour time frame?

**A24. CTDOC does not currently have a tablet program.**

**Q25.** Are there call time duration limits?

**A25. Currently there is limit of 15 minutes per call.**

**Q26.** What are allowed hours for wireless calls?

**A26. CTDOC does not currently have a tablet program.**

**Q27.** Have any call rates parameters been defined for calls initiated on tablets?

**A27. No. CTDOC does not currently have a tablet program.**

**Q28.** What is the existing model for tablets ownership by inmates?

**A28. CTDOC does not currently have a tablet program.**

**Q29.** Do inmates currently own music on current tablets?

**A29: No, CTDOC inmates do not currently have a tablet program. Today inmates uses a CD player and CD's and or a radio to play music.**

**Q30.** Do inmates use the current tablets to order commissary? If not, is this of interest to CTDOC?

**A30: No, CTDOC inmates do not currently have a tablet program to order commissary. Yes, CTDOC is interested in ordering commissary from both tablets and kiosk.**

**Q31.** What is the current method of charging and distributing tablets on a daily basis?

**A31. CTDOC does not currently have a tablet program.**

**Q32.** What are the expectations for transfer of existing music contained on tablets by inmates?

**A32. CTDOC does not have a tablet program to play music and does not except the selected vendor to transfer inmates existing music to the tablets.**

**Q33.** Regarding Exhibit 2, "Proposer must respond to each specification and explain how it will comply with each requirement." How should the explanation be provided, e.g. in column D of the Exhibit file, as a separate Word file with references to the Exhibit 2 number?

**A33: Column D of the Exhibit file.**

**Q34.** Regarding renting or selling of the tablets to inmates – is the DOC open to the Proposer providing the tablets at no cost to the inmate (however can charge for selected use of the tablet)?

**A34. Yes. All business model are open for consideration.**

**Q35.** Regarding 1.28 "Inmate Tablets must be individually registered to the Inmate who purchases/rents the unit." Will the DOC accept a model of the Proposer administering Inmate privileges and applications on the basis of a secure username/password used to access any tablet rather than privileges and

applications tied to specific tablets tied to specific inmates? This would allow for a no-cost, tablet-sharing business model.?

**A35. All business models that meet/address the security requirements stated in the RFP specifications will be considered.**

**Q36.** Regarding 12.1 “Ability of Inmates to access and view DOC approved law library.” Please specified DOC’s approved law library source?

**A36. With regard to a law library, CTDOC does not have a law library system in place system-wide. Where available, inmates have limited access to statute books and other legal reference books.**

**Q37.** Are you looking to have all 15 facilities enabled for wireless infrastructure?

**A37: Yes.**

**Q38.** Is their [there] priority order for which facilities are first?

**A38: The Department anticipates the following facilities be given priority. However, this may change in discussions with the vendor:**

- 1. Corrigan/Radgowski**
- 2. Level 4 Facilities to include (not in priority order)**
  - Cheshire CI**
  - MacDougall/Walker**
  - Manson Youth Institute**
  - Garner CI**
  - York CI**
- 3. Reintegration Center**
  - Williard/Cybulski**

**Q39.** Is the current infrastructure wired or wireless?

**A39. Wired (limited).**

**Q40.** What are the current Educational programs?

**A40. CTDOC Educational Services/Programs is provided through Unified School District #1 (USD #1). USD #1 is a legally vested school district within the Department of Correction (DOC). Education continues to be one of the Department's most valuable assets in providing opportunities that will support an offender's successful reintegration back into the community.**

**Q41.** How many inmates utilize educational resources?

**A41: Currently CTDOC services approximately 16,000 duplicated students per year through our teachers. CTDOC anticipates that another 3,000-5,000 may access educational materials if they were available. Duplicated counts indicate that the student is serviced multiple times throughout the year – i.e. transfers from one facility where the inmate is receiving school and to another facility or is enrolled in GED class in one facility and then vocational classes in another.**

**Q42.** Are there fees associated with utilizing educational resources?

**A42. CTDOC does not charge a fee to inmates to participate in education programs.**

**Q43.** Is there a total number of titles that the customer would like to receive as it relates to categories listed in the RFP: education, programs and treatment, Re-entry Life Skills, Work Readiness/Vocational, and Religious content??

**A43. There is no limit to the number titles CTDOC would like access to, as long as the titles are appropriate for the inmate population and of high quality.**

**Q44.** With regard to religious content, are there any specific religions that must be covered? If so, which religions must be covered?

**A44. The primary religions that must be covered are as follows (note this list is subject to change based on the makeup of the inmate population):**

- **Christian: Catholic and Protestant**
- **Muslim**
- **Jewish**
- **Native American**
- **Jehovah Witness**
- **Buddhist**

**Q45.** With regard to education content, are there any specifics as it relates to the education content or material? For example, GED prep, English As A Second Language (ESL) etc...??

**A45: CTDOC would like to know what each proposer has to offer.**

**Q46.** Is there any test prep or assessment/evaluation material required?

**A46. CTDOC would like to know what each proposer has to offer.**

**Q47.** If approved, how many weeks do we have before content delivery is required?

**A47. A two-week turnaround would be the maximum. A one-week turnaround would be ideal.**

**Q48.** Does DOC facilities have CAT6 cabling for communication infrastructure?

**A48. It is required that the selected vendor's system will be completely separate from any and all DOC systems.**

**Section 1.15 of Exhibit 2 – Specifications Document - of this RFP states that “the selected vendor shall supply all necessary equipment, services, and cabling at no cost to CTDOC. Cabling will become the property of DOC upon termination.”**

**Q49.** Is the Proposer responsible for electrical install?

**A49. Yes**

**Q50.** Is the Proposer responsible for Internet Install?

**A50. Yes**

**Q51.** Are in-pod kiosks currently being used in each pod/cell?

**A51. Not Currently**

**Q52.** What is the current functionality of in-pod kiosks for the inmates if applicable?

**A52. In-pod kiosks are not currently used.**

**Q53. Regarding – 2.15 - Will the State please clarify where recorded communications must be kept? Are inmate telephone recordings to be kept within current providers (Securus) system?**

**A53: All telephonic communications (communications utilizing the inmate telephone system) will be kept by the current inmate telephone provider. It is expected that, if the tablet is use to make telephone calls, that the tablet would interface with the current inmate telephone providers system. The actual telephone call would be made via the current inmate telephone providers system. The**

**selected vendor will need to coordinate this functionality with the current inmate telephone provider.**

**With regard to all other non-telephonic communications (i.e. inmate email), the selected vendor will need to maintain this information within in their system.**

**Q54. Regarding - 4.6 & 14.1** - Does the State allow inmates to use inmate paid calling or is 100% of calling paid for by the collect call recipient? If the latter, what prepaid balances would the inmates be reviewing?

**A54. The current inmate telephone contract allows for the following payment options: Prepaid, Traditional Collect and Direct Bill. The selected vendor will need to work with the current inmate telephone provider to develop an interface to allow for the current inmate telephone provider's billing and account balance information to be accessed via the tablet.**

**Q55. Regarding 14.2** - *Ability of Inmates to make telephone calls from the Tablet (use Tablet as a telephone).* - Does this mean that the tablets must have a telephone calling application and Proposer must develop an interface with the State's current inmate telephone provider (Securus)? Will the State's current inmate telephone provider continue to provide call controls, recording and monitoring services, bill for all calls and continue to pay the State a commission from revenues generated?

**A55: Yes, if the vendor offers this capability, then the tablets should have a telephone calling application.**

**Yes, the selected vendor will need to develop an interface with the current inmate telephone provider (if the selected vendor is to offer this capability).**

**Yes, the current inmate telephone provider will continue to provide call controls, recording and monitoring services, It is expected that an application on the tablet will interface with the current inmate telephone providers system and that the selected vendor will need to work with the current inmate telephone provider to enable this functionality.**

**The current inmate telephone provider is Securus Technologies, Inc. and the current state contract for the provision of Inmate Telephones is #10ITZ0119MA/12PSX0098.**

**Q56. Regarding 14.3** - *Vendor shall enable Tablets for outbound voice communications that include the features and functionality associated with the Inmate telephone platform, including system settings, investigative capabilities, and security features.* - Does this mean that the tablets must have a telephone calling application and Proposer must develop an interface with the State's current inmate telephone provider (Securus)? Will the State's current inmate telephone provider continue to provide call controls, recording and monitoring services, bill for all calls and continue to pay the State a commission from revenues generated?

**A56: If the vendor offers this capability, then:**

**Yes, the selected vendor will need to develop an interface with the current inmate telephone provider.**

**Yes, the current inmate telephone provider will continue to provide call controls, recording and monitoring services, bill for all calls and continue to pay the State a commission from revenues generated. It is expected that an application on the tablet will interface with the current inmate telephone providers system and that the selected vendor will need to work with the current inmate telephone provider to enable this functionality.**

**Q57. Regarding 14.4** - *Vendor shall work with the agency's current (and any future) Inmate Telephone system provider to ensure interoperability and seamless interface. Such interface shall be at the Vendor's cost.* - Does this mean that the tablets must have a telephone calling application and Proposer must develop an interface with the State's current inmate telephone provider (Securus) or future inmate telephone provider? Will the State's current inmate telephone provider continue to provide call controls,



recording and monitoring services, bill for all calls and continue to pay the State a commission from revenues generated?

**A57. See A. 55**

**Q58. Regarding 14.5** - Will the State's current inmate telephone provider continue to provide call controls from calls initiated via the tablets, including providing secure calls to the inmate's legal counsel?

**A58. Yes.**

**Q59. Regarding 38 – Business Model** -Will the telephone calls continue to be processed and billed by the State's current provider (Securus)??

**A59. Yes.**

**Q60. Regarding 38.1** - Will the telephone calls continue to be processed and billed by the State's current provider (Securus)??

**A60. Yes.**

**Q61.** Will the State of Connecticut award a contract to a Proposer that has a criminal or civil proceeding pending that pertains to a public contract in another state?

**A61. This information will be taken into consideration.**

**Q62.** How many points is each section worth that is listed under the Selection Criteria?

**A62. This information is not available until after an award is made.**

**Q63.** With regard to Exhibit 2: Specifications Document, it states each Proposer should explain how it will comply with each specific requirement. However, the column labeled "Vendor Response" is locked to only those answers listed in the drop down box for that cell. Where should the Proposer provide their explanation for their response for each requirement in Exhibit 2?

**A63. Column D of the Exhibit file.**

**Q64.** How Exhibit 3 Pricing and Products be evaluated?

**A64. Refer to the RFP "Selection Criteria"**

**Q65.** With regard to Exhibit 3: Pricing and Products, can DAS please provide further clarification on how Exhibit 3 should be filled out??

**A65. The State is looking for Proposer to supply all of their pricing associated with Tablets and Kiosks.**

**Q66.** Can DAS please provide the number of housing units at each institution including each housing units offender population?

**A66. Housing units by facility are as follows. Note that daily populations fluctuate. The following should be considered to by approximate numbers.**

Facility	Units	High	Low	AVG	Total
Bridgeport CC	12	120	38	69	774
Brooklyn CI	4	114	114	114	455
Cheshire CI	15	128	40	95	1,393
Corrigan/Radgowski CI	15	116	11	87	1207
Enfield CI	7	202	54	103	722
Garner CI	11	92	92	92	553
Hartford CC	13	128	10	50	955
Macdougall/Walker CI	21	120	95	101	1,966
Manson YI	11	70	20	50	573

New Haven CC	10	128	51	68	671
Northern CI	4	100	98	99	265
Osborn CI	9	260	175	215	1374
Robinson CI	10	180	70	148	1,453
Willard-Cybulski CI	10	118	110	114	1,144
York CI	24	112	12	59	996

**Q67.** Can DAS please provide the number of pods/living units within each housing unit??

**A67. Please see answer to 66.**

**Q68.** Are outlets available within each offender's cell?

**A68. Outlets are available in most inmate cells.**

**Q69.** If charging carts/stations are utilized, will the Proposer be required to provide the electrical circuits or can the Proposer use existing outlets?

**A69. Most housing units have outlets that could be used.**

**Q70.** Will DAS grant site visits prior to the Due Date for Proposers to get a better idea on the infrastructure costs that will be involved?

**A70. Yes, dates to be determined at a later date which would be posted to the State Contracting Portal as well as any addendums to this RFP.**

**Q71.** Can DAS please provide what the costs to the Proposer will be to interface with GTL's Offender Management System?

**A71. No. This information is not available. This will need to be negotiated between the selected vendor and GTL.**

**Q72.** Can DAS please provide what the costs to the Proposer will be to interface with Syscon's Inmate Banking and Commissary system?

**A72. No. This information is not available. This will need to be negotiated between the selected vendor and Syscon.**

**Q73.** Can DAS please provide what the costs to the Proposer will be to interface with Securus' Telephone System?

**A73. No. This information is not available. This will need to be negotiated between the selected vendor and Securus.**

**Q74.** Can DAS please provide what the costs to the Proposer will be to interface with the Internal DOC RT system and CaseNotes?

**A74. These are DOC systems. The cost to the selected vendor will be whatever their cost is to development the interface. DOC will work with the selected vendor on the development of these interfaces.**