



WINNEBAGO COUNTY

— ILLINOIS —

County Administration Building
404 Elm Street
Rockford, Illinois 61101

Purchasing Department
Phone: 815-319-4380
Fax: 815-319-4381

August 20, 2025

ADDENDUM THREE

TELECOMMUNICATION SERVICES – WINNEBAGO COUNTY JAIL REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #25P-2416

1. Please provide the current service and commission rates associated with each of the following inmate services: a). ITS; b). VVS; c). Electronic Messaging (aka Email) and d). Entertainment/Media. **See Exhibits B and C. If we are able to provide additional reports, we will send them ASAP.**
2. To allow a vendor to present their best possible offer, it is very important to have historical information regarding revenue data for current inmate services. Will the County please provide copies of Service Usage/Revenue/Commission reports for the past three months for the following County services: a). ITS; b). VVS; c). Electronic Messaging (aka Email) and d). Entertainment/Media? **See Exhibits B and C. If we are able to provide additional reports, we will send them ASAP.**
3. Please provide several recent revenue or usage reports for the Jail, showing calls, minutes and revenue (or at minimum paid minutes). **See attached Exhibit B and C for revenue and usage reports.**
4. Please outline the fees that are being charged to end-users for any required services, including deposits for tablet usage and emails or photos:
 - a. Account Funding Fee via Web
 - b. Account Funding Fee via IVR
 - c. Account Funding Fee via Live Operator**Friends & Family web deposit fees to "tablet account": \$3.00 plus 3.25%**
Friends & Family web deposit fees to phone account: \$0
5. Please provide details about any commission, cost reimbursement, technology grants, signing bonuses, or any other compensation the County receive from the current vendor. **See below as well as reference Exhibit B – GTL Tablet Revenue and Phone Revenue.**

Year 1 Annual Bonus: \$35,000 – MAG \$870,000

Year 2 Annual Bonus: \$48,000 – MAG \$870,000

Year 3 Annual Bonus: \$48,000 – MAG \$870,000

Year 4 Annual Bonus – No Reference

Year 5 Annual Bonus – No and No MAG due to FCC changes

6. Are you being invoiced for any services provided by the current vendor? **No, our understanding is also any processing fees tied to credit card transactions are put on the cardholder.**
7. What limits does the County place, if any, on use of the services in this RFP –maximum number of onsite visits allowed per week (or other interval), remote visits per week, calls per week, minutes per call/visit, etc? **Visit wise, 1 per week is offered however we are flexible and allow more if the operations can accommodate accordingly.**
8. With regard to Requirements and Scope of Work on page 12 where the term “must” is used, we are concerned that the County is issuing various requirements in this RFP that are specific to a single vendor’s solution and, as the requirements are written, cannot be met by any other solution provider without custom development. While other bidders could accomplish the same goal with a different, possibly better solution, these solutions could potentially be deemed non-compliant given the restrictive RFP requirement language and would also lead to an unusual number of exceptions.

We are concerned that the requirements as written do not provide a level playing field and give one vendor an advantage in advance of the evaluation (in terms of the spec’s required that are unique to one vendor only). As well, the narrow scope within the requirements may lead to a less secure solution. To establish a level playing field and a potentially more secure solution, would the County be open to receiving bids that accomplish the same goal with a different and potentially better solution than outlined in a specific requirement and still be considered as meeting all the requirements as required per the RFP?

Is there a specific requirement you want to reference for us to provide a clarification? We are open to all solution options. There is always the opportunity to provide value added solutions. Obviously, due to the type of facility we also have correctional standards to adhere to which connect some of the statements on page 12. We are open to value added solutions. We realize technologies have advanced since our last RFP process. We will seek clarifications as needed as a part of this evaluation process.

9. The RFP states “services that rely on the use of subcontractors, third parties or affiliate vendors will not be accepted.” All inmate technology services companies would be excluded from responding to this RFP as certain items would be manufactured (i.e. chipsets, wall mounted inmate telephone hardware), housed in centralized data centers or cloud systems utilizing web services solutions, as a few examples where a third party would traditionally be involved. Can the County confirm that the spirit of this requirement is for the proposer to be the Prime contractor responsible for providing the services to the County? **Our intent is the ownership and implementation of this program falls solely with one provider. We realize there are connects to third party data centers, cloud systems etc. However, when possible, we would like to limit the risk of contracting out miscellaneous services for this product. We also recognize the connection for our vendor and Aramark to manage the transactions.**

We also want to ensure ownership in the long-term maintenance support, upgrades and security protocols in place to avoid lapse in service and support.

Ideally, we have a one company point of contact scenario to implement and operate these necessary services.

10. Regarding requirement on page 23 Specifications/Scope of Work – Inmate Digital Postal Mail System (DPMS), that states “To ensure the best level of support, Proposer must be the prime contractor of the DPMS proposed. DPMS provided by a subcontractor, third party or affiliate will not be accepted.”

To provide customers with a full spectrum of available solutions to meet their needs, yet not wanting to divert from their main line of business, some vendors utilize a third-party vendor who specializes in a

specific function which may provide only 5-15 percent of the overall solution. This means the prime vendor would provide the remaining 95-85 percent of the solution.

An everyday example on how this solution is commonly utilized would be that while a bank's expertise is managing money for large businesses, they subcontract the pickup and delivery of the money/deposits from the customer to the bank to a vendor whose expertise is in keeping the funds safe during transport.

As an example, in this RFP, would be a solution where the receipt and scanning of the mail is the part of solution where a third party is utilized, but the storage, tracking, investigative and inmate delivery via the tablet and tablet application is developed and managed by the prime contractor. Some vendors have chosen to partner with a third party to ensure that customers receive the best possible solution in that both the prime contractor and vendor are performing the functions that are within their core expertise and in the best interest of the customer.

Would the County consider this a compliant response?

We are looking to improve the inmate digital postal mail system. While the above example may be considered compliant, we are also looking for new technology solution options to avoid contraband and hazardous mailing scenarios within corrections. We need to maintain the mail integrity to ensure compliance with necessary security guidelines.

11. Regarding requirement B.10 on page 17 the County is asking for VVS facial recognition to block out visual content. While the technology for facial detection to limit the viewing area of the VVS screen is available to the industry as a whole, this is a relatively new technology. Vendors may have a listing of customer sites where this technology is deployed and operational, but not for a minimum of 2 years. To allow for a level field for vendors, would the County accept references for this that have been deployed less than 2 years? Yes, references would be accepted. We are interested in this as a value-added security measure.
 12. Regarding requirement C.1 on page 19 and on page 24 the County requires vendors to provide a legal mail system that scans copies of legal mail. Give that this form of processing legal physical mail may incur additional labor for the facility staff, and that this method may cause additional security issues, would the County allow the vendor to offer an alternative to the delivery of legal mail to inmates? We are open to all mailing options. As technologies have evolved there may be a better way to manage this operation. We are looking to mitigate the security risk while efficiently providing this service to inmates and complying with all applicable laws and regulations.
 13. The requirement on page 22 that states the vendor must offer a tablet charging system that uses metal contact pin connector. By limiting the scope of the charging method, the County may be adding to the staff burden since this method is old technology and removes availability for access to more reliable charging mechanisms such as magnetic. Would the County allow vendors to offer an alternative to metal pin connectors for tablet charging? Can we provide multiple offers by duplicating the form provided if our offers are clearly identified for each solution proposed? We are just need to follow appropriate safety standards for corrections and the FCC. We are open to these requirements being specific to the proposed solution.
 14. Can the County confirm how results of the RFP will be provided once evaluations are complete and the intent to award and/or award has been made? Submissions for this RFP will be evaluated based on the below criteria originally included in this RFP. Winnebago County will provide a proposal tab upon receiving submissions for all submitters to see who is in the evaluation aspect of this process. We also work to disclose evaluations as quickly as possible upon awarding contracts.
-

RFP Evaluation Criteria	
Completeness of Response	10%
Qualifications & Experience	25%
Quality of Solution Proposed	30%
Relevant Project Experience	15%
Pricing	20%
Total Points	100%

The following Exhibits will be included in this email:

- Exhibit B – GTL Phone Revenue
- Exhibit B – GTL Tablet Revenue
- Exhibit C – Tablet Commission Report

As always if you have additional questions, please direct all communications to purchasing@purchasing.wincoil.gov.

END OF ADDENDUM THREE