

#### 4. DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM -- CORRECTIONS FUNDING -- CORRECTIONS

(Request sent to 206 vendors)

RFP #17-0086 Contract

	Helix Business Solutions LLC	cFive Solutions, Inc.	Konica Minolta Business Solutions U.S.A., Inc.	Tribridge Holdings, LLC		Journal Technologies, Inc.	
	Hosted	On-Premise	On-Premise	On-Premise	Hosted	On-Premise	Hosted
Implementation Costs	\$775,000.00	\$145,257.00	\$240,000.00	\$630,001.00	\$630,001.00	\$350,000.00	\$350,000.00
Licensing Fees (where applicable)	included	\$267,650.00	\$222,500.00	\$189,314.00	\$119,274.00	included	included
Training	included	\$80,560.00	\$10,000.00	\$57,600.00	\$57,600.00	included	included
Maintenance and Support Year 1	\$5,972,933.00	\$99,127.00	\$44,500.00	included	included	included	included
Maintenance and Support Year 2	\$5,972,933.00	\$103,013.00	\$44,500.00	\$63,947.00	\$119,274.00	\$226,000.00	\$354,000.00
Maintenance and Support Year 3	\$5,972,933.00	\$107,051.00	\$44,500.00	\$63,947.00	\$119,274.00	\$226,000.00	\$354,000.00
Maintenance and Support Year 4	\$5,972,933.00	\$111,248.00	\$44,500.00	\$63,947.00	\$119,274.00	\$226,000.00	\$354,000.00
Maintenance and Support Year 5	\$5,972,933.00	\$115,608.00	\$44,500.00	\$63,947.00	\$119,274.00	\$226,000.00	\$354,000.00
Total five (5) year cost	\$30,639,665.00	\$1,029,514.00*	\$695,000.00	\$1,132,703.00*	\$1,283,971.00	\$1,254,000.00*	\$1,766,000.00
Hourly rate for additional on-site training outside initial training (hourly rate should include travel expenses)	No Bid	\$185.00	\$200.00	\$185.00		\$175.00	
Hourly rate for additional remote training	No Bid	\$160.00	\$200.00	\$160.00		\$175.00	
No Bid	Valor System, Inc.	ASG Technologies	VanDyke Software Inc.	The Sidwell Company		Nexlearn, LLC.	
	Innova-Consulting, LLC.	Accusoft Corporation	CDW-G	Globanet			

\*Indicates revised pricing

On the recommendation of Kimberly Bush, on behalf of the Division of Corrections, Talaya Schwartz moved to **accept the proposal from Journal Technologies, Inc. for a total five (5) year cost of \$1,254,000.00 and establish contract pricing for any additional training that may be utilized.** Jennifer Dombaugh seconded the motion. The motion passed 3 to 2, with Richard Powell and Linda Kizzire voting no.

A review committee comprised of Mary Fulghum, Mario Salinas and Steve Stonehouse - Division of Corrections, Joe Currier, Greg Gann and Bobbi Meairs - Information Technology and Support Services (ITSS) and Kim Bush - Purchasing reviewed and scored the responses based on criteria set forth in the RFP. cFive Solutions, Inc., Tribridge Holdings, LLC and Journal Technologies, Inc. received the top three (3) scores and were shortlisted. Each shortlisted proposer provided a technical demonstration of their solution and were requested to submit a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) request for revised pricing.

The Division of Corrections (DOC) currently utilizes outdated and obsolete databases which are not supported by ITSS. DOC and ITSS have been in partnership to resolve database concerns for over four (4) years without any resolution. Due to the fact that Microsoft Access is NOT designed to function at this scale, and is NOT sustainable or effectively supportable, the division is paying \$110.00 per hour to contract with High Touch to maintain and support the current databases. This project is critical in achieving the division mission, reducing recidivism, and increasing client and public safety. The DOC databases will eventually become unstable. Without accurate intake and release information, state reimbursements will decrease, and the county will be more susceptible to lawsuits from clients and outside entities that count on accurate client records. Without the ability to make substantive changes to the current system, state mandated reports have to be hand calculated, which takes substantial administrative support time and raises the probability of errors.

The new software will provide detention/residential facility management, community corrections case management tracking, client medical and food allergy information, client programming hours, staff training information, client/provider web portal access for payments, judicial system status and client case notes from treatment, ad hoc reporting tools, kiosk for client check in for all DOC locations, and a division wide system that will communicate across all programs.

cFive Solutions, Inc. didn't offer OnBase file transfer, and they were unable to replace the check-in, accounting, and tracking system. Their mapping feature for home visits is still under development and not live yet.

Tribridge Holdings, LLC did not appear to have a polished and complete product. Their system also lacked accounting functionality.

Konica Minolta Business Solutions, U.S.A., Inc. did not offer a complete proposal. Responses provided to the Scope of Work were fairly generalized and would require additional discovery in order for them to formulate a complete solution. The pricing they provided was based on an initial discovery and limited licensing. More costs would be incurred as they developed the actual solution to meet the needs of Department of Corrections.

**Note:** Scoring criteria set in this RFP were as follows:

1. Meeting all proposal requirements and instructions, submitting clear, detailed information and providing all requested documentation.
2. Data security standards and practices, experience in integrating with a variety of existing applications.
3. Experience with similar projects for government entities (social services, probation, corrections).
4. Ease and ability to run ad hoc reports across the entire system.
5. Overall cost of solution (calculated and scored by mathematical equation as provided in RFP).

*Questions and Answers:*

Richard Powell: Apologize for asking so many questions, but this one is interesting to me. I would ask, if this solution is being recommended has properties in solutions built-in that would potentially be also available in the long-term solution the county is looking at for a new CAD JMS and RMS integrative type system? If there is anyone here that can answer that?

Tom Stolz: That is a good question, I'll ask it more simply. Do you share data? Would it be beneficial for you to get data from the jail, or from CAD, or from police or from any other components of Criminal Justice? Would it be a benefit for you to have that kind of data with this system?

Mario Salinas: Administrative Manager for Division of Corrections. It is our understanding that this product is used across the board for government, as far as jail management, as well as the court system and the district attorney's office. All that information would be available if those other types of departments were to use the same kind of program.

Linda Kizzire: I am going to do a follow-up. So you're saying that the Sheriff, CAD and everybody would have to go to Journal Technologies, too?

Mario Salinas: Or they would have to work with that vendor to have some type of interface where they can communicate with each other.

Linda Kizzire: I thought the goal was to get all of those consolidated?

Mario Salinas: It is.

Tom Stolz: The problem that we run into with this project is timing. This system that we currently have is, was defined to me as crashing over a year ago, when we began to go through the budget process. What Colonel Powell is talking about and what Linda is referring to, is the broader scope right now of looking at a single system that can integrate all these components together, be efficient, talk back and forth, could save us money on purchase and acquisition and at the end of the day give us a better product. I don't have any trouble with your mathematics I think that the committee did a really good job on picking the right vendor for this. My struggle is, if you see benefit to being part of a bigger system can we delay this a bit? And bring it to the table with the Sheriff, 911 dispatcher, Police Chief, Fire Chiefs and Mark Bennet and talk about integrating you into a larger system; is that feasible at all?

Greg Gann: Good afternoon Greg an IT Project Manager, Information Technology. This question was brought up many times in our discussion the timing is unfortunate for us because of, as you stated Mr. Stolz, the access databases are not talking to each other, the tremendous amount of manual input and effort to create reports just to update the data on a daily basis. If any one of these systems fails it cripples the Department of Corrections ability to serve the public. In a perfect world we would love to be on the same system. We did ask questions: could we share data, could we make this system available to the upcoming system that Sheriff and 911 and everyone else is looking at? Simple consolidation and sharing of data that is a possibility, at this time though the time frame is such that we just can't wait.

Linda Kizzire: Do you have any idea Greg, how much total spend to High Touch was at that \$110.00 an hour?

Greg Gann: \$10,000.00 to \$15,000.00 for 2017 approximate.

Tom Stolz: Is it possible that we have such a crash that High Touch couldn't fix it anymore?

Greg Gann: Yes it is very possible.

Mario Salinas: From the meaning of IT is that each year Access comes out you lose more and more functionality. Eventually we're going to hold ourselves back with what software our employees can use in order to keep that Access database. We can't upgrade to a newer version of anything because we have to keep Access down to an older version.

Greg Gann: Each subsequent version of Access does not play well with older versions.

Tom Stolz: Greg, if we push this down the road, in other words with the commission votes on this and we go to acquisition what's an estimate on transition time before we could get into this system?

Greg Gann: It's a largely dependent on the vendor and Corrections but, if we could put this into effect this calendar year that would be ideal.

Tom Stolz: Is that a goal?

Greg Gann: It is definitely.

Tom Stolz: At minimum what we need to ask the Sheriff and the committee that's looking at the global solution would be the factor if we're going to go down this track. Let me ask a technical question from Purchasing, how long do these bids how long are they valid before they would expire?

Kim Bush: Proposals are typically valid for a 120 days, we've already passed that, these vendors are holding their pricing for us.

Tom Stolz: It could go at anytime then, we have no guarantee?

Kim Bush: Potentially, yes. And if I might add I also worked on the RFI for the CAD and the Sheriff's RMS as well so I know that they're still reviewing that information and it could be a while until something comes out.

Tom Stolz: Or fiscal '19 before we implemented anything.

Kim Bush: Right, but those questions were asked because I was working on both projects simultaneously.

Tom Stolz: Can I ask, did the committee feel like this should go forward? The internal committee?

Kim Bush: For this project?

Tom Stolz: Yes.

Kim Bush: Absolutely.

Talaya Schwartz: I just have one question. During the review process for the reference checks, were any of the references for other county entities within the state or close to?

Kim Bush: I believe they were all public sector Correctional Departments. There were state and some local governments.

Talaya Schwartz: I'm assuming those references were all good, for high praise of the product.

Kim Bush: We also use Journal Technologies, Inc. in the DA's office, they have been using it for quite a while and I believe they do have some data exchange with the city of Wichita if I recall correctly so I know that it's possible to set up those that exchanges between different systems.

Mario Salinas: Essentially as long as we know what the other system is that would determine if they can communicate with each other. So if we knew the Sheriff was looking at future systems we were able to ask those questions.

Tom Stolz: Why you both there, the purchase price of this and the annual maintenance seems awfully high is this typical? To have a maintenance agreement that's literally almost the cost of the installation, is that fairly typical?

Mario Salinas: I was shocked when I asked Greg to pull numbers, just from the DA's, because it's such an old software. Over 10 years old and still about the same price.

Talaya Schwartz: I would say it's similar with electronic medical records.

Tom Stolz: So maintenance program cost almost as much as the program.

Mario Salinas: Unfortunately.

Talaya Schwartz: Yes, that is how they make their money now.

Kim Bush: Yes.

Richard Powell: Looking at the various vendors by name, I cannot be absolutely certain but by far the majority of these names I don't recognize as vendors that are perspectives that we have looked at already with regards to the CAD JMS/RMS project. If purchasing knows otherwise, feel free to correct me, but I don't recognize any of these names. Which leaves me the question, did corrections take any opportunity to view the demonstrations that have been going on for the last several weeks and will continue in the next week with these various vendors and their JMS/RMS packages?

Mario Salinas: We haven't attended any of those, we weren't aware.