

Law Offices

February 15, 2012

1500 K Street N. W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C.
20005-1209

(202) 842-8800
(202) 842-8465 fax
www.drinkerbiddle.com

CALIFORNIA

DELAWARE

ILLINOIS

NEW JERSEY

NEW YORK

PENNSYLVANIA

WASHINGTON D.C.

WISCONSIN

By ECFS

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20554

RE: *Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and
Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996
Petitioners' Alternative Rulemaking Proposal*
CC Docket No. 96-128

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Martha Wright, *et al.* ("Petitioners"), by and through her attorneys, respectfully submit into the record of the above-referenced proceeding this additional information in support of the Petitioners' Alternative Rulemaking Proposal (the "Alternative Proposal"), which was filed with the Commission nearly five years ago, on March 1, 2007. To date, there has been no action on the Alternative Proposal, which was submitted three and half years after the Petitioners submitted its Petition for Rulemaking on October 31, 2003.

Thus, for the past eight and half years, the Petitioners have waited for Commission action - action that was ordered by the District Court of the District of Columbia on August 22, 2001, when it referred the class action lawsuit to the FCC with the instruction that the Commission accept "appropriate pleadings" to "assist the Court in its task of adjudicating" the class action claims.¹ That class-action suit remains pending to date, as the Petitioners, and the D.C. Circuit Court, await direction from the Commission.

In the meantime, there have been sweeping changes to the inmate calling service industry, with companies merging themselves out of existence, and with technological changes making the provision of telephone service to inmates much simpler to provide within the security parameters established by federal, state and local law enforcement agencies.

¹ *Wright v. Corrections Corp. of America*, C.A. No. 00-293 (GK)(D.D.C. Aug. 22, 2001), Order, slip op. at 1; Memorandum Opinion, rel. November 5, 2001 (attached as Attachments B, C, and D to the Petitioners' Petition for Rulemaking).

In the Alternative Proposal, the Petitioners proposed the adoption of benchmark rates based on the undisputed fact that the actual cost of providing inmate calling services were substantially lower than the rates charged to inmates and their families. In particular, the Petitioners proposed that the Commission establish benchmark rates of no more than \$0.20 per minute for debit calling and \$0.25 per minute for collect calling, with no separate per-call charges imposed by the inmate telephone service provider.

In the subsequent pleadings submitted into the record, it became clear that the benchmark rates proposed by the Petitioner were actually more generous than expected, and that the actual charges, net of commissions paid to state and local authorities, could be substantially lowered with no set-up fees.

This result is supported by recent proposals submitted in response to a Request for Proposal issued by the State of Missouri. In particular, the responses received by the State of Missouri proposed the following per-minute charges for collect, pre-paid and debit calls:²

Synergy:	\$0.09	PCS:	\$0.07
Unisys:	\$0.05	Securus	\$0.05
TalkTelio:	\$0.05	CenturyLink:	\$0.07-\$0.09
Consolidated:	\$0.08		(four separate proposals)

Moreover, as noted in the *Prison Legal News* study submitted by the Petitioners into the record on July 27, 2011, the following ten states had per-minute rates equal to, or lower than, the benchmarks set forth in the Alternative Proposal:

Securus	Florida	\$0.04
GTL	Louisiana	\$0.21
GTL	Massachusetts	\$0.10
Embarq	Michigan	\$0.15
PCS	Missouri	\$0.10
PCS	Montana	\$0.20
PCS	Nebraska	\$0.05
ICS	New Hampshire	\$0.10
Securus	North Dakota	\$0.24
Embarq	South Carolina	\$0.15

Clearly, then, the rates proposed in the Alternative Proposal were reasonable, and perhaps overstated the actual costs, net of commissions paid to state and local authorities, of providing inmate telephone services.

² See Exhibit A.

Thus, the Commission can and should move forward to adopt an order granting the Alternative Proposal without further delay. The Alternative Proposal was released on public notice, and the Commission received significant input from all interested parties.³ The Alternative Proposal was clearly a logical outgrowth of the long-pending proceeding, and the subject matter of the Alternative Proposal was certainly anticipated by the Commission and all interested parties.

However, in the event that the Commission intends to issue a further notice of proposed rulemaking, it must specifically demand that the inmate telephone service providers supply detailed cost information to support their position that the rates set forth in the Alternative Proposal are too low. The inmate telephone service providers have consistently refused to provide such information, and Securus Technologies' most recent submission into the record, a one-page letter indicating that its costs had increased by 16% with no supporting information, is wholly insufficient to counter the overwhelming evidence that the rates set forth in the Alternative Proposal are reasonable and must be adopted.

Moreover, in the absence of any specific cost data provided by the inmate telephone service providers, the Commission must rely on the conclusive evidence already in the record, and conclude that Securus and other inmate telephone service providers have conceded that the proposed rates set forth in the Alternative Proposal are reasonable.⁴ The inmate telephone service providers have had more than nine years to supply specific cost data, and the Commission must reject the service providers' "generalized assertions that their rates are justified by higher costs."⁵

Therefore, the Petitioners respectfully restate its urgent request that the Commission release an order adopting the proposals set forth in the Alternative Proposal. As the Commission is aware, the District Court of the District of Columbia referred the instant matter to the Commission more than 10 years ago based on the belief that the Commission was best suited to resolve the case. Certainly, no one in 2001 expected that this proceeding would remain pending for more than ten years, with no immediate end in sight.

Unless the Commission specifically requires the inmate telephone service providers to submit into this docket accurate, detailed, and up-to-date cost information, there is no need for the Commission to re-open the record, as it would merely delay action for at least another two to three years. The inmate telephone service providers have been given every chance to provide detailed cost data, and they have declined at every turn. As such, it is time for the Commission to act.

³ *Petitioners Reply Comments*, dated June 20, 2007, pgs. 42-49.

⁴ *Cable & Wireless P.L.C. v. FCC*, 116 F.3d 1224, 1233 (D.C.Cir. 1999) (citing *International Settlement Rates*, 12 FCC Rcd 19806, 19839 (1997)).

⁵ *Access Charge Reform*, 16 FCC Rcd 9923, 9941, nt. 104 (2001).

Respectfully submitted,



Lee G. Petro

Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP
1500 K Street N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
202-230-5857 – Telephone
202-842-8465 - Telecopier

Counsel for Martha Wright, et al.

Attachments

cc (*via electronic mail*) :

Chairman Julius Genachowski
Commissioner Robert McDowell
Commissioner Mignon Clyburn
Austin Schlick, General Counsel
Sharon Gillett, Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau
Sherrese Smith, Chief Counsel & Legal Advisor to Chairman Genachowski
Michael Steffen, Legal Advisor to Chairman Genachowski
Christine Kurth, Policy Director & Wireline Counsel to Commissioner McDowell
Angela Kronenberg, Wireline Legal Advisor to Commissioner Clyburn
Victoria Goldberg, Acting Chief, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau
Pamela Arluk, Assistant Chief, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau
Jennifer Prime, Office of the Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau

EXHIBIT A

MEMORANDUM

Office of Administration Division of Purchasing and Materials Management

To: RFP File B2Z11019

From: Brent Dixon

Date: June 28, 2011

RE: Evaluation Summary

Eight proposals were received in response to Request for Proposal (RFP) B2Z11019 for an offender telephone system for the Office of Administration's Information Technology Services Division/Department of Corrections. Proposals were received from the following:

1. CenturyLink of Overland Park, KS
2. Consolidated Communications Public Services of Mattoon, IL
3. Noir & Ogram, LLC of Columbia, MO
4. PCS of Los Angeles, CA
5. Securus Technologies of Dallas, TX
6. Synergy Telecom Service Company/Telcomate of San Antonio, TX
7. Talktelio of Sarasota, FL
8. Unisys Corporation of Reston, VA

Copies of the proposals and an evaluation memo (as attached) were forwarded to the state agency. Evaluation meetings were held during the months of March, April, and May of 2011 to discuss the proposals and perform a subjective evaluation in accordance with the criteria stated in the RFP.

In evaluating the proposals, the evaluation committee first reviewed the proposals for acceptability to determine if each offeror complied with the mandatory requirements of the RFP. It was determined that competitive negotiations were required to revise some of the RFP language and to ensure that all offerors' proposals were responsive to the mandatory requirements of the RFP. Therefore, pursuant to paragraph 4.2.2 of the RFP, Best and Final Offer (BAFO) #001 was sent to all the offerors. BAFO #001 responses received from CenturyLink, Consolidated Communications Public Services, PCS, Securus, Synergy, Talktelio, and Unisys were determined to be acceptable. Noir & Ogram's proposal was unacceptable due to their failure to meet mandatory requirements of the RFP. See the unacceptability memo dated May 31, 2011 for details. The committee continued their subjective review in a round-table fashion of the remaining acceptable proposals.

The subjective evaluation of Experience/Reliability of Organization (20 pts.) and Proposed Method of Performance, Solution Functionality and Expertise of Personnel (80 pts.) is included in the attached Subjective Evaluation report. Also attached are memos addressing the evaluation of MBE/WBE Participation (worth 10 pts.) and the evaluation of Blind/Sheltered Workshop participation (worth 10 bonus pts.). The cost evaluation was completed in accordance with the cost evaluation criteria in RFP section 4.3. Since none of the offerors proposed Missouri Service-Disabled Veteran Business Preference, no bonus points were assigned for this category.

RSMo 34.042 mandates that the contract be let to the lowest and best offeror. Therefore, DPMM combined the assigned points for the "best" portion of the evaluation – Experience/Reliability of Organization, Proposed Method of Performance, Solution Functionality and Expertise of Personnel, and MBE/WBE Participation – with the assigned points of the "lowest" portion of the evaluation – Cost, and the Blind/Sheltered Workshop participation bonus. Consequently, the resulting lowest and best proposal is Securus Technologies.

After careful review and consideration, the Division of Purchasing and Materials Management concurs with the recommendation of lowest and best as outlined above. Securus Technology's proposal satisfies the agency's requirements as outlined in the Request for Proposal. Per the attached e-mail dated June 27, 2011 the Office of Administration's Information Technology Services Division is in agreement to proceed with the award the Securus Technologies.

/bd

Attachments

Dixon, Brent

From: Wieberg, Pete
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 5:50 PM
To: Dixon, Brent
Subject: Fw: B2Z11019 - Offender Telephone System RFP

From: Young, Doug
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 04:52 PM
To: Siegler, Steve; Wieberg, Pete
Cc: Thomas, Ron
Subject: RE: B2Z11019 - Offender Telephone System RFP

ITSD is okay to proceed with award.

From: Siegler, Steve
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 2:40 PM
To: Young, Doug
Subject: FW: B2Z11019 - Offender Telephone System RFP

?

From: Wieberg, Pete
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 2:39 PM
To: Siegler, Steve
Subject: FW: B2Z11019 - Offender Telephone System RFP

You want to approve or have Doug approve ?

From: Dixon, Brent
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 9:22 AM
To: Wieberg, Pete
Cc: Roedel, Theresa; Bochat, Nancy; Thomas, Ron
Subject: B2Z11019 - Offender Telephone System RFP

Pete: I spoke to Ron Thomas and he indicated you would be the appropriate person to contact to get Steve's and Doug's approvals for the award of the offender telephone system to the lowest and best proposal submitted by Securus. Attached is the evaluation information including: evaluation report form, cost evaluation, subjective narrative, M/WBE report, and Blind/Sheltered Workshop report. Please let me know if you need anything else. Thanks!

Brent Dixon, CPPB

Buyer III
OA - Division of Purchasing and Materials Management
Phone: (573) 751-4903
Fax: (573) 526-9816

MEMORANDUM

Office of Administration
Division of Purchasing and Materials Management

TO: Gary Eggen

DATE: May 31, 2011

THRU: Cindy Stafford

FROM: Brent Dixon ^{BD}

RE: B2Z11019 – Unacceptability Memo

*Approved
Gary Eggen
6/1/11*

Eight (8) responses were received in response to RFP B2Z11019 for an offender telephone system for the Office of Administration's Information Technology Services Division/Department of Corrections. After reviewing the proposals and conducting competitive negotiations resulting in Best and Final Offer (BAFO) #001, it has been determined that the proposal submitted by Noir & Ocrum, LLC is unacceptable for failure to meet mandatory requirements of the RFP as described below:

- Noir & Ocrum failed to provide an offender telephone system that would be furnished, installed, include all necessary hardware and software, and be maintained at each of the institutions referenced in Attachment #1. Noir & Ocrum only proposed to provide contractor monitoring services. Specifically, Noir & Ocrum BAFO #001 response states, *"It is the desire of Noir & Ocrum to collaborate and partner with the contractor, awarded the Offender Telephone System contract, in the delivery of a centrally located 'Call Monitoring Center', providing the State of Missouri a viable solution to the intelligence gathering and call monitoring requirements of the Missouri Department of Corrections as identified in Section 2.23 of RFP #B2Z11019. Noir and Ocrum is NOT a provider of Offender Telephone System services, but rather a Missouri based MBE/WBE that stands ready, willing and able to provide the contractor with an effective offender call monitoring solution – that not only meets the contractor's Call Monitoring Requirements – as outlined in section 2.23 of the RFP #B2Z11019 – but also meets the expanding intelligence gathering requirements of the Missouri Department of Corrections, Office of the Inspector General."*

Consequently, Noire & Ocrum failed to meet RFP paragraph 2.1.3 which requires, *"The contractor shall provide, install, and maintain an offender telephone system for the state agency locations identified in Attachment #1, on an as-needed, if needed basis, which must meet or exceed the requirements and provisions specified herein."*

- Noire & Ocrum failed to propose pricing for an offender telephone system in their response to the required line items of the RFP. Noire & Ocrum's BAFO #001 response to the required line items of the RFP stated, *"N/A"* and *"Noire & Ocrum is not a provider of an offender telephone system, nor a telecommunications company with control of call rates, fees, taxes or other telecom related cost."*

Consequently, Noire & Ocrum failed to meet Exhibit A, Pricing Pages of the RFP which requires, *"The offeror shall provide firm, fixed pricing for the offender telephone system pursuant to all mandatory requirements herein, including furnishing, installing, providing any necessary hardware and software, monitoring, maintaining at each of the institutions referenced in Attachment #1. All costs associated with providing the required services, including all travel and expenses to be incurred by contractor staff, must be included. Prices shall not include commissions to be paid to the State of Missouri. All per minute prices must be a whole number (i.e. fractions of cents, \$0.075, must not be proposed)."*

Therefore, as Noir & Ocrum's proposal failed to include an offender telephone system as required in the RFP and only proposed to provide contractor monitoring services, their proposal was deemed unacceptable and removed from further consideration.

C: B2Z11019

/bd

**EVALUATION REPORT FORM
DIVISION OF PURCHASING AND MATERIALS MANAGEMENT**

Request for Proposal Number BZZ11019
Brent Dixon, Buyer

Name of Offeror	Method of Performance, Solution Functionality and Expertise of Personnel (Maximum 80 Points)	Experience and Reliability of Organization (Maximum 20 Points)	MBE / WBE Participation (Maximum 10 Points)	Cost (Maximum 90 Points)	Blind/Sheltered Workshop Preference (10 Points)	MO Service-Disabled Veteran Business Preference (3 Points)	Total Points (Maximum 213 Points)
1 CenturyLink - Option #1	72	18	10.00	52.00	10	0	167.00
2 CenturyLink - Option #2	76	18	10.00	47.00	10	0	161.00
3 CenturyLink - Option #3	73	18	10.00	49.00	10	0	160.00
4 CenturyLink - Option #4	77	18	10.00	44.00	10	0	159.00
5 Consolidated Public Services	71	15	10.00	49.00	10	0	155.00
6 Public Communications Services	77	20	10.00	61.00	10	0	178.00
7 Securus	78	20	10.00	72.00	10	0	190.00
8 Synergy	76	12	10.00	44.00	17	0	152.00
9 TalkTello	72	5	10.00	90.00	10	0	187.00
10 Unisys	71	17	10.00	72.00	10	0	180.00

We hereby attest that the subjective points assigned to each offeror listed above were scored pursuant to the established evaluation criteria and represent our best judgment of the subjective areas of the offerors' proposals. We have attached a brief written narrative, which highlights the reasons for our evaluation of the proposals as indicated by the scores above. Our comments represent only the opinions of this evaluation team and do not represent the position of the Division of Purchasing and Materials Management, the State of Missouri, or any other party. In addition, we understand that the MBE/WBE participation points, cost points, any Blind and/or Sheltered Workshop preference bonus points, and any Missouri Service-Disabled Veteran Business preference bonus points will be calculated and added by the Division of Purchasing and Materials Management to arrive at the total points. The offeror with the highest total point score will be our final recommendation of the lowest and best proposal.

Theresa Raddel Evaluator's Signature	Theresa Raddel Evaluator's Printed Name / Title	OA ITSD Agency	DOC Date
Nancy Bockat Evaluator's Signature	Nancy Bockat, Telecom Manager Evaluator's Printed Name / Title	OA ITSD Agency	6-22-11 Date
Joan McDonnell Evaluator's Signature	Joan McDonnell, Asst to the DA Evaluator's Printed Name / Title	Director Agency	DOC-DAI Date
Shane Ziebarth Evaluator's Signature	Shane Ziebarth Evaluator's Printed Name / Title	Int'l Analyst Agency	OD IG Date
Kelley [Signature] Evaluator's Signature	Kelley [Signature] Evaluator's Printed Name / Title	[Signature] Agency	DOC-PHS Date
Amy Roderick Evaluator's Signature	Amy Roderick Evaluator's Printed Name / Title	Inspector General Agency	DOC IG Date

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL B2Z11019
OFFENDER TELEPHONE SYSTEM**

**SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION
EXPERIENCE AND RELIABILITY OF ORGANIZATION and
METHOD OF PERFORMANCE, SOLUTION FUNCTIONALITY AND
EXPERTISE OF PERSONNEL**

The attached represents the evaluation committee's assessment of the seven responsive proposals submitted in response to Request for Proposal (RFP) B2Z11019 for Offender Telephone System. Responsive proposals were received from CenturyLink, Consolidated Public Services, Public Communications Services (PCS), Securus, Synergy, TalkTelio, and Unisys.

The State of Missouri subjectively evaluated the offerors' responses according to the established evaluation criteria of the RFP, as outlined below:

- Experience and Reliability of Organization – 20 points possible
- Method of Performance, Solution Functionality and Expertise of Personnel – 80 points possible

The following narrative and subjective evaluation point assignments were scored based upon the facts as presented by the offerors in response to the RFP and subsequent Best and Final Offer.

EXPERIENCE AND RELIABILITY OF ORGANIZATION
(Maximum 20 points)

In evaluating each offeror's experience and reliability of their organization, the evaluation committee was looking for evidence of the extent of each offeror's experience in providing offender telephone systems as required in the RFP and the reliability of each offeror's organization, including the breadth of resources available to support the scope of the RFP.

While all areas of the RFP were considered during the subjective evaluation, any experience and reliability criteria in the RFP not specifically addressed in the subjective evaluation was considered to be satisfactorily met by all offerors, with it being of the opinion of the evaluation committee, that no one offeror's proposal was significantly better nor lacking in specific areas when compared to the other offerors' proposals.

In evaluating the offerors' **experience and reliability** the evaluation committee specifically considered the offerors' responses to Exhibit B of the RFP. Emphasis areas of this subjective evaluation focused on each offeror's experience in providing an offender telephone system and each offeror's organization's reliability.

Upon reviewing the experience and reliability information of each offeror's proposal, the committee offers the following summaries:

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES (PCS)

PCS, a telecommunication provider also providing offender telephone systems and a subsidiary of GTL, has 11 years experience in providing offender telephone systems and provided documentation indicating experience in meeting the demands and requirements of the RFP. PCS is the current offender telephone system provider for Missouri and Nebraska, which are both multi-institutional networked systems. PCS stated they hold contracts with two counties in California and one county in Florida which are all multi-institutional networked systems. GTL, PCS' parent company, also has contracts with five states (Pennsylvania, Virginia, New Jersey, Ohio, and West

Virginia) which are all multi-institutional networked systems. PCS also stated they hold contracts with over 100 federal, state, and county facilities, but did not state whether the contracts are for multi-institutional networked systems. PCS stated they provide offender telephone services for over 125,000 offenders and GTL provides offender telephone services for over 1.1 million offenders. References contacted for PCS were positive. As the current offender telephone system contractor for the State of Missouri, PCS has provided satisfactory services.

SECURUS

Securus, a communications solutions provider also providing offender telephone systems, has more than 20 years experience in providing telephone services to correctional facilities and provided documentation indicating experience in meeting the demands and requirements of the RFP. Securus is the current offender telephone system provider for six states (Maryland, Kentucky, Florida, Arizona, Alaska, and North Dakota) which are all multi-institutional networked systems. Securus stated they hold contracts with one county in Massachusetts and one county in Illinois which are both multi-institutional networked systems. Securus indicated they provide offender telephone services for approximately 850,000 offenders. References contacted for Securus were positive.

CENTURYLINK

CenturyLink, a telecommunication provider also providing offender telephone systems, has 20 years experience in providing offender telephone systems and provided documentation indicating experience in meeting the demands and requirements of the RFP. CenturyLink is the current offender telephone system provider for six states (Kansas, Nevada, South Carolina, Michigan, Texas, and Wisconsin) and numerous counties throughout the United States. All of the state contracts in place are for multi-institutional networked offender telephone systems. CenturyLink indicated they provide offender telephone services for approximately 270,000 offenders. References contacted for CenturyLink were positive.

UNISYS

Unisys, an information technology company also providing offender telephone systems, has 7 years experience in providing offender telephone systems and provided documentation indicating experience in meeting the demands and requirements of the RFP. Unisys is the current offender telephone system provider for the State of New York, Federal Bureau of Prisons, and Dallas County Sheriff's Department. All of the contracts in place are for multi-institutional networked offender telephone systems. Unisys indicated they provide offender telephone services for approximately 265,000 offenders. References contacted for Unisys were positive.

CONSOLIDATED PUBLIC SERVICES

Consolidated, a telecommunication provider also providing offender telephone systems, has 23 years experience in providing offender telephone systems and provided documentation indicating experience in meeting the demands and requirements of the RFP. Consolidated is the current offender telephone system provider for the State of Illinois which is a multi-institutional networked system. Consolidated also indicated they hold contracts with eleven counties in Illinois which include one facility each and one county in Texas with two facilities. Consolidated stated they provide offender telephone services for over 50,000 offenders. References contacted for Consolidated were positive.

SYNERGY

Synergy, a telecommunication provider also providing offender telephone systems, has 15 years experience in providing telephone services to correctional facilities that include offender telephone systems and provided documentation indicating experience in meeting the demands and requirements of the RFP. Synergy is the current offender telephone system provider for the Province of Alberta and Province of Saskatchewan which are multi-institutional networked systems. Synergy also indicated they hold contracts with six counties and one city in Texas which include one facility each. Synergy stated they provide offender telephone services for over 5,600 offenders.

Synergy is currently providing satisfactory service as a subcontractor for payphone services through the State of Missouri's current offender telephone system contract. References contacted for Synergy were positive.

TALKTELIO

TalkTelio, a sister company of Talk To Me (which is a payphone service provider), is an offender telephone systems provider with 25 years experience in providing operator services internationally and in the United States. TalkTelio did not indicate how long they have been providing offender telephone systems. TalkTelio did not provide details regarding their experience in meeting the demands and requirements of the RFP. TalkTelio stated they provide offender telephone services in the following countries: Germany, Austria, Poland, Netherlands, and United Arab Emirates which are institutional networked systems, but TalkTelio did not provide any specific information regarding the organizations where the systems have been implemented. TalkTelio stated they provide offender telephone services for at least 60,000 offenders. TalkTelio did not provide any contact information for the contracts they currently have in place.

SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE AND RELIABILITY OF ORGANIZATION

Based upon the information provided in the proposals, the evaluation committee felt that Securus and PCS were in a more favorable position to manage the contract based upon their experience and the reliability of their organizations. Securus and PCS have extensive experience in providing offender telephone systems in multi-institutional networked systems and have the largest user base of offenders utilizing their offender telephone systems. The evaluation committee considered CenturyLink to have extensive experience in providing offender telephone systems in multi-institutional networked systems, but their scope of users is not as extensive as Securus and PCS. Unisys has sufficient experience and reliability based upon their years of experience and the number of large multi-institutional networked systems they have in place and the user base of offenders utilizing their offender telephone systems, but their scope of users is not as extensive as Securus and PCS. While Consolidated has been providing offender telephone systems for a number of years, they only have one multi-institutional networked system with a large user base of offenders utilizing their offender telephone system and do not have as extensive of a customer base as Securus, PCS, CenturyLink and Unisys. While Synergy has extensive experience in providing offender telephone systems and have two multi-institutional networked systems located in Canada, they have a significantly smaller user base of offenders utilizing their offender telephone system. Synergy also has a smaller customer base than Securus, PCS, CenturyLink, Unisys, and Consolidated. TalkTelio stated they have several multi-institutional networks systems, however the information in their proposal did not provide reference contacts to validate a level of experience the evaluation committee felt necessary to successfully design, implement and monitor multi-institutional networked offender telephone systems, especially since none of their referenced systems are U.S.-based offender telephone systems.

Below is a summary of the subjective points assigned for each offeror's experience and reliability of organization:

Offeror	Points Assigned for Experience and Reliability of Organization (Max. Points Available: 20)
PCS	20
Securus	20
CenturyLink	18
Unisys	17
Consolidated Public Services	15
Synergy	12
TalkTelio	5

METHOD OF PERFORMANCE, SOLUTION FUNCTIONALITY AND EXPERTISE OF PERSONNEL
(Maximum 80 Points)

In the subjective evaluation of method of performance, solution functionality and expertise of personnel, worth a maximum of 80 points, the evaluation committee was looking at each offeror's proposed method of performance, solution functionality and expertise of personnel in providing an offender telephone system.

The subjective evaluation of method of performance, system functionality and expertise of personnel was based on the following areas of the RFP:

- 1) Hardware and software (telephone hardware and the hardware and software provided to state agency staff): When evaluating proposed hardware and software (telephone hardware and the hardware and software provided to state agency staff), the committee reviewed the phone equipment proposed including the hardware and software the offerors' proposed for the state agency's staff to utilize with the system.
- (2) Functionality of proposed platform: When reviewing the functionality of proposed platform, the committee looked at the features of the system and the ease of use of the proposed system as shown during the product demonstrations.
- (3) Reporting capabilities and exporting files: Under the reporting capabilities and exporting of files, the committee looked at the offerors' ability to provide required and custom reports and the formats capable of exporting the report data.
- (4) Contract monitoring: When reviewing contract monitoring, the committee reviewed the offerors' proposed solution to monitor calls including the technology they would utilize and the location of the staff dedicated to monitoring calls since the RFP preferred that the staff be located in Jefferson City, Missouri.
- (5) Personnel expertise: Under personnel expertise, the committee was looking for offerors proposing staff with expertise capable of supporting an offender telephone system the size of Missouri's system.
- (6) Economic impact: The committee reviewed each offeror's proposed economic impact to Missouri.
- (7) Optional features: The committee reviewed the offerors' proposed optional features.
- (8) Other required costs (pre-paid account set-up fee, international calls, and payphone calls): Finally, the committee evaluated each offeror's identified firm fixed costs associated with pre-paid account set-up fee, international calls, and payphone calls.

The committee considered all aspects of each offeror's proposal. While all areas of the RFP were considered during the subjective evaluation, any methodology criteria in the RFP not specifically addressed in the subjective evaluation was considered to be satisfactorily met by all offerors, with it being the opinion of the evaluation committee, that no one offeror's proposal was significantly better nor lacking in specific areas when compared to the other offerors' proposals regarding method of performance, solution functionality, and expertise of personnel.

Hence, the committee offers the following summaries addressing the offerors' method of performance and expertise of personnel under the specific evaluation categories:

SECURUS

Hardware and software (telephone hardware and the hardware and software provided to state agency staff):

- Securus proposed a satisfactory response regarding the telephone and workstation hardware and software to be utilized to fulfill the requirements of the RFP.

Functionality of proposed platform:

- The platform proposed by Securus appeared to be easily navigated and currently meets all of the functional requirements as demonstrated during the product demonstrations.

- Securus' platform not only allows the state agency to burn call records to a CD in multiple formats as required in the RFP, but also exceeded the requirement by including an additional feature that would allow the state agency to send a secure link to allow a third party to listen or burn authorized call recordings to a CD in multiple formats.

Reporting capabilities and exporting files:

- Securus stated they are capable of providing all of the required reports outlined in the RFP and have a variety of additional reports available based upon customized reports they have developed for other customers. Securus also indicated they would provide additional custom reports as requested and would export files in all required formats.

Contract monitoring:

- Securus proposed a very detailed solution and strategic plan to provide call monitoring services that includes the use of Guarded Exchange's technology and staff (a preferred approach) to perform the required call monitoring of five percent of calls. The offender call monitoring staff would be located in the Lake of the Ozarks and Jefferson City, Missouri.

Personnel expertise:

- Securus identified a substantial number of staff they currently have in place to service the state's account who have a variety of expertise in providing offender telephone systems.

Economic impact:

- While Securus is a Texas-based company, Securus proposed to subcontract with Huber & Associates, Guarded Exchange, and AlphaPointe which are Missouri-based companies.
- Securus proposed to subcontract with ShawnTech which is an Ohio-based company with four technicians currently located in Missouri.

Optional features:

- Securus offered the following optional products and services: cell phone detection and/or interruption services; offender voicemail; JLG investigative biometrics; additional enhanced investigative resources (12 additional staff); up to \$250,000 of software programming services; OTS word spotting technology; PREA hotline; officer check-in; and capability to allow multijurisdictional access to offender call records.

Other required costs (pre-paid account set-up fee, international calls, and payphone calls):

- Securus proposed the following other required costs:

Pre-paid Account Set-Up Fee	
*Per Transaction Set-Up Fee for Pre-Paid Account	\$6.95
*One Time Set-up Fee to Establish a Pre-paid Account	\$0.00
International Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for International Call	\$0.50
*Set Up Charge for International Call	\$0.50
Coin Payphone Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for Calls Made on Coin Payphone	\$0.50

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES (PCS)

Hardware and software (telephone hardware and the hardware and software provided to state agency staff):

- PCS proposed a satisfactory response regarding the telephone and workstation hardware and software they would utilize to fulfill the requirements of the RFP.

Functionality of proposed platform:

- The platform proposed by PCS appeared to be easily navigated and currently meets all of the functional requirements as demonstrated during the product demonstrations and as verified as the platform used for the current contract.
- PCS' platform allows the state agency to establish a queue on the workstation to burn call recordings to CD in multiple formats and save the queue for future dissemination, which exceeds the requirements of the RFP.

Reporting capabilities and exporting files:

- PCS stated they are capable of providing all of the required and custom reports and exporting files in the required formats.

Contract monitoring:

- PCS proposed a detailed solution and strategic plan to provide call monitoring services that included the use of a combination of PCS' technology and Guarded Exchange's technology and staff (a preferred approach) to perform the required call monitoring of five percent of calls. The offender call monitoring staff would be located in the Lake of the Ozarks and Jefferson City, Missouri.

Personnel expertise:

- PCS identified a substantial number of staff they currently have in place to service the state's account who have a variety of expertise in providing offender telephone systems.

Economic impact:

- While PCS is a California-based company, PCS proposed to subcontract with Huber & Associates, Guarded Exchange, Capital International Communications, and BCI as subcontractors which are Missouri-based companies.

Optional features:

- PCS offered the following optional products and services: cell phone control; five air cards; offender visitation orientation videos; offender management system; call tracker; and kiosk support and maintenance.

Other required costs (pre-paid account set-up fee, international calls, and payphone calls):

- PCS proposed the following other required costs:

Pre-paid Account Set-Up Fee	
*Per Transaction Set-Up Fee for Pre-Paid Account	\$5.00
*One Time Set-up Fee to Establish a Pre-paid Account	\$0.00
International Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for International Call	\$0.50
*Set Up Charge for International Call	\$1.00
Coin Payphone Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for Calls Made on Coin Payphone	\$0.10

CENTURYLINK – OPTION #4

Hardware and software (telephone hardware and the hardware and software provided to state agency staff):

- CenturyLink proposed a satisfactory response regarding the telephone and workstation hardware and software they would utilize to fulfill the requirements of the RFP.

Functionality of proposed platform:

- The platform proposed by CenturyLink appeared to be easily navigated and currently meets all of the functional requirements as demonstrated during the product demonstrations.
- CenturyLink's platform allows the state agency to burn call recordings to CD in multiple formats.

Reporting capabilities and exporting files:

- CenturyLink stated they are capable of providing all of the required and custom reports and exporting files in all required formats.

Contract monitoring:

- CenturyLink included an adequate solution and plan to provide call monitoring service to monitor five percent of calls. CenturyLink would utilize a combination of Guarded Exchange's technology and staff (a preferred approach), ShawnTech's staff, and Alphapointe's staff to perform the call monitoring services which will be managed by ShawnTech.
- CenturyLink also proposes an additional \$250,000 in annual IT services to be provided to the state agency.
- CenturyLink did not describe where the offender call monitoring staff would be located.

Personnel expertise:

- CenturyLink identified a substantial number of staff they currently have in place to service the state's account who have a variety of expertise in providing offender telephone systems.

Economic impact:

- While CenturyLink is a Kansas-based company, CenturyLink proposed to subcontract with Huber & Associates, Guarded Exchange, and AlphaPointe which are Missouri-based companies.
- CenturyLink described their current impact in Missouri which includes 1250 employees and 67 buildings.
- CenturyLink proposed to subcontract with ShawnTech which is an Ohio-based company with four technicians currently located in Missouri.

Optional features:

- CenturyLink offered the following optional products and services: cell phone detection; identification and control; Investigator voice biometric platform; PIN-linked voice mail and messaging services; MP3 program; secure deposit program; secure electronic mail program; and Data Detective integrated intelligence system.

Other required costs (pre-paid account set-up fee, international calls, and payphone calls):

- CenturyLink proposed the following other required costs:

Pre-paid Account Set-Up Fee	
*Per Transaction Set-Up Fee for Pre-Paid Account	\$4.95
*One Time Set-up Fee to Establish a Pre-paid Account	\$0.00
International Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for International Call	\$0.25
*Set Up Charge for International Call	\$1.00
Coin Payphone Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for Calls Made on Coin Payphone	\$0.10

CENTURYLINK – OPTION #2

Hardware and software (telephone hardware and the hardware and software provided to state agency staff):

- CenturyLink proposed a satisfactory response regarding the telephone and workstation hardware and software they would utilize to fulfill the requirements of the RFP.

Functionality of proposed platform:

- The platform proposed by CenturyLink appeared to be easily navigated and currently meets all of the functional requirements as demonstrated during the product demonstrations.
- CenturyLink’s platform allows the state agency to burn call recordings to CD in multiple formats.

Reporting capabilities and exporting files:

- CenturyLink stated they are capable of providing all of the required and custom reports and exporting files in all required formats.

Contract monitoring:

- CenturyLink included an adequate solution and plan to provide call monitoring service to monitor five percent of calls. CenturyLink would utilize a combination of Guarded Exchange’s technology and staff (a preferred approach), ShawnTech’s staff, and Alphapointe’s staff to perform the call monitoring services which will be managed by ShawnTech.
- CenturyLink did not describe where the offender call monitoring staff would be located.

Personnel expertise:

- CenturyLink identified a substantial number of staff they currently have in place to service the state’s account who have a variety of expertise in providing offender telephone systems.

Economic impact:

- While CenturyLink is a Kansas-based company, CenturyLink proposed to subcontract with Huber & Associates, Guarded Exchange, and AlphaPointe which are Missouri-based companies.
- CenturyLink described their current impact in Missouri which includes 1250 employees and 67 buildings.
- CenturyLink proposed to subcontract with ShawnTech which is an Ohio-based company with four technicians currently located in Missouri.

Optional features:

- CenturyLink offered the following optional products and services: cell phone detection; identification and control; Investigator voice biometric platform; PIN-linked voice mail and messaging services; MP3 program; secure deposit program; secure electronic mail program; and Data Detective integrated intelligence system.

Other required costs (pre-paid account set-up fee, international calls, and payphone calls):

- CenturyLink proposed the following other required costs:

Pre-paid Account Set-Up Fee	
*Per Transaction Set-Up Fee for Pre-Paid Account	\$4.95
*One Time Set-up Fee to Establish a Pre-paid Account	\$0.00
International Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for International Call	\$0.25
*Set Up Charge for International Call	\$1.00
Coin Payphone Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for Calls Made on Coin Payphone	\$0.10

SYNERGY

Hardware and software (telephone hardware and the hardware and software provided to state agency staff):

- Synergy proposed a satisfactory response regarding the telephone and workstation hardware and software they would utilize to fulfill the requirements of the RFP.

Functionality of proposed platform:

- The platform proposed by Synergy appeared to be easily navigated and currently meets all of the functional requirements as demonstrated during the product demonstrations. Synergy's platform met the minimum requirement to allow the state agency to burn call records to CD in the required formats.

Reporting capabilities and exporting files:

- Synergy stated they are capable of providing all of the required and custom reports and exporting files in all required formats.

Contract monitoring:

- Synergy proposed an adequate solution and strategic plan to provide call monitoring services that included the use of Guarded Exchange's technology and staff (a preferred approach) to perform the required call monitoring of five percent of calls. The offender call monitoring staff would be located in Jefferson City, Missouri.

Personnel expertise:

- Synergy identified a substantial number of staff they currently have in place to service the state's account who have a variety of expertise in providing offender telephone systems.

Economic impact:

- While Synergy is a Texas-based company, Synergy proposed to utilize Huber & Associates, Guarded Exchange, and AlphaPointe as subcontractors which are Missouri-based companies. Synergy proposed to subcontract with ShawnTech which is an Ohio-based company with four technicians currently located in Missouri.

Optional features:

- Synergy offered the following optional products and services: cell detection; electronic monitoring devices; video phones; lobby payment kiosks; voicemail communications; visitation recording; and automated visitation scheduling.

Other required costs (pre-paid account set-up fee, international calls, and payphone calls):

- Synergy proposed the following other required costs:

Pre-paid Account Set-Up Fee	
*Per Transaction Set-UP Fee for Pre-Paid Account	\$5.00
*One Time Set-up Fee to Establish a Pre-paid Account	\$0.00
International Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for International Call	\$0.50
*Set Up Charge for International Call	\$1.00
Coin Payphone Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for Calls Made on Coin Payphone	\$0.10

CENTURYLINK – OPTION #3

Hardware and software (telephone hardware and the hardware and software provided to state agency staff):

- CenturyLink proposed a satisfactory response regarding the telephone and workstation hardware and software they would utilize to fulfill the requirements of the RFP.

Functionality of proposed platform:

- The platform proposed by CenturyLink appeared to be easily navigated and currently meets all of the functional requirements as demonstrated during the product demonstrations.
- CenturyLink's platform allows the state agency to burn call recordings to CD in multiple formats.

Reporting capabilities and exporting files:

- CenturyLink stated they are capable of providing all of the required and custom reports and exporting files in all required formats.

Contract monitoring:

- CenturyLink included an adequate solution and plan to provide call monitoring service to monitor five percent of calls. CenturyLink would utilize a combination of Ecco Select technology and staff and Alphapointe staff to perform the call monitoring services which will be managed by CenturyLink.
- CenturyLink also proposes an additional \$250,000 in annual IT services to be provided to the state agency.
- CenturyLink did not describe where the offender call monitoring staff would be located.

Personnel expertise:

- CenturyLink identified a substantial number of staff they currently have in place to service the state's account who have a variety of expertise in providing offender telephone systems.

Economic impact:

- While CenturyLink is a Kansas-based company, CenturyLink proposed to subcontract with Ecco Select, ICSolutions/Keefe, AlphaPointe, and Huber & Associates which are Missouri-based companies.
- CenturyLink described their current impact in Missouri which includes 1250 employees and 67 buildings.
- CenturyLink proposed to subcontract with ShawnTech which is an Ohio-based company with four technicians currently located in Missouri.

Optional features:

- CenturyLink offered the following optional products and services: cell phone detection; identification and control; Investigator voice biometric platform; PIN-linked voice mail and messaging services; MP3 program; secure deposit program; secure electronic mail program; and Data Detective integrated intelligence system.

Other required costs (pre-paid account set-up fee, international calls, and payphone calls):

- CenturyLink proposed the following other required costs:

Pre-paid Account Set-Up Fee	
*Per Transaction Set-Up Fee for Pre-Paid Account	\$4.95
*One Time Set-up Fee to Establish a Pre-paid Account	\$0.00
International Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for International Call	\$0.25
*Set Up Charge for International Call	\$1.00
Coin Payphone Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for Calls Made on Coin Payphone	\$0.10

TALKTELIO

Hardware and software (telephone hardware and the hardware and software provided to state agency staff):

- TalkTelio's proposed telephone and workstation hardware exceeded the minimum requirements of the RFP.
- TalkTelio proposed satisfactory workstation software to fulfill the requirements of the RFP.

Functionality of proposed platform:

- The platform proposed by TalkTelio appeared to be easily navigated as demonstrated during the product demonstrations. While some of the features were not available at the time of system demonstrations, TalkTelio indicated they would implement the required features.
- TalkTelio's platform met the minimum requirement to allow the state agency to burn call records to CD in the required formats.

Reporting capabilities and exporting files:

- TalkTelio stated they are capable of providing all of the required and custom reports and exporting files in several different formats including the formats specified in the RFP.

Contract monitoring:

- TalkTelio proposed an adequate solution and strategic plan to provide call monitoring services that included the use of a combination of TalkTelio's technology and Guarded Exchange's technology and staff (a preferred approach) to perform the required call monitoring of five percent of calls.
- TalkTelio did not describe where the offender call monitoring staff would be located.

Personnel expertise:

- TalkTelio identified an adequate number of staff they currently have in place to service the state's account who have a variety of expertise in providing offender telephone systems.

Economic impact:

- While TalkTelio is a Florida-based company, TalkTelio proposed to subcontract with Huber & Associates, Guarded Exchange, and Alphapointe as subcontractors which are Missouri-based companies.
- TalkTelio proposed to subcontract with ShawnTech which is an Ohio-based company with four technicians currently located in Missouri.

Optional features:

- TalkTelio offered the following optional products and services: cell phone detection and interruption services; TalkTelio Pre Call Biometrics VocalPassword; and TalkTelio Continuous Voice Biometrics FreeSpeech.

Other required costs (pre-paid account set-up fee, international calls, and payphone calls):

- TalkTelio proposed the following other required costs:

Pre-paid Account Set-Up Fee	
*Per Transaction Set-Up Fee for Pre-Paid Account	\$0.00
*One Time Set-up Fee to Establish a Pre-paid Account	\$6.95
International Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for International Call	\$0.25
*Set Up Charge for International Call	\$2.50
Coin Payphone Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for Calls Made on Coin Payphone	\$0.40

CENTURYLINK – OPTION #1

Hardware and software (telephone hardware and the hardware and software provided to state agency staff):

- CenturyLink proposed a satisfactory response regarding the telephone and workstation hardware and software they would utilize to fulfill the requirements of the RFP.

Functionality of proposed platform:

- The platform proposed by CenturyLink appeared to be easily navigated and currently meets all of the functional requirements as demonstrated during the product demonstrations.
- CenturyLink's platform allows the state agency to burn call recordings to CD in multiple formats.

Reporting capabilities and exporting files:

- CenturyLink stated they are capable of providing all of the required and custom reports and exporting files in all required formats.

Contract monitoring:

- CenturyLink included an adequate solution and plan to provide call monitoring service to monitor five percent of calls. CenturyLink would utilize a combination of technology and staff from Ecco Select and Alphapointe staff to perform the call monitoring services which will be managed by CenturyLink.
- CenturyLink did not describe where the offender call monitoring staff would be located.

Personnel expertise:

- CenturyLink identified a substantial number of staff they currently have in place to service the state's account who have a variety of expertise in providing offender telephone systems.

Economic impact:

- While CenturyLink is a Kansas-based company, CenturyLink proposed to subcontract with EccoSelect, ICSolutions/Keefe, AlphaPointe, and Huber & Associates which are Missouri-based companies.
- CenturyLink described their current impact in Missouri which includes 1250 employees and 67 buildings.
- CenturyLink proposed to subcontract with ShawnTech which is an Ohio-based company with four technicians currently located in Missouri.

Optional features:

- CenturyLink offered the following optional products and services: cell phone detection; identification and control; Investigator voice biometric platform; PIN-linked voice mail and messaging services; MP3 program; secure deposit program; secure electronic mail program; and Data Detective integrated intelligence system.

Other required costs (pre-paid account set-up fee, international calls, and payphone calls):

- CenturyLink proposed the following other required costs:

Pre-paid Account Set-Up Fee	
*Per Transaction Set-Up Fee for Pre-Paid Account	\$4.95
*One Time Set-up Fee to Establish a Pre-paid Account	\$0.00
International Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for International Call	\$0.25
*Set Up Charge for International Call	\$1.00
Coin Payphone Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for Calls Made on Coin Payphone	\$0.10

UNISYS

Hardware and software (telephone hardware and the hardware and software provided to state agency staff):

- Unisys proposed a satisfactory response regarding the telephone and workstation hardware and software they would utilize to fulfill the requirements of the RFP.

Functionality of proposed platform:

- The platform proposed by Unisys appeared to be easily navigated and currently meets all of the functional requirements as demonstrated during the product demonstrations.
- Unisys' platform allows the state agency to burn call recordings to CD via their V-Track interface in the required formats.

Reporting capabilities and exporting files:

- Unisys stated they are capable of providing all of the required and custom reports and exporting files in all required formats.

Contract monitoring:

- Unisys proposed an adequate solution to provide call monitoring services that included the use of VAC's technology and Unisys' staff to perform the required call monitoring of five percent of calls. However, Unisys did not provide a strategic plan explaining how they were going to manage their call monitoring solution.
- Unisys' offender call monitoring staff would be located within fifty miles of Jefferson City, Missouri.

Personnel expertise:

- Unisys identified an adequate number of staff they currently have in place to service the state's account who have a variety of expertise in providing offender telephone systems.

Economic impact:

- While Unisys is a Virginia-based company, Unisys proposed to subcontract with Capital Workshop and Rose International which are Missouri-based companies.

Optional features:

- Unisys offered cell phone detection as an optional product.

Other required costs (pre-paid account set-up fee, international calls, and payphone calls):

- Unisys proposed the following other required costs:

Pre-paid Account Set-Up Fee	
*Per Transaction Set-UP Fee for Pre-Paid Account	\$5.99
*One Time Set-up Fee to Establish a Pre-paid Account	\$0.00
International Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for International Call	\$1.00
*Set Up Charge for International Call	\$4.00
Coin Payphone Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for Calls Made on Coin Payphone	\$0.05

CONSOLIDATED PUBLIC SERVICES

Hardware and software (telephone hardware and the hardware and software provided to state agency staff):

- Consolidated proposed a satisfactory response regarding the telephone and workstation hardware and software they would utilize to fulfill the requirements of the RFP.

Functionality of proposed platform:

- The platform proposed by Consolidated was not as easily navigated since it required the end user to utilize multiple screens to advance through the features of the system, but it does currently meet all of the functional requirements as demonstrated during the product demonstrations.
- Consolidated's platform met the minimum requirement to allow the state agency to burn call records to CD in the required formats.

Reporting capabilities and exporting files:

- Consolidated stated they are capable of providing all of the required and custom reports and exporting files in all required formats.

Contract monitoring:

- Consolidated proposed an adequate solution to provide call monitoring services that included the use of Nexidia technology, PSRI staff, and Consolidated's staff to perform the required call monitoring of five percent of calls. However, Consolidated did not provide a strategic plan explaining how they were going to manage their call monitoring solution.
- The offender call monitoring staff would be located in Jefferson City, Missouri.

Personnel expertise:

- Consolidated identified a substantial number of staff they currently have in place to service the state's account who have a variety of expertise in providing offender telephone systems.

Economic impact:

- While Consolidated is an Illinois-based company, Consolidated proposed to subcontract with Huber & Associates, PSRI, and Alphonite which are Missouri-based companies.
- Consolidated proposed to subcontract with ShawnTech which is an Ohio-based company with four technicians currently located in Missouri.

Optional features:

- Consolidated did not offer any optional products or services.

Other required costs (pre-paid account set-up fee, international calls, and payphone calls):

- Consolidated Public Services proposed the following other required costs:

Pre-paid Account Set-Up Fee	
*Per Transaction Set-Up Fee for Pre-Paid Account	\$3.00
*One Time Set-up Fee to Establish a Pre-paid Account	\$0.00
International Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for International Call	\$0.50
*Set Up Charge for International Call	\$0.00
Coin Payphone Calls	
*Firm, Fixed Per Minute Price for Calls Made on Coin Payphone	\$0.20

SUMMARY OF METHOD OF PERFORMANCE, SOLUTION FUNCTIONALITY AND EXPERTISE OF PERSONNEL:

The evaluation committee felt all of the offerors would be capable of providing a satisfactory solution regarding their method of performance, solution functionality, and expertise of personnel.

SECURUS - The evaluation committee felt the enhanced feature offered by Securus for a secure link to provide access to calls to a third party would drastically reduce state staff time and CD costs and would be more advantageous to the state agency than burning a CD for each call records request received. Securus proposed the most detailed solution and strategic plan to provide call monitoring services, which included Guarded Exchange, with staff located at the Lake of the Ozarks and Jefferson City, MO, which was favorably considered by the evaluation committee. Securus' proposed number of staff and their expertise was viewed favorably by the evaluation committee. Securus proposed an easily navigated site, and a wide variety of reporting features. Securus' proposal was considered to be equal to several other offerors in regard to their list of formats to export files, they included an adequate solution regarding their hardware and software, and they offered a variety of optional products and services that the department may or may not utilize. Securus' proposed economic impact for Missouri is through their proposed subcontracting relationships, which was considered to be less of an economic impact for Missouri compared to Centurylink. Securus' other proposed required costs were high compared to other offerors.

PCS - PCS' proposal was viewed favorably based upon their detailed solution and strategic plan to provide call monitoring services, which included Guarded Exchange, with staff located at the Lake of the Ozarks and Jefferson City, MO, but the evaluation committee felt it was a less detailed solution and strategic plan compared to what was proposed by Securus. PCS' proposal was viewed favorably based upon their ability to save call recordings to a queue and burn CDs in multiple formats from a queue that can be saved for future use. PCS' proposed number of staff and their expertise was considered favorably by the evaluation committee. PCS also proposed an easily navigated site. PCS' solution is equal to several other offerors in regard to their list of formats to export files, their ability to provide a variety of reporting features, their proposed hardware and software, and they offered a variety of optional products and services that the department may or may not utilize. PCS' proposed other required costs were average compared to the other offerors. PCS' proposed economic impact for Missouri is through their proposed subcontracting relationships, which was considered to be less of an economic impact for Missouri compared to Centurylink.

CENTURYLINK - CenturyLink's proposal options #2 and #4 were considered favorably based upon their detailed solution to provide call monitoring services, which included Guarded Exchange. Option #4 was considered the most favorable since it also included additional IT services. CenturyLink's proposal options #1 and #3 were considered adequate, but less favorable than options #2 and #4, based upon their solution to provide call monitoring services. Option #3 also received favorable consideration for the additional IT services proposed. None of the options proposed by CenturyLink described where the call monitoring staff would be located, and the evaluation committee felt CenturyLink provided a less detailed solution and strategic plan compared to what was proposed by Securus. CenturyLink's proposed staff quantity and expertise was considered favorably by the evaluation committee. The evaluation committee felt CenturyLink proposed an economic impact to Missouri which was greater than all of the other offerors based on CenturyLink's extensive presence in Missouri. CenturyLink's per minute international rate was one of the lowest rates proposed. CenturyLink's proposal was equal to several other offerors in regard to their easily navigated site, list of formats to export files, their ability to provide a variety of reporting features, their proposed hardware and software, and they offered a variety of optional products and services that the department may or may not utilize. CenturyLink proposed an adequate CD burning solution. CenturyLink's other required costs were average compared to the other offerors.

SYNERGY - Synergy's proposed staff quantity and expertise was considered favorably by the evaluation committee. Synergy's proposal included an adequate solution and strategic plan to provide call monitoring services, which included Guarded Exchange, with staff located in Jefferson City, MO, but the evaluation committee felt it was a less detailed solution and strategic plan compared to what was proposed by Securus, PCS, and CenturyLink. Synergy's solution is equal to several other offerors in regards to their list of formats to export files, variety of reporting features, easily navigated site, their proposed hardware and software, and they offered a variety of optional products and services that the department may or may not utilize. Synergy's proposed other required costs were average compared to the other offerors. Synergy's proposed economic impact for Missouri is through their proposed subcontracting relationships, which was considered to be less of an economic impact for Missouri compared to Centurylink. While Synergy's proposed solution met the minimum requirement regarding CD burning, it did not offer as many formats as other offerors.

TALKTELIO – TalkTelio’s proposed telephone and workstation hardware enhanced features exceeded the mandatory requirements of the RFP and were viewed favorably by the evaluation committee. The workstation software included in TalkTelio’s proposal was considered to be equivalent to the other offerors’ proposed software. TalkTelio’s proposal was considered adequate regarding their solution and strategic plan to provide call monitoring services, which included Guarded Exchange, but they did not described where the call monitoring staff would be located and the evaluation committee felt it was a less detailed solution and strategic plan compared to what was proposed by Securus, PCS, and CenturyLink. TalkTelio was the only offeror to propose a one-time set up fee to establish a pre-paid account which would be significantly less expensive to the pre-paid account holder over the duration of the contract. TalkTelio’s per minute international rate was one of the lowest rates proposed. TalkTelio solution is equal to several other offerors in regard to the ease of navigating their site, adequate staff quantity and expertise, and they offered a variety of optional products and services that the department may or may not utilize. TalkTelio proposed the second highest per minute payphone rates and set up fee for international calls. TalkTelio’s proposed economic impact for Missouri is through their proposed subcontracting relationships, which was considered to be less of an economic impact for Missouri compared to Centurylink. While TalkTelio’s proposed solution met the minimum requirement regarding CD burning, it did not offer as many formats as other offerors. Although TalkTelio’s proposed telephone and workstation hardware equipment exceeded the RFP’s requirements, TalkTelio’s proposed solution was considered less favorably since it did not have all of the mandatory features available during their system demonstration. TalkTelio committed to have all features available the time they would implement the system.

UNISYS - Unisys’ site was easily navigated and included burning call recordings to CDs using their V-Track interface. While Unisys’ proposal included an adequate solution to provide call monitoring services, they did not include a strategic plan for utilization of call monitoring staff beyond indicating that the staff would be located within a 50 mile radius of Jefferson City, MO which was not as specific as the information provided by most of the other offerors. Therefore, the evaluation committee felt Unisys’ call monitoring services approach was considered to be less desirable compared to most of the other offerors. Unisys’ solution is equal to several other offerors in regards to their list of formats to export files, variety of reporting features, staff quantity and expertise, and their proposed hardware and software. Unisys’ per minute rate for payphone use was the lowest and their prepaid per transaction set up fee was the second highest. Unisys’ proposed other required costs were higher than the other offerors. Unisys’ proposed economic impact for Missouri is through their proposed subcontracting relationships, which was considered to be less of an economic impact for Missouri compared to Centurylink. Unisys proposed a cell phone detection solution, but did not propose any additional optional products or services.

CONSOLIDATED - While Consolidated’s proposal included an adequate solution to provide call monitoring services, they did not include a strategic plan for utilization of call monitoring staff beyond indicating the staff would be located in Jefferson City, MO which was not as specific as the information provided by most of the other offerors. Consolidated’s solution is equal to several other offerors in regard to their list of formats to export files, variety of reporting features, staff quantity and expertise, and their proposed hardware and software. Consolidated was the only offeror to not charge a set up fee for international calls, and they proposed the lowest per transaction fee for pre-paid accounts. Consolidated proposed an average per minute rate for international calls and payphone calls comparable to the other offerors. Consolidated proposed a site that is not as easily navigated as the other offerors and while their solution met the minimum requirement regarding CD burning, it did not offer as many formats as other offerors. Consolidated’s proposed economic impact for Missouri is through their proposed subcontracting relationships, which was considered to be less of an economic impact for Missouri compared to Centurylink. Consolidated was the only offeror to not propose a cell phone detection solution nor did they propose any additional optional products or services.

The maximum point assignment of 80 points was not given to any of the offerors because the committee felt that no one offeror provided the best proposal in all areas of the evaluation.

Below is a summary of the subjective points assigned for each offeror’s Method of Performance, Solution Functionality and Expertise of Personnel:

Offeror	Points Assigned for Method of Performance, Solution Functionality and Expertise of Personnel (Max. Points Available: 80)
Securus	78
PCS	77
CenturyLink – Option 4	77
CenturyLink – Option 2	76
Synergy	76
CenturyLink – Option 3	73
CenturyLink – Option 1	72
TalkTelio	72
Unisys	71
Consolidated Public Services	71

BZZ11019 - Offender Telephone System

Offeror's Name		Synergy Telecom Service Company/Telemate		Unisys Corporation		TalkTello		Consolidated Communications Public Services	
Location		San Antonio, TX		Reston, VA		Sarasota, FL		Mattoon, IL	
Contract Period		Estimated Quantity	Per Minute Price for Collect, Pre-paid, and Debit Call	Extended Price	Per Minute Price for Collect, Pre-paid, and Debit Call	Extended Price	Per Minute Price for Collect, Pre-paid, and Debit Call	Extended Price	
Year One of Initial Contract Period		113,052,258	\$0.09	\$10,174,703.22	\$0.05	\$5,652,612.90	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	
Year Two of Initial Contract Period		113,052,258	\$0.09	\$10,174,703.22	\$0.05	\$5,652,612.90	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	
Year Three of Initial Contract Period		113,052,258	\$0.09	\$10,174,703.22	\$0.05	\$5,652,612.90	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	
Year Four of Initial Contract Period		113,052,258	\$0.09	\$10,174,703.22	\$0.05	\$5,652,612.90	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	
Year Five of Initial Contract Period		113,052,258	\$0.09	\$10,174,703.22	\$0.05	\$5,652,612.90	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	
First Renewal Option		113,052,258	\$0.09	\$10,174,703.22	\$0.05	\$5,652,612.90	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	
Second Renewal Option		113,052,258	\$0.09	\$10,174,703.22	\$0.05	\$5,652,612.90	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	
Total				\$71,222,922.54		\$39,568,290.30		\$63,309,264.48	
Set-up Charge per Collect Call									
Contract Period		Estimated Quantity	Per Collect Call Set-up Charge	Extended Price	Per Collect Call Set-up Charge	Extended Price	Per Collect Call Set-up Charge	Extended Price	
Year One of Initial Contract Period		1,439,350	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	
Year Two of Initial Contract Period		1,439,350	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	
Year Three of Initial Contract Period		1,439,350	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	
Year Four of Initial Contract Period		1,439,350	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	
Year Five of Initial Contract Period		1,439,350	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	
First Renewal Option		1,439,350	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	
Second Renewal Option		1,439,350	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	
Total				\$10,075,450.00		\$10,075,450.00		\$10,075,450.00	
Total Price for Collect, Pre-Paid, and Debit Call and Set-up Charge per Collect Call				\$81,298,372.54		\$49,643,740.30		\$73,384,714.48	
Cost Points (90 Points Possible)				44		72		49	
				\$39,568,290.30		\$90		\$73,384,714.48	

B2Z11019 - Offender Telephone System

Offeror's Name	PCS		Securus Technologies		CenturyLink - Offer #1	
Location	Los Angeles, CA		Dallas, TX		Overland Park, KS	
Collect, Pre-paid, and Debit Call						
Contract Period	Estimated Quantity	Per Minute Price for Collect, Pre-paid, and Debit Call	Extended Price	Per Minute Price for Collect, Pre-paid, and Debit Call	Extended Price	Per Minute Price for Collect, Pre-paid, and Debit Call
Year One of Initial Contract Period	113,052,258	\$0.07	\$7,913,658.06	\$0.05	\$5,652,612.90	\$0.07
Year Two of Initial Contract Period	113,052,258	\$0.07	\$7,913,658.06	\$0.05	\$5,652,612.90	\$0.07
Year Three of Initial Contract Period	113,052,258	\$0.07	\$7,913,658.06	\$0.05	\$5,652,612.90	\$0.07
Year Four of Initial Contract Period	113,052,258	\$0.07	\$7,913,658.06	\$0.05	\$5,652,612.90	\$0.07
Year Five of Initial Contract Period	113,052,258	\$0.07	\$7,913,658.06	\$0.05	\$5,652,612.90	\$0.07
First Renewal Option	113,052,258	\$0.07	\$7,913,658.06	\$0.05	\$5,652,612.90	\$0.07
Second Renewal Option	113,052,258	\$0.07	\$7,913,658.06	\$0.05	\$5,652,612.90	\$0.07
Total			\$55,395,606.42		\$39,568,290.30	\$55,395,606.42

Set-up Charge per Collect Call						
Contract Period	Estimated Quantity	Per Collect Call Set-up Charge	Extended Price	Per Collect Call Set-up Charge	Extended Price	Per Collect Call Set-up Charge
Year One of Initial Contract Period	1,439,350	\$0.25	\$359,837.50	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.30
Year Two of Initial Contract Period	1,439,350	\$0.25	\$359,837.50	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.30
Year Three of Initial Contract Period	1,439,350	\$0.25	\$359,837.50	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.30
Year Four of Initial Contract Period	1,439,350	\$0.25	\$359,837.50	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.30
Year Five of Initial Contract Period	1,439,350	\$0.25	\$359,837.50	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.30
First Renewal Option	1,439,350	\$0.25	\$359,837.50	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.30
Second Renewal Option	1,439,350	\$0.25	\$359,837.50	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.30
Total			\$2,518,862.50		\$10,075,450.00	\$13,098,085.00
Total Price for Collect, Pre-Paid, and Debit Call and Set-up Charge per Collect Call			\$57,914,468.92		\$49,643,740.30	\$68,493,691.42
Cost Points (90 Points Possible)			61		72	52

BZ211019 - Offender Telephone System

Offeror's Name		CenturyLink - Offer #2		CenturyLink - Offer #3		CenturyLink - Offer #4	
Location		Overland Park, KS		Overland Park, KS		Overland Park, KS	
Collect, Pre-paid, and Debit Call							
Contract Period	Estimated Quantity	Per Minute Price for Collect, Pre-paid, and Debit Call	Extended Price	Per Minute Price for Collect, Pre-paid, and Debit Call	Extended Price	Per Minute Price for Collect, Pre-paid, and Debit Call	Extended Price
Year One of Initial Contract Period	113,052,258	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	\$0.09	\$10,174,703.22
Year Two of Initial Contract Period	113,052,258	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	\$0.09	\$10,174,703.22
Year Three of Initial Contract Period	113,052,258	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	\$0.09	\$10,174,703.22
Year Four of Initial Contract Period	113,052,258	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	\$0.09	\$10,174,703.22
Year Five of Initial Contract Period	113,052,258	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	\$0.09	\$10,174,703.22
First Renewal Option	113,052,258	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	\$0.09	\$10,174,703.22
Second Renewal Option	113,052,258	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	\$0.08	\$9,044,180.64	\$0.09	\$10,174,703.22
Total			\$63,309,264.48		\$63,309,264.48		\$71,222,922.54
Set-up Charge per Collect Call							
Contract Period	Estimated Quantity	Per Collect Call Set-up Charge	Extended Price	Per Collect Call Set-up Charge	Extended Price	Per Collect Call Set-up Charge	Extended Price
Year One of Initial Contract Period	1,439,350	\$1.30	\$1,871,155.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00
Year Two of Initial Contract Period	1,439,350	\$1.30	\$1,871,155.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00
Year Three of Initial Contract Period	1,439,350	\$1.30	\$1,871,155.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00
Year Four of Initial Contract Period	1,439,350	\$1.30	\$1,871,155.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00
Year Five of Initial Contract Period	1,439,350	\$1.30	\$1,871,155.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00
First Renewal Option	1,439,350	\$1.30	\$1,871,155.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00
Second Renewal Option	1,439,350	\$1.30	\$1,871,155.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00	\$1.00	\$1,439,350.00
Total			\$13,098,085.00		\$10,075,450.00		\$10,075,450.00
Total Price for Collect, Pre-Paid, and Debit Call and Set-up Charge per Collect Call			\$76,407,349.48		\$73,384,714.48		\$81,298,372.54
Cost Points (90 Points Possible)			47		49		44

Memorandum

To: File
From: Brent Dixon *BWD*
Date: May 18, 2011
Re: Evaluation of MBE/WBE Participation

Pursuant to paragraph 4.6.1 of B2Z11019, evaluation points are available for offerors who propose the use of qualified MBEs and WBEs in the delivery of the services and products required, provided the required certification qualification and evidence have been met. Therefore, the proposals received in response to B2Z11019 were reviewed to determine if they qualified for the evaluation points. Following is a summary of that review:

1. The following offerors **were granted evaluation points** for proposing to use a qualified MBE/WBE in a manner that constituted a commercially useful function related to the delivery of the services and products required:
 - ✓ CenturyLink - Option #1
 - ✓ CenturyLink - Option #2
 - ✓ CenturyLink - Option #3
 - ✓ CenturyLink - Option #4
 - ✓ Consolidated Public Services
 - ✓ Public Communications Services
 - ✓ Securus
 - ✓ Synergy
 - ✓ TalkTelio
 - ✓ Unisys

MBE/WBE Participation Evaluation
RFP B2Z11019

Each offeror's proposed participation of MBE/WBE firms in meeting the targets of RFP B2Z11019 have been evaluated according to the formula stated in the RFP. Documentation of the calculation for the assignment of the evaluation points is identified below.

CenturyLink - Option #1	Points Assigned =	10
--------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------

<u>MBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
ECCO Select Corporation	6.00	B01804	8/25/13
ShawnTech	4.00	M00794	8/13/12
Total	10.00		
Amount for Evaluation	10.00		

<u>WBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Huber & Associates	5.00	W00715	6/1/13
Total	5.00		
Amount for Evaluation	5.00		

CenturyLink - Option #2	Points Assigned =	10
--------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------

<u>MBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
ShawnTech	10.00	M00794	8/13/12
Total	10.00		
Amount for Evaluation	10.00		

<u>WBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Huber & Associates	5.00	W00715	6/1/13
Total	5.00		
Amount for Evaluation	5.00		

CenturyLink - Option #3	Points Assigned =	10
--------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------

<u>MBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
ECCO Select Corporation	6.00	B01804	8/25/13
ShawnTech	4.00	M00794	8/13/12
Total	10.00		
Amount for Evaluation	10.00		

<u>WBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Huber & Associates	5.00	W00715	6/1/13
Total	5.00		
Amount for Evaluation	5.00		

CenturyLink - Option #4	Points Assigned =	10
--------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------

<u>MBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
ShawnTech	10.00	M00794	8/13/12
Total	10.00		
Amount for Evaluation	10.00		

<u>WBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Huber & Associates	5.00	W00715	6/1/13
Total	5.00		
Amount for Evaluation	5.00		

Consolidated Communications Public Services	Points Assigned =	10
--	--------------------------	-----------

<u>MBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Professional Services Resources, Inc.	10.00	B00332	6/1/13
ShawnTech	3.00	M00794	8/13/12
Total	13.00		
Amount for Evaluation	10.00		

<u>WBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Huber & Associates	5.00	W00715	6/1/13
Total	5.00		
Amount for Evaluation	5.00		

Public Communications Services	Points Assigned =	10
---------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------

<u>MBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Capital International Communications	10.00	M01943D	1/31/12
Total	10.00		
Amount for Evaluation	10.00		

<u>WBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Huber & Associates	5.00	W00715	6/1/13
Total	5.00		
Amount for Evaluation	5.00		

Securus	Points Assigned =	10
----------------	--------------------------	-----------

<u>MBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
ShawnTech	10.00	M00794	8/13/12
Total	10.00		
Amount for Evaluation	10.00		

<u>WBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Huber & Associates	5.00	W00715	6/1/13
Total	5.00		
Amount for Evaluation	5.00		

Synergy	Points Assigned =	10
----------------	--------------------------	-----------

<u>MBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
ShawnTech	17.00	M00794	8/13/12
Total	17.00		
Amount for Evaluation	10.00		

<u>WBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Huber & Associates	5.00	W00715	6/1/13
Total	5.00		
Amount for Evaluation	5.00		

TalkTelio	Points Assigned =	10
------------------	--------------------------	-----------

<u>MBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
ShawnTech	10.00	M00794	8/13/12
Total	10.00		
Amount for Evaluation	10.00		

<u>WBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Huber & Associates	5.00	W00715	6/1/13
Total	5.00		
Amount for Evaluation	5.00		

Unisys	Points Assigned =	10
---------------	--------------------------	-----------

<u>MBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Rose International	10.00	B00033	1/31/12
Total	10.00		
Amount for Evaluation	10.00		

<u>WBE Participation</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Certification</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
Rose International	5.00	B00033	1/31/12
Total	5.00		
Amount for Evaluation	5.00		

Memorandum

To: File
From: Brent Dixon *BLD*
Date: May 18, 2011
Re: Organization for the Blind/Sheltered Workshop Preference

Pursuant to paragraph 4.7.1 of B2Z11019, bonus points are available for offerors who propose the use of organization for the blind/sheltered workshops in the performance of the services required, provided certain conditions and evidence have been met. Therefore, the proposals received in response to B2Z11019 were reviewed to determine if they qualified for the bonus points. Following is a summary of that review:

The following offerors **were granted the bonus points** for proposing to use an organization for the blind/sheltered workshop in a manner that constituted an added value or provided a service required and met the required conditions and evidence:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| ✓ CenturyLink – Option #1 | ✓ CenturyLink – Option #3 |
| ✓ CenturyLink – Option #2 | ✓ CenturyLink – Option #4 |
| ✓ Consolidated Public Services | ✓ Securus |
| ✓ Public Communications Services | ✓ Synergy |
| ✓ Unisys | ✓ TalkTelio |

Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon
Governor



Kelvin Simmons
Commissioner

State of Missouri
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION
Division of Purchasing and Materials Management
301 West High Street, Room 630
Post Office Box 809
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0809
(573) 751-2387 FAX: (573) 526-9815
TTD: 800-735-2966 Voice: 800-735-2466
<http://www.oa.mo.gov/purch>

James Miluski
Director

TO: B2Z11019 Evaluation Team
FROM: Brent Dixon, DPMM *BD*
RE: Proposals Received for RFP B2Z11019
DATE: March 10, 2011

Eight (8) responses were received to Request for Proposal B2Z11019 for an offender telephone system. The responses were received from:

1. CenturyLink of Overland Park, KS
2. Consolidated Communications Public Services of Mattoon, IL
3. Noir & Ocam, LLC of Columbia, MO
4. PCS of Los Angeles, CA
5. Securus Technologies of Dallas, TX
6. Synergy Telecom Service Company/Telcomate of San Antonio, TX
7. Talktelio of Sarasota, FL
8. Unisys Corporation of Reston, VA

Attached to this memo is a copy of the Confidentiality/Conflict of Interest Agreement which all committee evaluators (and all expert subject staff/management who may be consulted during the evaluation) must sign and return to my attention immediately, if you have not done so already.

Please advise your evaluation team to begin reviewing the proposals, making notations where they may find proposal deficiencies (in relationship to the mandatory requirements of the RFP), concerns, or requirements for further clarification. Also caution your staff to secure their bid copies during the work day and upon leaving the office at night. For your convenience, attached is a copy of general evaluation guidelines.

I would like to schedule the first evaluation meeting at your earliest convenience, hopefully next couple days.

/bd
Attachments
c: File RFP B2Z11019

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

DIVISION OF PURCHASING & MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

General Evaluation Guidelines

The evaluation committee is requested to conduct an impartial and professional analysis of the proposals received. I would ask that the committee observe the following evaluation guidelines.

In accordance with RSMo 34, the contract must be awarded to the lowest and best offeror.

The evaluation committee's role will be to subjectively evaluate the best portion of the evaluation, which in this case, includes the offeror's Experience and Reliability of Organization and Method of Performance, Solution Functionality, and Expertise of Personnel. The Division of Purchasing and Materials Management (DPMM) will conduct the objective evaluation of pricing which constitutes the cost portion of the evaluation. In addition, the DPMM will evaluate any MBE/WBE and blind/sheltered workshop participation proposed by the offerors. The results of these two efforts will then be combined to determine the recommendation of the lowest and best offeror.

Listed below are steps of the evaluation process:

- A. Subjective evaluation – Review the facts of each proposal and then determine the pros and cons of those facts in terms of the requirements expressed in the Request for Proposal, specifically the mandatory Functional, Technical, and Performance Requirements of Section 2. To be responsive to the requirements of Section 2, an offeror must meet all mandatory requirements. If an evaluator finds deficiencies between the offeror's proposal and the RFP, the evaluator should note the paragraph/page for reference.
 - I would suggest that the committee agree on the order to be taken during the review of proposals.
- B. At the first formal evaluation meeting, we will review all committee members' notations and discuss those findings.
 - After performing the above for all proposals received, the committee will then determine the need for any clarifications or decide any necessary negotiation issues, proposal deficiencies, and factors that will be considered negotiable.

If negotiations are determined to be necessary, I will request Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) from each offeror. Once received, a copy of each offeror's Best and Final Offer will be forwarded to the committee for further evaluation.
 - After review of the Best and Final Offers, the committee will need to (1) summarize the evaluation efforts/findings, and (2) finalize acceptability issues as well as post-negotiation subjective evaluation issues.
- C. Upon completion of all of the evaluation tasks outlined above, I will need the following:
 - 1) A completed evaluation report (point) form (which I will provide).
 - 2) A comprehensive written evaluation report that subjectively analyzes each acceptable proposal based upon the facts contained therein and based upon the evaluation categories. This report also justifies the point scoring of the offerors on the evaluation report form.

The offeror determined to be lowest and best will be presented to the state agency for final approval.

I sincerely appreciate your willingness to participate in this evaluation. Please feel free to call me anytime at 751-4903 or email me at brent.dixon@oa.mo.gov if you have any questions.

Attachments

**CONFIDENTIALITY / CONFLICT OF INTEREST
AGREEMENT**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) B2Z11019
OFFENDER TELEPHONE SYSTEM**

It is my understanding that information related to the procurement process for the above referenced Request for Proposal has been provided to me on a need-to-know basis and that in accordance with 610.021 RSMo such records are closed to public review until such time as a contract is executed or all proposals are rejected.

It is also my understanding that disclosure of an offeror's proposal to a competitor may result in the competitor's disqualification from consideration for contract award and suspension/debarment from future procurement processes.

Therefore, I hereby agree to keep all information related to the Request for Proposal in strict confidence and not to divulge such information, in whole or in part, in any manner or form, to anyone or to allow others access to such information, unless they have a need to know such information and have executed a similar Confidentiality/Conflict of Interest Agreement. In the event that I should have reason to believe that the confidentiality of this information has been breached, I will notify the Division of Purchasing and Materials Management immediately.

I attest that to the best of my knowledge my participation in this procurement process does not violate any state laws that relate to conflict of interest including Sections 105.452 and 105.454 RSMo.

SIGNATURE

DATE

PRINTED NAME

AGENCY NAME

**CONFIDENTIALITY / CONFLICT OF INTEREST
AGREEMENT**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) B2Z11019
OFFENDER TELEPHONE SYSTEM**

It is my understanding that information related to the procurement process for the above referenced Request for Proposal has been provided to me on a need-to-know basis and that in accordance with 610.021 RSMo such records are closed to public review until such time as a contract is executed or all proposals are rejected.

It is also my understanding that disclosure of an offeror's proposal to a competitor may result in the competitor's disqualification from consideration for contract award and suspension/debarment from future procurement processes.

Therefore, I hereby agree to keep all information related to the Request for Proposal in strict confidence and not to divulge such information, in whole or in part, in any manner or form, to anyone or to allow others access to such information, unless they have a need to know such information and have executed a similar Confidentiality/Conflict of Interest Agreement. In the event that I should have reason to believe that the confidentiality of this information has been breached, I will notify the Division of Purchasing and Materials Management immediately.

I attest that to the best of my knowledge my participation in this procurement process does not violate any state laws that relate to conflict of interest including Sections 105.452 and 105.454 RSMo.

Joan McDonnell
SIGNATURE

3/10/11
DATE

Joan McDonnell
PRINTED NAME

Dept. of Corrections
AGENCY NAME

**CONFIDENTIALITY / CONFLICT OF INTEREST
AGREEMENT**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) B2Z11019
OFFENDER TELEPHONE SYSTEM**

It is my understanding that information related to the procurement process for the above referenced Request for Proposal has been provided to me on a need-to-know basis and that in accordance with 610.021 RSMo such records are closed to public review until such time as a contract is executed or all proposals are rejected.

It is also my understanding that disclosure of an offeror's proposal to a competitor may result in the competitor's disqualification from consideration for contract award and suspension/debarment from future procurement processes.

Therefore, I hereby agree to keep all information related to the Request for Proposal in strict confidence and not to divulge such information, in whole or in part, in any manner or form, to anyone or to allow others access to such information, unless they have a need to know such information and have executed a similar Confidentiality/Conflict of Interest Agreement. In the event that I should have reason to believe that the confidentiality of this information has been breached, I will notify the Division of Purchasing and Materials Management immediately.

I attest that to the best of my knowledge my participation in this procurement process does not violate any state laws that relate to conflict of interest including Sections 105.452 and 105.454 RSMo.

Theresa Roedel

SIGNATURE

3-10-11

DATE

Theresa Roedel

PRINTED NAME

OA ITSD

AGENCY NAME

**CONFIDENTIALITY / CONFLICT OF INTEREST
AGREEMENT**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) B2Z11019
OFFENDER TELEPHONE SYSTEM**

It is my understanding that information related to the procurement process for the above referenced Request for Proposal has been provided to me on a need-to-know basis and that in accordance with 610.021 RSMo such records are closed to public review until such time as a contract is executed or all proposals are rejected.

It is also my understanding that disclosure of an offeror's proposal to a competitor may result in the competitor's disqualification from consideration for contract award and suspension/debarment from future procurement processes.

Therefore, I hereby agree to keep all information related to the Request for Proposal in strict confidence and not to divulge such information, in whole or in part, in any manner or form, to anyone or to allow others access to such information, unless they have a need to know such information and have executed a similar Confidentiality/Conflict of Interest Agreement. In the event that I should have reason to believe that the confidentiality of this information has been breached, I will notify the Division of Purchasing and Materials Management immediately.

I attest that to the best of my knowledge my participation in this procurement process does not violate any state laws that relate to conflict of interest including Sections 105.452 and 105.454 RSMo.

Amy Roderick

SIGNATURE

3/10/11

DATE

Amy Roderick

PRINTED NAME

Mo. Dept. of Corrections

AGENCY NAME

**CONFIDENTIALITY / CONFLICT OF INTEREST
AGREEMENT**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) B2Z11019
OFFENDER TELEPHONE SYSTEM**

It is my understanding that information related to the procurement process for the above referenced Request for Proposal has been provided to me on a need-to-know basis and that in accordance with 610.021 RSMo such records are closed to public review until such time as a contract is executed or all proposals are rejected.

It is also my understanding that disclosure of an offeror's proposal to a competitor may result in the competitor's disqualification from consideration for contract award and suspension/debarment from future procurement processes.

Therefore, I hereby agree to keep all information related to the Request for Proposal in strict confidence and not to divulge such information, in whole or in part, in any manner or form, to anyone or to allow others access to such information, unless they have a need to know such information and have executed a similar Confidentiality/Conflict of Interest Agreement. In the event that I should have reason to believe that the confidentiality of this information has been breached, I will notify the Division of Purchasing and Materials Management immediately.

I attest that to the best of my knowledge my participation in this procurement process does not violate any state laws that relate to conflict of interest including Sections 105.452 and 105.454 RSMo.

Shane Ziebarth
SIGNATURE

3/10/11
DATE

Shane Ziebarth
PRINTED NAME

MOOC
AGENCY NAME

**CONFIDENTIALITY / CONFLICT OF INTEREST
AGREEMENT**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) B2Z11019
OFFENDER TELEPHONE SYSTEM**

It is my understanding that information related to the procurement process for the above referenced Request for Proposal has been provided to me on a need-to-know basis and that in accordance with 610.021 RSMo such records are closed to public review until such time as a contract is executed or all proposals are rejected.

It is also my understanding that disclosure of an offeror's proposal to a competitor may result in the competitor's disqualification from consideration for contract award and suspension/debarment from future procurement processes.

Therefore, I hereby agree to keep all information related to the Request for Proposal in strict confidence and not to divulge such information, in whole or in part, in any manner or form, to anyone or to allow others access to such information, unless they have a need to know such information and have executed a similar Confidentiality/Conflict of Interest Agreement. In the event that I should have reason to believe that the confidentiality of this information has been breached, I will notify the Division of Purchasing and Materials Management immediately.

I attest that to the best of my knowledge my participation in this procurement process does not violate any state laws that relate to conflict of interest including Sections 105.452 and 105.454 RSMo.



SIGNATURE

3/10/11

DATE

RODNEY KUETHER

PRINTED NAME

CORRECTIONS

AGENCY NAME

**CONFIDENTIALITY / CONFLICT OF INTEREST
AGREEMENT**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) B2Z11019
OFFENDER TELEPHONE SYSTEM**

It is my understanding that information related to the procurement process for the above referenced Request for Proposal has been provided to me on a need-to-know basis and that in accordance with 610.021 RSMo such records are closed to public review until such time as a contract is executed or all proposals are rejected.

It is also my understanding that disclosure of an offeror's proposal to a competitor may result in the competitor's disqualification from consideration for contract award and suspension/debarment from future procurement processes.

Therefore, I hereby agree to keep all information related to the Request for Proposal in strict confidence and not to divulge such information, in whole or in part, in any manner or form, to anyone or to allow others access to such information, unless they have a need to know such information and have executed a similar Confidentiality/Conflict of Interest Agreement. In the event that I should have reason to believe that the confidentiality of this information has been breached, I will notify the Division of Purchasing and Materials Management immediately.

I attest that to the best of my knowledge my participation in this procurement process does not violate any state laws that relate to conflict of interest including Sections 105.452 and 105.454 RSMo.

Nancy Bockat
SIGNATURE

3-10-11
DATE

Nancy Bockat
PRINTED NAME

OAIITSD
AGENCY NAME