

From: Shannon Brown
To: Mike Cantrell; John Price; Kenneth Mayfield; Maurine dickey; Jim Foster
CC: Ron Stretcher; Bob Schell; Dapheny Fain; Linda Boles; CHRIS THOMPSON; Traci Enna; Clemson, Allen; Savage, Dan; Brenda Sauls; Downes, Danny; Michael Pappas; SHAWN BALUSEK; Leffie Crawford; CATHEY SHAY
Sent: 11/1/2007 6:36:59 PM
Subject: Inmate Phones
Attachments: Dallas County Presentation - Securus Slide.ppt

Judge and Commissioners,

On Tuesday, you requested that the Purchasing Department and evaluation committee provide additional information on the issue of inmate visitation phone maintenance and recording and how this issue was addressed in the evaluation process. I have copied the evaluation committee on this information.

Six (6) firms initially submitted proposals. Four (4) were deemed susceptible on June 12/June 19. The Evaluation Committee scheduled presentations with each of the four (4) vendors on June 27 and June 28. During those presentations, each vendor presented the functionality of their systems and provided initial rates/commission structures. The Evaluation Committee discussed the presentations and during this discussion there were certain system functionality that the committee felt could be beneficial to Dallas County. All vendors focused attention on the ability to record and store calls. The Sheriff's Office was glad to see this expanded functionality and that all systems had a way to ensure that inmate/attorney calls were not recorded.

In addition, two vendors mentioned that they could provide maintenance and recording of inmate visitation phones - GTL and Securus. Chief Downes with the Sheriff's Office was interested in this functionality and agreed to ask the Intelligence Division if this would be a useful tool for them. Chris Thompson was interested in assigning the maintenance of the inmate phones to the vendor because these phones are constantly an issue and he felt this could be a good way to have consistency in their maintenance (visitation phones are currently maintained by Facilities Management). Chief Downes confirmed that the Intelligence Division would use the visitation phone recording functionality and the Committee agreed to include that in the BAFO information. Each vendor also provided information on their data storage time frame and the Committee agreed that for the BAFO all vendors should provide the same amount of storage capacity. Another functionality mentioned by a vendor in their presentation was video arraignment equipment. The Committee discussed this option but decided not to include this functionality in the BAFO information because another method of getting this system in place was already in the works. Based on the presentations, all vendors were deemed susceptible to move to the next stage of the process (briefed on July 24).

The Committee wanted to make sure that all vendors had a chance to provide their best offer based on the same criteria. The BAFO document was prepared to reflect the \$2.00 local call option preferred by Commissioners Court and required that long-distance rates were lowered from their current level. The BAFO provided a sample contract and requested that the pricing assume a minimum of twelve (12) months data storage, free calls to an informant line, nurse line, and suicide hotline, assume responsibility for maintaining and recording inmate visitation phones, and a sixty (60) day transition period.

Securus did not provide a complete picture of the time line associated with the BAFO process. BAFO letters were faxed or emailed to all vendors on Friday, September 14, 2007 with the information as described above. These letters had a due date for questions of Tuesday, September 17, 2007 and a due date for final responses by Friday, September 28, 2007. The letters also indicated that answers to questions would be sent out by Friday, September 21, 2007. Several questions were received from the vendors. Securus submitted nine (9) questions on Wednesday, September 18, 2007 at approximately 3:45 pm - after the stated deadline. However, staff worked to answer all of the questions. Final answers were distributed on Thursday, September 27, 2007 at approximately 12:45 pm and the due date for final responses extended until Wednesday, October 3, 2007 at 4:00 pm. Securus' representative indicated the September 27 was the first notification of the requirement for maintenance and recording on visitation phones. That requirement was provided to all firms with the initial letter. The answers to Securus' questions concerning the visitation phones were provided on September 27 with the extension granted for all vendors to the new date. One vendor submitted their proposal prior to receiving the September 27 answers but provided a letter stating that they read the answers and they did not need to change their proposal.

GOVERNMENT
EXHIBIT NO.

358

3:14-CR-293-M

SBP-1A-162-0099-01-18356

of the additional information available.

Securus also mentioned on Tuesday that this additional requirement impacted their rate/commission proposal and as a new requirement resulted in a significant financial commitment on their part. I'm surprised at this assertion since Securus was one of the firms that touted this functionality in their presentation as a part of their product offering to Dallas County. While I can't definitively state the impact to the commissions of this functionality, I can state that the commission rates discussed at the presentations and the commission rates presented in the BAFOs improved significantly across three of the four vendors. Below is a comparison of the initial rates and the rates presented in the BAFOs for each vendor.

GTL

Initial rate/commission structure for \$2 local call was 55% - final was 63.1%

PCS

Initial rate/commission structure for \$2 local call was 48.44% - final was 43.92% (effective commission)

Securus

Initial rate/commission structure for \$2 local call was 47% - final was 50.2%

Unisys

Initial rate/commission structure for \$2 local call was 39.3% - final was 59%

There have been some questions with the legal issues of recording inmate conversations. This process is already happening with inmate out-going telephone calls. The new system (regardless of the vendor) will be much improved because it will have the functionality to identify attorney/client calls and not record them. Since two vendors presented a solution that extended this functionality to visitation phones, staff considered the option, found it to be beneficial, and included it in the BAFO documentation to ensure that all vendors were afforded the opportunity to present their commission rates under the same assumptions. Chris has provided some legal information/case law on taping inmate conversations that I will forward to the District Attorney's Office for their review.

I also asked Leffie Crawford to confirm Securus' MWBE participation since that issue was also raised on Tuesday. She is in the process of verifying the information and will provide it to me.

I have received a letter from GTL stating their concerns with Securus' presentation on Tuesday. GTL's primary concern is making sure that if additional financial information is to be prepared that no information from the BAFOs be disclosed that would jeopardize their offer. GTL also does not agree that they are an "incumbant" since they currently provide only long-distance service.

My recommendation would be to move forward with the award to GTL and to begin contract negotiations. At this time, there is not a court order on the formal agenda for November 6, 2007 so the vote would be taken on November 13, 2007. The evaluation committee still views the GTL proposal as the best combination of call rates and commissions offered to Dallas County.

The Purchasing Department can prepare a second BAFO and request that commission rates be submitted that exclude the functionality of recording/maintaining visitation phones.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions or need documentation of the items mentioned above. Since a contract has not been executed, all information pertaining to this solicitation is considered confidential per the terms of the RFQ.

Powerful Investigative Enhancements

- Redundant, Robust Monitoring and Recording Capabilities
 - 1 year online
 - Off line storage for the life of the agreement
- Integrated Visitation Phone Monitoring and Recording
- Scan Patrol – Allows officers to “scan” live calls as they are in progress
- Covert Alert – Forward live calls to outside numbers
- Easy Export of Investigative Data to External Media
- Investigative Folders for Case Tracking
- Crime Tip Line
- Customer Administrative Portal... Anytime, Anywhere Access
- Unparalleled, Patented 3-Way Call Detection
- Biometric Identification Technology
- Court supported and upheld technology

