

# MANATEE COUNTY GOVERNMENT SOURCE SELECTION

<b>SUBJECT</b>	Supervised Release and Pre-Trial Electronic Monitoring Services	<b>DATE POSTED</b>	Date Posted on <u>3/7/12</u> Mymanatee.org <u>MEJ</u>
<b>PURCHASING REPRESENTATIVE</b>	Dennis W. Wallace	<b>DATE CONTRACT SHALL BE AWARDED</b>	To Be Determined After Negotiations
<b>DEPARTMENT</b>	Financial Management Purchasing Division	<b>CONSEQUENCES IF DEFERRED</b>	N/A
<b>SOURCE RECOMMENDATION</b>	Request For Proposal No. 11-3475DW	<b>AUTHORIZED BY DATE</b>	Dennis W. Wallace March 7, 2012

### ACTION DESIRED

Authorization to enter into negotiations with the top ranked firm, **BI Incorporated, Boulder, CO**, to provide Supervised Release and Pre-Trial Electronic Monitoring Services on an annual basis.

### ENABLING/REGULATING AUTHORITY

Federal/State law(s), administrative ruling(s), Manatee County Comp Plan/Land Development Code, ordinances, resolutions, policy.)  
Manatee County Code of Law, Chapter 2-26 Manatee County Purchasing Ordinance, Section 2-26-40 and the Standards and Procedures approved by the County Administrator.

### BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The County competitively solicited a Request for Proposal ("RFP") No.11-3475DW for the Probation Division of the Community Services Department to provide Supervised Release and Pre-Trial Electronic Monitoring Services on a 24-hour continuous basis to ensure offender compliance with court ordered requirements. Services shall include, but are not limited to, equipment installation and removal, monitoring, support services and custom reports.

The RFP was broadcast via Demand Star and advertised in the Bradenton Herald, posted on the County's website, and provided to the Manatee County Chamber of Commerce for release to its' members.

- Continued on Page 2 -

<b>SUMMARY</b>	Authorization to enter into negotiations with <b>BI Incorporated</b> , Boulder, CO, to provide Supervised Release and Pre-Trial Electronic Monitoring Services.		
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b> (List in order as attached)	<b>INSTRUCTIONS TO BOARD RECORDS:</b>		
	NA		
<b>COST</b>	\$75,000.00 Estimated Annually	<b>SOURCE (ACCT# &amp; NAME)</b>	Community Services Department / Probation Division
<b>COMMENTS</b>	N/A	<b>AMT./FREQ. OF RECURRING COSTS (ATTACH FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT)</b>	N/A

Source Selection - continued

**PROPOSALS:** Proposals were received from the following firms:

Manatee County Firms: None

Local Firms: None

Other Firms:

BI Incorporated	Boulder, CO
G4S Justice Services, LLC	Richmond, VA
House Arrest Services, Inc.	Eastpointe, MI
iSECUREtrac	Omaha, NE
Judicial Electronic Monitoring Service, LLC	Peachtree City, GA

**SELECTION:**

The Selection Committee convened and short listed the following three (3) firms for Oral Presentations which were held on 1/18/2012:

- 1.) **BI Incorporated**
- 2.) **G4S Justice Services, LLC**
- 3.) **iSECUREtrac**

The Selection Committee evaluated and tested the proposed equipment from the three (3) short listed firms for a two (2) week period and reconvened on 2/8/2012 to discuss the findings of the equipment evaluation and subsequently ranked the firms as follows for the purpose of negotiating a contract with the top ranked firm:

**Ranked No. 1: BI Incorporated**

The top ranked firm demonstrated exceptional qualifications with impressive detail and outlined many innovations to satisfy the County's requirements. For example, the firm recommended a self-pay option for those cases where the offender would be billed directly by BI in the event the court ordered the offender to be responsible for paying the daily monitoring cost thus minimizing the County's risk should the offender fail to pay.

In addition, BI has an available "install option" where BI staff will supplement County Probation Staff in performing the installations and/or removals and allow for greater effectiveness in managing the daily workload of Probation Staff.

BI's equipment features a two (2) part set up which includes a bracelet and monitoring beacon; the bracelet also features a voice option. The use of the accompanying software was clear and functional and the monitoring call center had a minimal wait time. BI has also proposed providing an "on-call" cell phone to the County for mobile monitoring purposes.

The proposal demonstrated the firm's understanding of the County's requirements, highlighting their successful past performance in the electronic monitoring industry, provided several cost efficient options, and a reasonable pricing structure. As a result of these features, BI successfully demonstrated greater functionality in providing these monitoring services.

**Ranked No. 2: G4S Justice Services, LLC**

The firm presented its' professional capabilities in a clear and concise manner demonstrating that they have provided similar services as required in the Scope of Services with acceptable equipment, resources, and equipment.

G4S' equipment featured a single bracelet unit with functional software. However, local installation services were not available, and no "on-call" cell phone is available for those accounts with inventory of less than fifty (50) units. The proposal did not include a self-pay option. The call center wait time was difficult to access as the result of many prompts in accessing the call center.

As a result, the firm was ranked second by the Selection Committee.

**Ranked No. 3: iSECUREtrac**

The firm submitted a basic proposal detailing their qualifications and experience in the electronic monitoring industry.

The firm provided equipment with multiple parts which experienced signal difficulties during the demonstration and was not the state-of-the-art equipment necessary in satisfying the County's requirements. While the firm would provide an "on-call" cell phone for County use, no self-pay option or installation services was available.

The firm was ranked third when compared to the higher ranked firms due to the perception by the Selection Committee of less overall capabilities to meet the County's requirements.

**Remaining Respondents:** The remaining respondents, listed alphabetically below, were not ranked and, although well qualified, were not selected based on a comparison of capabilities of the selected firm however, as stated in the solicitation document, all of the criteria specified in the RFP were utilized in the selection determination.

- House Arrest Services, Inc., Eastpointe, MI
- Judicial Electronic Monitoring Service, LLC, Peachtree City, GA