



**ADDENDUM #1  
2023-003 RFP  
ALCOHOL MONITORING  
Kitsap County**

**TO:** All Respondents  
**FROM:** Glen McNeill, Purchasing Supervisor.  
**CLOSING DATE:** February 16, 2023, at 2:00 PM **(CHANGED)**  
**REF NO.:** 2023-003  
**DATE:** January 24, 2023

---

The following information is provided to assist in responding to the above referenced proposal and extend the response due date as listed above.

1. Who is the current contracted vendor providing products and services for the County?

The current provider is the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC).

2. Regarding page 3 of 16 – 6. Electronic Monitoring Devices:

- a. Item 1. Radio Frequency Devices – Can respondents propose a hybrid solution that includes an RF Beacon installed in the home communicating with a GPS ankle monitor worn by an individual, where the ankle monitor communicates the arrival and departure from the RF Beacon?

The fundamental purpose of this RFP is to procure a system that regularly monitors and reports-on individual alcohol use among treatment court participants who have been prohibited from consuming alcohol. The County will consider hybrid solutions that fundamentally achieve this primary objective through some means beyond breathalyzer devices.

- b. Item 3. Alcohol Monitoring - The County states that the respondents offer SHOULD include a Continuous supervision option. Would a deep lung remote alcohol monitoring device that provides random tests (so the individual is unaware when the test will be administered) suffice for this option? A Continuous Alcohol Monitoring or Transdermal Alcohol Device is only offered by two OEM's or their Value-Added Resellers limiting competition on the comprehensive solution as well as more innovative GPS solution.

This RFP has been specifically written to procure equipment and monitoring services related to transdermal alcohol monitoring systems. However, the County will consider other innovative solutions provided hand-held breathalyzer devices are not the sole/central focus of the solution.

- c. If the County does not accept the deep lung remote alcohol monitoring service, would the County consider contracting with a single vendor that provides GPS and RF Devices and a separate vendor that provides the continuous supervision option?

For purposes of this project, the County is interested in procuring a single solution that provides GPS and RF devices that integrates continuous supervision.

3. Page 4 of 16 – 9. Supplier Responsibilities – on-site support:

- a. Do you expect on-site support upon request to provide this type of support daily/weekly?

The County's expectation is that on-site support will be available as necessary and based on the reliability of equipment, need for training, and/or to troubleshoot monitoring and reporting services. More frequent on-site support may be necessary upon contract initiation and less frequent for unique problem-solving thereafter. After initial start-up, the County's expectation is that on-site support should not be necessary more than 1-to-5 times per year.

- b. How many times has the current vendor provided on-site support in 2022?

The current provider was not called for on-site support in 2022.

4. Court Testifying Services – How many times did your current vendor provide testifying services in 2022 in person and virtually?

The current provider was not called to testify during 2022.

5. Regarding page 7 of 16 – 17. Proposal Submittal Requirements – item J. – Transmittal Page:

You refer to this having to be signed in ink and the first page of the RFP and refer to it as Submittal Form 1. There is no specific form that respondents need to complete is there? If it was not included, can the County please provide the correct form?

The Transmittal Page referred to in the RFP is the very first page (the "cover page") of the RFP packet found at: <https://www.kitsap.gov/das/Documents/2023-003%20RFP%20TAD,%20Alcohol%20Monitoring.pdf>.

- a. Does the standard Transmittal letter that the County is asking the respondent to include need to have a wet signature from the person that can sign contracts?

The Transmittal Page may have an e-signature affixed in keeping with Washington statutes and may be signed by any officer authorized by the responding vendor agency to present/offer services with a binding, proposed pricing model.

- 1) In order to mitigate the potential of a delay or conflict in delivery, all leading proposers ship proposals two (2) business days early to ensure delivery/acceptance the business day before they are actually due (Example: For a Thursday, February 2<sup>nd</sup> proposal due date, proposers will ship proposals on Tuesday, January 31st, to confirm delivery/receipt on Wednesday, February 1st). KCSC's answers to questions can have substantial impact on proposal content and direction, including but not limited to potentially determining which model of technology is actually proposed, thus the Superior Court's answers could warrant potential re-write of entire proposal responses to the RFP Specifications. These points made, will KCSC please extend the proposal due date to allow a minimum of two (2) complete weeks from the posting/distribution of final addendum/answers to questions until the proposal due date?

Deadline will be extended to February 16, 2023

- 2) Beyond the populations listed in the RFP, what is the possibility of program population growth, if applicable?

Not applicable.

- 3) On average, how many installations occur per month (activations)? On average, how many removals occur per month (deactivations)?

Based on 2022 data, the Court installed 3-4 devices per month, and deactivated approximately 3-4 devices per month.

- 4) On page 4, item #9 lists "On-Site Support". Can the Superior Court provide additional explanation on what type of on-site support is required?

The County's expectation is that on-site support will be available as necessary and based on the reliability of equipment, need for training, and/or to troubleshoot monitoring and reporting services. More frequent on-site support may be necessary upon contract initiation and less frequent for unique problem-solving thereafter. After initial start-up, the County's expectation is that on-site support should not be necessary more than 1-to-5 times per year.

- a. Will national monitoring center 24/7 support meet this requirement?

This depends on the severity of the issue requiring problem-solving.

- 5) Who is KCSC's current provider of services for this program?

The current provider is the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC).

- 6) What model of equipment is utilized for each service?

- a. GPS? Attenti AT1
- b. Transdermal Alcohol? Attenti AT1 device / BI Homeguard 206 DS base unit
- c. Portable Breath Alcohol Testing? Soberlink SL2
- d. Radio Frequency Monitoring? Unknown

- 7) Can KCSC confirm the current quantities of units in use are consistent?

Not always. Quantities of units highly depends upon the fluctuating populations in the Adult Drug Court and Veteran Treatment Court programs. The numbers found in the RFP are averages.

- a. GPS average at 15 units? What is the breakdown per tracking setting?

Average GPS unit usage in 2022 was 9 per month, but the overall program population is down currently by 20-30% following COVID. Population numbers are beginning to increase so an average of 15 is anticipated.

- i. Active Units? 10%
- ii. Hybrid Units? N/A
- iii. Passive Units? 90%

- b. Transdermal alcohol average at 10 units? Approx. 3-5 per month on average at reduced program population.

- c. Radio Frequency Electronic Monitoring at 9 units per month currently.

- 8) What is the daily rate paid by the Superior Court for each equipment model utilized?

- a. GPS? \$7.75 Per Day
- b. Transdermal Alcohol? \$ 10.45 Per Day
- c. Portable Breath Alcohol Testing? \$7.85 Per Day
- d. Radio Frequency Monitoring? \$ included in above costs.

- 9) Is pricing currently provided at a flat daily rate or by quantity tiers?

Flat daily rate

- a. Which format of fee structure does KCSC prefer?

Flat daily rate

- 10) Spare Equipment. What is the percentage of shelf inventory expected to be provided by the vendor at no cost to KCSC?

RFP indicates 20% or, on average, 3 shelf units.

- a. What is the current no cost shelf inventory percentage or amount of units provided by the current vendor?

3

- b. What is the daily cost for any excess spare equipment beyond the no cost spare allotment?

\$0

- 11) Lost, Damaged, and Stolen (LDS) Equipment. Can the Superior Court confirm the amount of LDS for each device type **for the past 12 months**:

- a. LDS total for GPS? \$0

- b. LDS total for Transdermal? \$0

- c. LDS total for Breath Alcohol Testing? \$0

- 12) What is the percentage of LDS equipment expected to be allotted by the vendor at no cost to KCSC?

3%

Does the Superior Court reimburse the vendor for the unrecovered or destroyed equipment beyond the allotted LDS percentage? No

If so, what is the reimbursement amount per device:

- a. GPS device? \_\_\_\_

- b. Transdermal Device? \_\_\_\_

- c. Transdermal Base unit? \_\_\_\_

- d. Breath Alcohol Testing Unit? 0

- 13) Are participants allowed back onto the program if they damage any equipment? If so, what is the number of participants that this situation would apply to annually?

Yes. 1 participant in the last 3 years.

- 14) Who is responsible for Lost/Damaged/Stolen (LDS) equipment? Superior Court or participant?

The participant – or the Court is the participant is unable.

- a. If a participant destroys the equipment, are they removed from the program or are they permitted to remain on?

It depends. The Treatment Court team will staff this to determine whether the participant continues (following an appropriate sanction) or not. Case-by-case determination.

- 15) Does the Superior Court pay the current vendor for consumables utilized in the operation of the devices? For example, device straps, power chargers, etc.?

No

- a. Over the last 12 months, how many GPS chargers and Breath Alcohol testing device chargers have been lost?

0

- b. Over the last 12 months, how many GPS or transdermal device straps have been cut or destroyed?

0

- 16) Would the Superior Court accept the use of nationally accepted purchasing agreements that are available; e.g., NASPO, GSA?

No

- 17) Please clarify if KCSC's protocols require the vendor's staff to have voice communication with clients.

No

- a. If so, are any languages beyond English required? NA

- 18) Does KCSC require provision of notification tools, i.e., cell phones, laptops, etc. for Superior Court program staff? If so, how many (by device type) are estimated to be required for each Court/program?

No

- 19) Does the current vendor provide any on-site staff for service to this program?

No

- 20) How many agency locations are involved in the operation of this program?

1

- 21) For officer training, are webinar sessions acceptable?

Yes

- 22) How many officers will require training?

5

- 23) Are alert notifications to be submitted to a general program contact person or specific officers?

General program contact person.

- 24) Is weekend or after-hours reporting required?

No

- 25) We understand that normal reporting business hours are traditionally from 8:00am to 5:00pm, M-F. We have several questions regarding reporting hours:

- a. Is any critical violation reporting required after standard work hours? If so, to whom?

No

- b. Are weekend and/or holiday reporting duties required? If so, to whom?

No

- c. What method of alert notifications are required and/or provided to Superior Court officers? Texts? Emails? Direct phone calls to staff?

Emails

d. Does the Superior Court prefer an option to have direct voice communication from the vendor's monitoring center to:

- i. Court staff? **Yes**
- ii. Participants/offenders? **Likely**
- iii. Other personnel? **No**

e. Does the current vendor provide any local staff-related services during weekends?

**No**

26) Will the Superior Court accept expert vendor, web-based/online services when court testimony is required?

**Yes**

27) We have several questions regarding the RFP schedule:

a. The RFP does not provide a start date. Can a tentative date be provided in order for proper planning and equipment preparation?

**As soon as possible following the County's standard contracting process. Ideally, as early as March 1, 2023 and no later than April 1, 2023.**

b. As an existing program, will the existing and new population transition to the new vendor at a mutually agreed upon date or will the program start with ZERO participants?

**Ideally, existing participants will transfer to the new system on the 1<sup>st</sup> of the month following contract execution.**

28) In acknowledging that KCSC is looking for multiple types of offender monitoring services as part of this RFP:

a. Is the Superior Court seeking to award one contractor for all elements?

**Yes**

b. If so, will the Superior Court reject proposals that fail to meet the overall scope required by the RFP for the requirements of any proposed device?

**Not necessarily. While the fundamental purpose of this RFP is to specifically procure transdermal alcohol devices and associated testing/monitoring, the County is open to considering innovative approaches (excluding sole breathalyzer alternatives) that meet the underlying objective.**

c. Does the evaluation criteria/scoring attribute any scoring to a single contractor(s) who propose all elements of the RFP and, if so, specifically how?

**No**

29) Are there any other functions and services provided by the current vendor that are desired, but not specifically described in the RFP?

**No**

30) Is any Domestic Violence GPS monitoring being performed? If so, what responsibilities does the current vendor have for this service?

No, this is out of scope.

- a. If so, how many cases utilize GPS DV monitoring? N/A
- b. If utilized, does KCSC have staff available 24/7 for DV alert notifications? N/A
- c. What is the daily rate charged by the incumbent vendor for this service? N/A

31) Will victim notification services be required? If so, please describe the required services as these programs entail additional proactive action from the provider and hence may incur additional fees.

No, that is outside the scope of this RFP.

32) Does the Superior Court require interface between its system and that of the vendor's? If so, can the Superior Court provide at a minimum, preliminary data system specifications for vendor IT personnel review?

No

33) What is the Superior Court's preferred method for vendors to label proposal response information as "confidential"?

Placing the word "Confidential" in red either in the Header of the document(s)

34) RFP # 17.J, page 7 of 16, please provide the **Submittal Form 1** required for submission by vendors as the Transmittal Page of the "Proposal Submittal Package".

The Transmittal Page referred to in the RFP is the very first page (the "cover page") of the RFP packet found at:

<https://www.kitsap.gov/das/Documents/2023-003%20RFP%20TAD,%20Alcohol%20Monitoring.pdf>.

35) Section 7. Equipment Expectations (bottom of page 3) states that equipment "will remain the property of the supplier". Does this mean that the KSCS is only interested in renting equipment (vs. purchasing)? Or, if the county is interested in keeping its equipment, should responses show both rental and purchase pricing?

At this time, the County is interested in renting equipment, not purchasing it. Pricing should reflect this contract model.

36) Page 6, 17. Proposal (Submittal) Requirements, D. Equipment Monitoring Requirements only references the submission of "a description of the monitoring system capabilities that are available through your proposal as contemplated under #8, above." Based on that requirement, will you please confirm that the County is **not** looking for responses to 6. Electronic Monitoring Devices and 7. Equipment Expectations or for descriptions about how the equipment meets the devices and expectations requirements?

Proposers should respond to all sections of the RFP to the best of their ability to ensure the Court has a full understanding of the proposed solution.

37) . Page 3 lists the estimated monthly usage of the monitors. Because alcohol and electronic monitoring is invoiced on a daily basis, will you please provide the average daily usage of the monitors?

Based on available 2022 data, the average daily usage of the monitors by device are:

TAD	~2 devices per day
Soberlink	>1 device per day
GPS Passive 1 Piece	~5 devices per day
GPS Active 1 Piece	>1 device per day

38) 8. How many units were in use as of December 31, 2022 by equipment type?

December 2022 data is not yet available. November 2022 data is as follows:

TAD Cellular/Homebase	5 units
Soberlink	1 unit
GPS Passive 1 Piece	6 units

39) . What is the current contracted daily rate for all equipment by make and model?

Already addressed.

a. Does the daily rate include all costs? Yes

b. If not, what additional costs are incurred? N/A

40) What is the average length of time a participant is on GPS monitoring? Alcohol monitoring?

GPS monitoring	60-90 days
TAD Monitoring	90-120 days

41) Is there a preference for a one-piece or two-piece GPS tracking device? a. If not, is it acceptable for vendors to offer both one- and two-piece GPS devices?

The Court is more familiar with and anticipate working with one piece units but will consider two piece units that meet the fundamental objective(s) of the Court.

42) 15. Are you interested in additional and/or alternative electronic monitoring technologies and products? If yes, may we offer these as “optional products and services” with associated pricing?

Proposers should feel free to provide additional and/or alternative electronic monitoring technologies as optional products and services, provided they are intended to meet the Court’s fundamental program objectives.

43) The RFP refers to overnight shipping, at no cost, when needed. How often has the County required overnight shipping in the last 12 months?

No more than 1-2 times over the last 12 months.

44) We have found that sometimes, perhaps because proposers do not ask a question clearly enough, the answers are unclear. Upon release of the County’s initial answers to questions, will proposers be permitted to ask additional clarification questions if they do not fully understand the initial answers?



Only one period of Q&A is incorporated in this RFP process. If any issues or questions remain following the Response Period, proposers are encouraged to include in their bid any thing that requires clarification.

45) Since monitoring center staffing factors heavily into vendor costs, we request clarification of the monitoring services required. - Is the County requesting the additional provision of direct manual outbound calls from the monitoring center staff to either offenders or officers?

Already addressed

a. If the answer is yes, who is to be contacted by telephone? The officer, the offender, or both?

Already addressed

b. Which violation notifications must be provided via a phone call? Alcohol usage

c. For each of the violations that require a phone call, approximately how many alarms are generated each month?

2-4 alerts per month

d. Can you please provide the current outbound protocols?

No response available.

46) Contract for Professional Services, Section 5. Indemnification. Will the County please limit indemnification to third party claims? This is normal practice in the electronic monitoring industry.

Without committing to any amendments at this time, the County is open to reviewing proposed language and proposers should include proposed language in their responses. However, historically, the County has made minimal, if any, changes to the PSA Indemnification section.

47) Contract for Professional Services, Section 9, 9.1 Ownership. Will the County please amend the requirement to include, "The parties agree that any previously or independently developed or owned intellectual property is and shall remain the property of the respective party that previously or independently developed or owned said intellectual property"?

Without committing to any amendments at this time, the County is open to reviewing proposed language and proposers should include proposed language in their responses.

48) Contract for Professional Services, Section 4, Termination 4.1 For Convenience. Will the County please amend to allow for mutual termination for convenience?

Without committing to any amendments at this time, the County is open to reviewing proposed language and proposers should include proposed language in their responses.

49) Will the County add Limitation of Liability language?

Without committing to any amendments at this time, the County is open to reviewing proposed language and proposers should include proposed language in their responses.

50) Contract for Professional Services, Section 5.3 is not applicable to electronic monitoring; will the County please delete?

Without committing to any amendments at this time, the County is open to reviewing proposed language and proposers should include proposed language in their responses.

51) Will the County allow contract negotiations upon award?

Without committing to any amendments at this time, the County is open to reviewing proposed language and proposers should include proposed language in their responses.

END OF ADDENDUM #1