

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
1.	RFP - Paragraph 7.6.4 (Proposer's Approach to Providing Required Services (Section C) (25%))	<p>Clarify the required response format for the three subsections:</p> <p>a) Is the County requesting a point-to-point response to Exhibit A, Statement of Work (SOW), and Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirement Response Matrix)?</p> <p>b) Clarify additional narrative requirements Proposers must address within the three subsections, Section C.1, Section C.2, and Section C.3, to ensure compliance with the County's requirements.</p>	<p>a) No point-to-point response is required for Exhibit A (SOW). Proposer must respond to each requirement listed on Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirements Response Matrix). If you need additional room to write your response you may attach additional pages to the document.</p> <p>b) Section C.1: Proposer must describe its management approach and the methodology they will use to fulfill the requirements. Also, describe how it intends to ensure 24/7 optimal operational status of the proposed GPS offender monitoring system. Section C.2: Proposer must describe how it intends to execute each task listed in Exhibit A (SOW), including all staffing and resources that will be allocated. Section C.3: Proposer must complete and submit Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirements Response Matrix) and provide full disclosure for each requirement that will, or may, require modifications.</p>
2.	RFP – Paragraph 2.1.3a: Offender Monitoring Program (OMP)	The RFP states that the program may expand significantly. What is the anticipated timeline for this growth?	To be determined. No current timeline.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
3.		Provide the estimated number of program participants who will be required to utilize the following: a) GPS tracking with active case management b) GPS tracking without active case management c) Radio frequency (RF) electronic monitoring with landline connection d) RF electronic monitoring with cell phone connection e) Transdermal alcohol monitoring	a) 300+ b) 300+ c) 40+ d) 40+ e) Data is not available; this is a new requirement.
4.	Exhibit A (SOW), Paragraph 2.2.2 (Scope of Service)	At this time, there is no GPS tracking device that provides this type of tracking and transdermal alcohol monitoring. Will the County please modify this section to remove the tracking element of the service?	Correct, this dual capability exists using RF devices not on GPS devices. The intent is to have the subject tethered to the home using an RF device if alcohol monitoring is required.
5.	Appendix B (Required Forms) – Exhibit 9 (Pricing Schedule)	The current price page does not include any price fields for the transdermal alcohol device. Would the County please add the alcohol line items to the price page.	Exhibit 9 (Pricing Schedule) amended via Bulletin #4.
6.		a) Will the County reimburse the vendor for any equipment that is not returned or damaged for any reason? b) Can the participants be charged financially for the lost or destroyed devices? c) Will the participant be removed from the program for any lost or destroyed devices?	a) No b) Yes c) Yes, at the County's sole discretion.
7.		For the monthly face-to-face meetings with participants, will the County provide office space at the County site(s) to accommodate this requirement?	The County will provide office space, as needed.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
8.	RFP – Paragraph 7.6.3.2 (Proposer’s List of References (Section B.2))	The bid calls for three current references; however, it also asks for all public entities’ contracts for the last three consecutive years. As this is a significant amount of information, including entities that request that their information not be disclosed, we are requesting that the County limit the request to a specific number of similar references or remove this portion of the requirement. If this remains a requirement, will the County please allow Proposers to mark this list ‘Confidential’ and not disclosed to the public.	Proposer must provide a total of three references for public and/or private entities.  Exhibit 8 (Proposer’s List of References) amended via Bulletin #4.
9.		For high-risk alerts, will the County require after-hours/weekend notification to Department staff? If so, will texts and/or email meet County requirements?	Yes and Yes.
10.	SOW – Paragraph 2.1 (Scope of Service)	Active Case Management Services: a) Estimate of OMP participants that currently require Active Case Management Services? b) Is that number expected to increase or decrease? c) How long are OMP participants under active case management? d) Where are the case management meetings currently being conducted?	a) ~100. b) Increase. c) Typically 90 days. d) Release location / Treatment facility lobby.
11.	Exhibit A (SOW), Paragraph 11.4 (Active Case Management – OMP Participants)	Contractor’s case managers: a) How frequent are the status meetings with the County Project Manager b) In the last year, how many times have case managers been required to testify in court? c) Is video testimony accepted?	a) Bi-annually. b) Once. c) No.
12.		Training: a) How many initial users will need to be trained? b) How many training locations are there?	a) ~ 20. b) Two.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
13.	Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirements Response Matrix)	Would the County consider amending the requirement in Exhibit B, Section 7, to allow remote breath alcohol devices in addition to, or as a substitute for, the transdermal option?	Yes, the County is open to new technology.
14.		Where does the incumbent vendor provide the case management services?	Refer to the County's response to Question #10(d) above.
15.		Where do installations occur? Does the County provide office space?	Per Paragraph 7.2 of the SOW, installation may occur at IRC, CRDF, and/or PDC. The County will provide office space, as needed.
16.		As noted, the monitoring center cannot be outsourced. Will the County confirm that this outsource limitation does not apply to installations and daily case management?	No limitations.
17.		Could the County confirm the annual number of lost, stolen, or damaged devices, by type, by participants and by the County?	Approximately 20 by participants and zero by the County.
18.		Are there any pending initiatives that may significantly increase or decrease the use of GPS / alcohol monitoring and, if so, will you indicate an anticipated impact timeline and associated percentage of increase/decrease?	At this time, there are no known pending initiatives that would significantly increase/decrease participation.
19.		Will the County consider online or electronic submission instead of a hardcopy?	Not as this time.
20.	RFP, Paragraph 7.6 (Business Proposal Requirements and Evaluation)	Regarding the required format, does the County require the proposal to include a response to each specification in the SOW? If yes, should it be included in this section of the response?	No, refer to the County's response to Question #1 above.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
21.	RFP, Paragraph 7.6 (Business Proposal Requirements and Evaluation)	Clarify that the County expects a summary discussion for the approach to filling the SOW, but will accept a statement of compliance or exceptions to Appendix A (Sample Contract) and attachments 1-3?	Refer to the County's response to Question #1 above. Additionally, Proposer must provide a statement offering Proposer's acceptance of, or exceptions to, Appendix A (Sample Contract), Exhibit A (SOW), and all requirements listed in Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirements Response Matrix) to this RFP.
22.		Does CORI document need to be signed and submitted prior to contract or with the proposal responses?	Attachment 3 (Supplemental Confidentiality of CORI Information - LASD) to the SOW, must be submitted after Contract has been awarded.
23.	SOW, Paragraph 6.2 (Enrollment)	Can we export data in .KML or any other format like .shp or .geoJson format?	No.
24.	Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirements Response Matrix), Item 11.12	Will the County consider an alternate timeout setting of 1 hour?	No, the 15 minute timeout is required.
25.		Will the County accept a separate device that detects alcohol?	Yes, the County is open to new technology.
26.		What are the hours for installing tracking devices, removing tracking devices and managing equipment?	Refer to Paragraph 8.1 (Hours and Days of Service) of the SOW.
27.		Is there a ratio active to staff that is preferred?	No.
28.		How many employees does the incumbent have in support of the programs?	This Q&A document is restricted to questions regarding the current RFP No. 650-SH. Questions regarding the current contract must be made via the Public Records Act request to the Department at: <a href="mailto:discoveryunitprarequests@lasd.org">discoveryunitprarequests@lasd.org</a> .
29.		How many participants or percentage of participants does the department request more than 1 meeting per month?	Small percentage, typically less than 10%.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
30.		Would the County share who the current contracted vendor is?	Sentinel Offender Services, LLC.
31.	RFP, Paragraph 2.1 (Scope of Work)	Clarification on the County's expectation when stating 'operationally proven, commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) offender monitoring system.' Are you specifically looking for technology solutions that already exist in the market and have obtained F.C.C. grants/certifications?	The County's expectation for COTS is a system that is ready to use upon installation and is designed to easily integrate with our Department's jail management system.
32.	RFP, Paragraph 2.1 (Scope of Work)	What is meant by 'turnkey operation'?	A completed product, ready to operate.
33.	RFP, Paragraph 2.1 (Scope of Work)	Elaborate on what is meant by 'configurable to meet the LACOMS requirements.'	Refer to Paragraph 4.0 (Develop and Implement Interface to Department's Jail Management System) and Attachment A-1 (XML System Interface with RAJIS) of Exhibit A (SOW).
34.	Exhibit A (SOW), Paragraph 2.1 (Scope of Service)	a) Is the 500 described in this section the number of OMP participants that will require case management services as an average population? b) Is full case management provided with your incumbent provider on your current contract and is it provided by the vendor or a subcontractor? c)	a) ~ 300. b) This Q&A document is restricted to questions regarding the current RFP No. 650-SH. Questions regarding the current contract must be made via the Public Records Act request to the Departments at: <a href="mailto:discoveryunitprarequests@lasd.org">discoveryunitprarequests@lasd.org</a> .
35.	RFP, Paragraph 3.2.4 (Proposer's Service Minimum Mandatory Requirements)	What type of high-level system architecture do you expect respondents to provide that will act 'validate' the above three requirements?	System architecture will include all application servers, data base servers, load balancers and any other infrastructure necessary to convey the scalability and capacity to accommodate the Department's expected usage.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
36.	RFP, Paragraph 3.2.5 (Proposer's Service Minimum Mandatory Requirements) & Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirements Response Matrix), Item 3.17	Proposer's GPS monitoring system must minimally refresh a participant's location once each minute. When the County asks this requirement are you asking if the device collects a point every minute or are you asking for the device to "transmit or upload" every minute?	The device transmits data (location) to monitoring center every minute.  Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirements Response Matrix) amended via Bulletin #4.
37.	RFP, Paragraph 3.2.6b (Proposer's Service Minimum Mandatory Requirements)	Is the County describing a separate device that would be placed/installed at the participants' residence to create an RF range in addition to providing the participant a one-piece GPS ankle monitor or something else?	Yes, a tracking device that can be paired with a home monitoring unit. Refer to Item 3.6a of Exhibit B (Business and Technical requirements Response Matrix).
38.	RFP, Paragraph 5.21 (Community Business Enterprise Participation)	We would like to seek clarification regarding how the evaluation process treats this aspect. We carefully reviewed the Evaluation summary but did not find specific mention of whether Community Business Enterprise Participation is considered as a benefit or if it adds additional value, points, or weight to respondents' proposals.	No points are assigned to this section of the evaluation.
39.		We are interested to know if the current vendor is participating in the County's preference programs, such as Small Business Enterprise (SBE), Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE), or Social Enterprise (SE) categories.	This Q&A document is restricted to questions regarding the current RFP No. 650-SH. Questions regarding the current contract must be made via the Public Records Act request to the Departments at: <a href="mailto:discoveryunitprerequests@lasd.org">discoveryunitprerequests@lasd.org</a> .

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
40.	RFP, Paragraph 7.6.3.2 (Proposer's List of References) & Exhibit 8 (Proposer's List of References)	<p>We would like to address the requirements for the Proposers List of References as outlined in Exhibit 8. We have the following questions regarding this section:</p> <p>a) clarification on whether proposers are allowed to provide references that have been associated with our company within the last three years.</p> <p>b) we would like to understand whether the proposer is required to submit a total of three references, which can include both public and private organizations.</p>	<p>a) Proposer must provide references for the same or similar scope of services which were provided by the Proposer during the previous three years.</p> <p>b) Correct, Proposer must provide a total of three references for public and/or private organization.</p>
41.	RFP, Paragraph 7.6.3.2 (Proposer's List of References)	<p>'In addition to the references provided, the Department will review the County's Contractor Alert Reporting Database, if applicable, reflecting past performance history on the County or other contracts.' We respectfully request clarification on the meaning and specific actions that the County or proposer needs to take in relation to this requirement. It is important for us to fully understand the implications of this statement, as it could have a significant impact on the scoring process.</p>	<p>The County will conduct reference checks for the three references provided by Proposer. Additionally, the County will review the County's Contractor Alert Reporting Database for any past performance history on the County or other contracts. Any negative findings may result in point deductions, at the County's sole discretion. No further action is required by Proposer.</p>



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
42.	RFP, Paragraph 7.6.6.1 (Exceptions to Terms and Conditions of Sample Contract and/or Requirements of Statement of Work and Attachments (Section E))	<p><i>"It is the County's expectation that in submitting a proposal, Proposers will accept, as stated, the County's terms and conditions in the Sample Contract and the County's Requirements in the Statement of Work. However, Proposers are provided the opportunity to take exceptions to the County's terms, conditions, and Requirements. <u>The County may deduct rating points or disqualify the proposal in its entirety if the exceptions are material enough to deem the proposal non-responsive.</u>"</i></p> <p>The penalties described here are vague in what would cause significant point deduction or create a non-responsive outcome. Before taking exceptions to this contract, we would like to understand what would constitute "material breach." Could you please better describe or give a specific example(s) of what the County considers a "material breach?"</p>	No 'penalties' nor 'material breach' are mentioned in Paragraph 7.6.6.1. Please review the RFP documents with your legal counsel for advice.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
43.	Appendix A – Sample Contract, Paragraph 8.40 (Subcontracting)	<p>The RFP clearly states that subcontracting is not allowed for case management and monitoring services, as these are considered daily and key responsibilities that vendors must directly perform. However, it is worth noting that the contract itself contains definitions of subcontract and subcontractor, and these terms are consistently referenced throughout various sections, such as 7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 8.6, 8.8, 8.9, 8.12, 8.13, 8.17, 8.19, 8.2, 8.24, 8.28, 8.33, and even has a dedicated section (8.40) specifically addressing subcontracting. Furthermore, section 8.5 also touches upon subcontracting.</p> <p>However, we have observed that a substantial portion of the contract language is focused on subcontracting, despite the bulk of the RFP prohibiting it. We bring this observation to your attention to seek clarification and ensure alignment between the RFP's restrictions on subcontracting and the content of the sample contract.</p>	<p>The 'bulk' of the RFP does not prohibit subcontracting.</p> <p>Note, the words 'no subcontracting will be permitted' are only used in Paragraph 3.0 of the RFP, to make reference to Proposer's minimum mandatory requirements. In other words, Vendors must meet the minimum mandatory requirements, without subcontracting. Once the contract has been executed, Contractor may request to subcontract some services.</p> <p>Refer to Paragraph 8.40 (Subcontracting) of Appendix A (Sample Contract), 'The requirements of this Contract cannot be subcontracted by Contractor <u>without the advance written approval of the County.</u>'</p>

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
44.	Appendix A – Sample Contract, Paragraph 7.6.5.4 (Compliance)	<p>We would like to seek clarification on the County's definition of validation or attestations. The section states that "Contractor must maintain any validation or attestation reports that it or its County-approved Subcontractors' data encryption product(s) generate, and such reports will be subject to audit in accordance with this Contract." We are specifically interested in understanding what type of validation or attestation reports the County expects. To ensure compliance and avoid any material breach of the contract, it would be beneficial for us to have more specific information on the County's requirements for these reports. For instance, would the County be requesting results from independent and internal penetration tests of our solution? Or would certifications such as Cyber Essentials or ISO 27001 be considered as acceptable validations or attestations? By providing additional clarity and specificity in describing the required attestations and validation, the County can enable us to align our compliance efforts accordingly and provide the necessary documentation to meet these expectations.</p>	<p>At this time Cyber Essentials or ISO27001 certification is an acceptable validation, but the County would prefer an independent (3rd party) assessment/audit.</p>

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
45.	Appendix A – Sample Contract, Paragraph 8.27 (Most Favored Public Entity)	<p>We would appreciate clarification on how this evaluation will be conducted if another contract has already been determined to have lower rates. Specifically, we would like to understand if the vendor will have an opportunity to provide input on the County's contract daily rate pricing, especially in comparison to similar contracts. We are interested in comprehending the rationale behind the current pricing levels and the pricing models utilized by both parties.</p> <p>By allowing the vendor to contribute their insights and perspectives on the County's contract pricing, it would facilitate a more comprehensive evaluation process. This would enable us to provide valuable feedback and potentially address any discrepancies or areas where adjustments could be made.</p>	<p>Per Paragraph 8.27 (Most Favored Public Entity), the County will have the right to utilize a County auditor, or an independent auditor to verify Contractor's compliance with this Paragraph 8.27 by review of Contractor's books and records.</p>

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
46.	Exhibit A (SOW), Paragraph 2.5 (Scope of Service)	<p>Clarification on the third bullet:</p> <p>a) The requirement states "Monitoring Compliance and location." Typically, GPS systems operate on an exception-based model, where alerts are generated when participants are non-compliant with programmed rules. These systems also have schedules and exceptions in place to inform Case Managers of any deviations. We would appreciate further clarification on the specific instances where Case Managers would need to view the location beyond the standard compliance monitoring.</p> <p>b) We would like to inquire about the number of Case Managers currently employed by the incumbent for this contract. Understanding the current staffing levels will assist us in determining the appropriate resources and staffing allocation for our proposed solution.</p> <p>Having a clear understanding of the County's requirements and the current practices employed by the incumbent will enable us to design an effective and efficient solution that meets the needs of the County's Offender Monitoring Program.</p>	<p>a) Per Paragraph 2.5, the third bullet states "Monitoring program participation and location." Nothing beyond the standard is being requested here.</p> <p>b) This Q&amp;A document is restricted to questions regarding the current RFP No. 650-SH. Questions regarding the current contract must be made via the Public Records Act request to the Departments at: <a href="mailto:discoveryunitprarequests@lasd.org">discoveryunitprarequests@lasd.org</a>.</p>

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
47.	Exhibit A (SOW), Paragraph 4.0 (Develop and Implement Interface to Department's Jail Management System)	<p>We would like to confirm whether the company responsible for the purchase, development, service, and/or support of the Regional Automated Justice Information System (RAJIS) is still Syscon Systems Inc., or if there has been a change in the organization responsible for these activities.</p> <p>This information is important for us to conduct prior research and assess the level of effort required to integrate with the existing RAJIS system. Understanding the current state of the system and any potential changes in ownership or support will enable us to accurately evaluate the scope and complexity of our proposed solution.</p>	No, Replicated Automated Justice System (RAJIS) is a Department developed/supported solution that complements our legacy Jail Management System. There is no dependency on a 3 <sup>rd</sup> party for RAJIS.
48.	Exhibit A (SOW), Paragraphs 6.0 (Enrollment) and 7.0 (Orientation and Equipment Installation)	<p>Can the County please provide how many enrollments and installs are performed weekly at:</p> <p>a) IRC b) CRDF c) PDC</p>	<p>a) ~50. b) ~30. c) 0 (sent to IRC).</p>
49.	Exhibit A (SOW), Paragraph 8.0 (Hours and Days of Service)	<p>How many de-installs/removals does the County average per week at?</p> <p>a) IRC b) CRDF c) PDC</p>	Removals are provided on an as-needed basis, no data available.
50.	Exhibit A (SOW), Paragraph 8.1 (Hours and Days of Service)	What is the current work hours/schedules the current vendor provides for the enrollments, installations, and de-installations?	<p>This Q&amp;A document is restricted to questions regarding the current RFP No. 650-SH. Questions regarding the current contract must be made via the Public Records Act request to the Departments at:</p> <p><a href="mailto:discoveryunitprerequests@lasd.org">discoveryunitprerequests@lasd.org</a>.</p>

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
51.	Exhibit A (SOW), Paragraph 6.1.2 (Enrollment) – 7 <sup>th</sup> bullet	Is the risk assessment done by the County staff or the Case Manager? If done by the Case Manager, does the County expect Case Managers to be trained and certified in Risk Assessment?	Risk assessment is done by County staff.
52.	Exhibit A (SOW), Paragraph 9.2 (Electronically Monitor Participants on a Continuous Basis)	Could the current alert protocols for all vendor monitored alerts that the current provider is using for processing alerts notifications be supplied to the proposers to better understand the monitoring services requirements?	This Q&A document is restricted to questions regarding the current RFP No. 650-SH. Questions regarding the current contract must be made via the Public Records Act request to the Departments at: <a href="mailto:discoveryunitprarequests@lasd.org">discoveryunitprarequests@lasd.org</a> .

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
53.	Attachment A-2 (Performance Requirements Summary (PRS) Chart) – Revised under Bulletin #2	<p>Specifically items 3 and 4, we have some inquiries regarding the notification requirements for alerts:</p> <p>a) The PRS states that "the Department must be notified instantaneous via telephone, text, message, and/or email of an alert..." Our system sends automated alerts instantaneously unless there is an alert protocol that could require monitoring and validating for more than two minutes. Buddi would like to add to this SLA to include "...must be notified instantaneous via telephone, text message, and/or email of an alert "unless alert protocol will prohibit delivering the validated and confirmed alert within two minutes? This clarification will enable us to align our alert delivery mechanisms with the County's expectations and ensure timely communication.</p> <p>b) While delivering alerts instantaneously is achievable for automated alerts through methods such as SMS, text-to-voice, voicemail, or email, it is essential to consider that alert protocols may involve additional steps such as validation and communication with participants or officers. These additional steps can introduce some delay, potentially exceeding the unrealistic expectation of instantaneous delivery. To ensure compliance and avoid penalties, we kindly request the County to provide the specific alert protocols and an</p>	<p>a) Items 3 and 4 of the PRS state the notifications must be made within <u>two minutes</u> not instantaneous.</p> <p>b) the time range is within two minutes.</p>



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
		<p>acceptable time range, measured in seconds or minutes, for alerts that require monitoring intervention. This information will enable us to design an alert system that meets the County's requirements while maintaining realistic expectations for response times.</p>	
54.	Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirements Response Matrix)	<p>a) If we are confident that our proposed solution clearly meets the requirement, is it necessary to add a comment?</p> <p>b) The comment section in the PDF format appears to have limitations when it comes to elaborating on specific requirements. In situations where we need to provide additional information that exceeds the space provided, could we attach a separate document, referenced in the comments section, that provides the required details?</p> <p>c) Alternatively, would it be possible to receive or convert Exhibit B into a Word document, allowing for more flexibility in addressing the requirements thoroughly?</p>	<p>a) Yes, a response is needed for each requirement.</p> <p>b) Yes, you may attach additional pages with reference to the requirement number.</p> <p>c) Yes, you may request Exhibit B in Word document via email to the contract analyst.</p>
55.	Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirements Response Matrix) – Section 2.0 (Monitoring Center)	<p>Regarding requirements 2.1 – 2.12 – Are these describing strictly the monitoring center where alerts are processed via LACOMS alert protocol and Customer Service Technicians answer customer inquiries 24 x 7 or are some of these requirements describe the data center and if so, which ones?</p>	<p>There is no mention of a “data center” in Exhibit B.</p>

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
56.	Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirements Response Matrix) – Item 2.9 (Monitoring Center)	Are you describing an escalation process here? If proposers have automated processes, can we provide that to expedite alert processing?	No escalation process, only a confirmation/acknowledgement by staff.
57.	Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirements Response Matrix) – Item 3.0 (Tracking Device)	<p>We have questions about 3.6b, 3.7a, and 3.8</p> <p>a) Is the County referring something like an RF Beacon in tandem with a GPS ankle monitor or RF Base station with an RF transmitter on the participant ankle?</p> <p>b) In 3.8 the requirement states it may configure for Wi-Fi, Bluetooth, or other available technology. Can this be used in lieu of landline technology described in 3.7a?</p>	<p>a) No tandem, mutually exclusive (either GPS or RF).</p> <p>b) The County asks for RF tethered or comparable technology.</p>
58.	Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirements Response Matrix) – Item 3.16b (Tracking Device)	If a proposer can provide pre-sized straps in a range of sizes, would answering "yes" to this mandatory requirement be acceptable?	Exhibit B was revised under Bulletin #2 to delete Item 3.16b.
59.	Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirements Response Matrix) – Item 6.5 (System)	We do intrusion detection periodically independently (through third party source) and internally. What specifically are you asking for with this requirement? Are you asking to be informed every time there is a suspected intrusion detection within two-hours?	Yes.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
60.	Exhibit B (Business and Technical Requirements Response Matrix) – Item 7.1 (Alcohol Monitoring Capability)	Are you asking for a GPS device that has transdermal monitoring capability or a separate device?	The County is open to new ideas/technology, such as a GPS device with transdermal monitoring capability or a separate device.
61.	Appendix B (Required Forms), Exhibit 6 (Minimum Mandatory Requirements), Item 2	We acknowledge that the County's intent is to ensure experience and expertise in case management, but we would like to propose reconsidering the strict adherence to this requirement. By removing this requirement entirely, it would allow for a broader range of competitive solutions to be considered.	Item #2 will stand as written.
62.		Does the LA Sheriff's office anticipate that offenders on the program will be allowed to live outside of the County of Los Angeles?	Yes, depending on the totality of circumstances.
63.		What areas (either Cities or general locations) does the County find the most troublesome with connecting to GPS? For instance, in the virtual meeting, Lancaster and Palmdale were identified. We would like to know what other areas the County can identify where the participant's device does not communicate well or at all.	Other areas include: Acton, Agua Dulce, Leona Valley, Elizabeth Lake, Lake Hughes, Green Valley, Littlerock, Pearblossom, Llano, Lake Los Angeles, Quartz Hill, Antelope Acres, Fairmont, Hi Vista, Wrightwood, and areas of the Angeles National Forest.
64.		Assuming that the original RFP 650-SH was not changed in Bulletin #2, is the restriction on subcontracting monitoring and case management still in effect?	Refer to the County's response to question #44 above.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 650-SH  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFENDER MONITORING SERVICE**

ATTACHMENT 1 TO BULLETIN NUMBER 4  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (Q&A)

QUESTION NUMBER	RFP LANGUAGE (IF PROVIDED)	PROPOSER'S QUESTION	ANSWER
65.	Appendix B (Required Forms), Exhibit 6 (Minimum Mandatory Requirements), Item 1	The County's RFP describes the need for (1) an original manufacturer's GPS and RF equipment and (2) a monitoring center without subcontracting to meet the requirement. The impression is that the OEM ("original equipment manufacturer") and Monitoring Center must be one in the same, which severely limits competition. Very few OEMs meet both requirements. Is the County willing to allow subcontractors for monitoring and case management given that it would be in the best interest of the County to promote competitive pricing and an opportunity for greater discounts?	The RFP makes no mention of "original equipment manufacturer." Refer to the County's response to Question #44 above.
66.		What is the reasoning behind the restriction for no subcontracting for monitoring and case management?	Proposer must be an established provider with years of experience.
67.		Does the County agree or disagree that the LA County Purchasing Policy & Procedural Manual at P. 13 defines "contractor" to include, among other things "subcontracting"? If so, what is the authority for restricting subcontracting for RFP 650-SH?	Refer to the County's response to Question #44 above.