

Shelby County, Alabama
Request for Proposals for
Juvenile Detention Facility Management System
Response to Questions

Consistent with Section 1.6 of the RFP, the County provides the following clarifications:

Question 1: Would you be able to provide the reasoning behind the decision to cancel the earlier RFP and reissue?

Response: This question is not relevant to this RFP.

Question 2: Does the county/agency have an established budget or not-to-exceed amount for this contract that respondents should be aware of?

Response: No. See Sections 4.3.b, 5.1, and Attachment 2 for information necessary to submit a Cost Proposal.

Question 3: Line 1 of the cost proposal is listed as “initial Deployment”, can we provide a breakdown of the services and costs that comprise that total?

Response: As directed in the Cost Proposal (Attachment 2), “Proposer should include one firm, fixed cost per line item for the implementation and provision of a solution that complies in all material aspects of the RFP.” As provided in Section 4.3.b.ii, the Cost Proposal “will be utilized for the purposes of evaluating the proposals. However, Proposer may submit alternate pricing solutions, which may be considered in negotiations with Successful Proposer.”

Question 4: The "Drug Testing" Clause (Section 2.13): The indemnification clause states the provider must indemnify the county for acts/omissions in the “performance of drug testing services.” “Can the County confirm that Section 2.13(a) contains a typographical error and should instead refer to the performance of Jail Management System software and implementation services?”

Response: Yes. This reference is a typo.

Question 5: Does Attachment C – SBITA need to be completed and attached to the proposal?

Response: No. This form can be completed as part of the contracting process.

Question 6: For the submission, requirements state (1) original, (2) hard copies, and one(1) electronic PDF copy. Does this also apply to the cost proposal? (i.e. one original, 2 copies, and one electronic PDF)

Response: Yes.

Question 7: Number of Users (Section 1.2): This section states that the estimated number of users is approximately 25. How many of these users require read-only access and full system access?

Response: All 25 users should have full access.

Question 8: What is the anticipated spend/budget for this new solution?

Response: This question is not relevant to this RFP.

Question 9: Why has this RFP been issued?

Response: This question is not relevant to this RFP.

Question 10: What challenges has the County faced with its current software solution and internal processes?

Response: The County does not current have a software system.

Question 11: To properly scope deployment costs, what is the name of the legacy software or database environment currently serving as the system of record for the juvenile facility?

Response: See Response to Question 10.

Question 12: What is the estimated total volume of historical text records and attached files/documents (in gigabytes or record counts) that must be migrated into the new system? If the exact volume is currently unknown, will the County allow vendors to provide tiered pricing for data migration within the Cost Proposal form

Response: The County does not have any electronic information to be migrated into the system. See Response to Question 10.

Question 13: Our proposed platform leverages an agile, no-code configuration engine to mirror facility policies without custom code changes. To ensure accurate configuration timelines, how many standardized paper forms, templates, or distinct operational workflows are currently utilized across the 13 functional areas listed in Section 3.2? (See also Section 3.3.7 for reference).

Response: The County cannot quantify the number of standard forms, templates, or workflows at this time. All functions are currently paper based. The County is seeking a vendor/partner who can bring that practical experience and help make the shift from paper to digital in a way that fits the operational needs of the facility for these 13 functional areas, which represent typical functions of juvenile justice programs. Successful vendor will work with County staff during discovery to surface, document, and map our current processes, then configuring a solution around these operational needs, not around a generic template. Proposed pricing and timelines should be based on vendor's ability to run that discovery work alongside our staff, rather than depending on inputs that are not currently available. In Response to Section 3.1.1.b of RFP, please include in your Proposal examples of how you've supported other facilities through this same move, from fully paper-based operations to a fully digital environment, and what that approach looked like in practice.

Question 14: For the points-based positive behavior reinforcement module (Section 3.2.h), does the facility utilize a specific, documented behavioral matrix or token economy system today that can be shared during the proposal phase?

Response: Please see attached Behavior Modification Program documentation.

Question 15: To ensure the system adequately supports behavioral classifications, separations, and special-management populations, can the County clarify if it uses a validated third-party juvenile classification tool or an internally developed policy matrix? (Sections 3.2.b & m).

Response: The County currently uses an internally developed matrix. See also Response to Question 13.

Question 16: The RFP highlights mobile-friendly workflows for housing units and transports. (See Section 3.3.11 & 3.4.9). Is the County strictly looking for a mobile-responsive web browser interface, or does it prefer a native mobile application (iOS/Android) capable of leveraging hardware features such as biometric login (face/fingerprint) and camera integration for direct photo uploads to resident records?

Response: Web interface is acceptable.

Question 17: Section 3.3.10 of the RFP states requirements for secure integration with law enforcement RMS/JMS, courts, education systems, medical providers (EMR), and the automated victim notification system. Could the County provide the specific vendor names, software versions, and database types (i.e., SQL Server, Oracle) for these existing systems? Are APIs or data exchange schemas currently available for them?

Response: This information is not currently available at this time. See also Section 3.4.6.a of the RFP.

Question 18: The system must support modern authentication protocols (SAML, OAuth 2.0, OpenID Connect) and MFA. (See Section 3.4.2). Does the County intend to leverage an existing

centralized Identity Provider (such as Azure AD/Entra ID or Okta) for Single Sign-On (SSO), or should the vendor include a standalone identity management component?

Response: *The Proposal should identify a solution that meets all requirements of the RFP including, but not limited to, role-based access consistent with Section 3.4.2 of the RFP. Azure would be an acceptable solution.*

Question 19: The RFP outlines compatibility with on-premises virtualization (VMware) as well as cloud-hosted models. (Section 3.4.1). Does the County have a firm preference between a Vendor-Hosted Cloud solution (SaaS) or a software subscription deployed on County-provided infrastructure?

Response: *No.*

Question 20: Given that the user base is approximately 25 staff members, does the County require the vendor to conduct direct end-user training for all staff, or is a "Train-the-Trainer" approach preferred to allow internal administrators to manage ongoing onboarding?

Response: *See Section 3.5.4 of the RFP.*

Question 21: Would the County consider only electronic copies for submission since 4.2.a. states that the County reserves the right to rely upon the electronic copy for evaluation purposes?

Response: *No.*

Question 22: The RFP mandates that the Cost Proposal must be in a separately sealed package. If the County will not accept only electronic submissions, should the electronic copy (PDF) required on the USB drive contain the entire submission (including cost), or should the cost proposal be placed on a separate electronic file/drive within the sealed cost envelope to preserve the blind evaluation?

Response: *The Cost Proposal should be included in a separate, sealed cost envelope.*

Question 23: Section 2.13(a) references indemnification for acts or omissions "in the performance of drug testing services." Please confirm this is a typographical error and should refer to the JMS services solicited under this RFP.

Response: *See Response to Question 4.*

Question 24: Addendum A, Section 5(c)(iii) appears to contain a placeholder stating backup integrity testing will occur "at least [quarterly/annually]." [Vendor] performs and verifies backup and recovery testing of its hosted environment as part of standard operations. What testing frequency does the County expect, and what notification or documentation does the County expect to receive when such tests are performed?

Response: Per Section 3.5.5 of the RFP, testing and quality assurance should be in accordance with industry standard. The proposed solution should be included in the Proposal. The Parties will agree upon the appropriate frequency and documentation in the negotiation process.

Question 25: Addendum A, Section 9 requires network risk and cyber liability coverage “in an amount of not less than \$ ____.” What minimum coverage amount will be required?

Response: \$1,000,000.00

Question 26: Section 2.12 requires Professional Liability (Errors & Omissions) coverage but does not state a limit. What minimum limits are required?

Response: Excluding coverage specific to network risk and cyber liability coverage identified in Question 25 above, \$50,000.00 per occurrence.

Question 27: Section 1.4 anticipates a three-year contract and the Cost Proposal (Attachment 2) reflects a 36-month subscription. Please confirm the Resulting Contract is a firm three-year term, and whether the County anticipates renewal options beyond the initial term.

Response: This business decision has not yet been made by the County.

Question 28: Attachment 2 includes a notary block. Please confirm whether notarization is required only for the Cost Proposal, or also for the Certification Form (Attachment 1) or other proposal components.

Response: Only the Cost Proposal need be notarized; however, any Proposer that submits a Proposal will be held to the commitments made in the Certification Form. Failure of successful proposer to comply during the course of the resulting contract shall be considered a breach of the agreement.

Question 29: Please confirm that Attachment C (SBITA/GASB 96) is completed during contract negotiation rather than submitted with the proposal.

Response: See Response to Question 5.

Question 30: Section 1.2 estimates approximately 25 users. Addendum No. 2 to prior RFP No. 2026-2-11642 indicated 24 staff users and 3 administrative users. Please confirm the total number of active users who will require access to the system.

Response: See Section 1.2 of this RFP.

Question 31: What is the County’s target go-live date for the new system?

Response: *Proposer is to include a detailed implementation schedule in its proposal consistent with Section 3.1.1 of the RFP.*

Question 32: Is there an existing data requiring migration into the new JMS. Does this remain accurate?

Response: *See Response to Question 12.*

Question 33: Are system interfaces required, with the systems listed serving as sources of data that may be transferred manually. Does this remain accurate for the integrations referenced in Section 3.3.10?

Response: *Per 3.3.10 of the RFP, interface capability is required under this RFP.*

Question 34: Is Active Directory/LDAP the County's authentication environment. Is single sign-on with a County identity provider expected?

Response: *See Response to Question 18.*

Question 35: Please confirm the BMP is the points-based positive behavior reinforcement system referenced in Section 3.2(h).

Response: *See Response to Question 14.*

Question 36: Is the County's victim notification an internal report only, with no interface required. Does this remain accurate?

Response: *See Response to Question 33.*

Question 37: Is CorEMR the facility's primary medical record, with the JMS serving as a supplemental system. Does this remain accurate?

Response: *Yes.*

Question 38: Is electronic signature capture a requirement to be included. Does this remain a requirement?

Response: *Yes.*

Question 39: Is there a preference for a mix of on-site and remote training, organized into two groups (IT/Admin and a comprehensive end-user group)?

Response: *Proposer's training program must comport with Section 3.5.4 of the RFP.*

Question 40: Regarding Section 3.2(l), what specific PREA compliance capabilities does the County expect the JMS to provide (e.g., incident documentation, audit support, reporting)?

Response: *See Response to Question 13.*

Question 41: [Vendor] currently holds CJIS certification through Berrien County, Michigan. Will this certification suffice, or would the County sponsor [Vendor] for Alabama CJIS certification? Additionally, is CJIS certification required at the time of proposal submission, or prior to contract execution and system access?

Response: *As required by the RFP, the successful Proposer shall provide a solution that meets all CJIS requirements, as well as other industry standard best practices. The County will work with the successful Proposer to ensure compliance with these standards as necessary.*

Question 42: May the electronic PDF copy required by Section 4.2(a) be submitted on a USB drive included with the sealed technical package? If a redacted copy is submitted under Section 2.10, may it also be provided on USB?

Response: *Yes.*

Question 43: Please clarify if the County expects one (1) original, two (2) copies, and one (1) electronic PDF copy of both the Technical and Cost proposal.

Response: *Yes.*

Question 44: What is the County's target go-live timeframe or desired implementation schedule?

Response: *See Response to Question 31.*