



Solicitation Information
7 June 2012

Addendum #3

RFP # 7449724

TITLE: Offender Fee Collection Services

Submission Deadline: 20 June 2012 @ 11:00 AM (EDT)

ATTACHED ARE FINAL VENDOR QUESTIONS WITH STATE RESPONSES.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS WILL BE ANSWERED.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jerome D. Moynihan".

Jerome D. Moynihan, C.P.M., CPPO
Assistant Director for Special Projects

Re: RFP#: 7449724, Offender Fee Collection Services

1. Under Title 38 Chapter 2 of the Rhode Island Law which was referenced in the RFP. Can a responder mark a proprietary business plan confidential where it is not released to the public? In other state RFP's, companies can do that to keep innovative practices or ideas between the state and the responding company confidential.

Answer: Yes, you can indicate what you believe to be confidential. However, the RI State Purchasing Agent, with legal advice, will make the final determination as to what is in the public domain.

2. In the RFP, it is stated that 12,000 mailings have to occur each month. Can other contact methods be submitted without being disqualified?

Answer: A monthly billing is required as outlined in the RFP. The state may entertain alternative approaches that are proposed; however, the methodology should be clearly identified in the proposal submission.

3. Can the fees being charged for collections be added to the \$20 required or do they have to be deducted from that total?

Answer: No additional fees are to be added to the monthly offender fee being collected as that amount is defined by statute. Any fee that is imposed shall be paid separately by the state under separate billing and be based upon the amount collected during that given timeframe.

4. Please provide details regarding any existing contract(s) for these services. If there is a current vendor, please provide the vendor's name, a copy of the current contract, and a disclosure of fees paid 2010 and 2011. Please specify if fees are paid by the DOC (% of fees collected), offender (by transaction type), or a combination (% of fees collected + convenience fee from offender for credit/debit transactions).

Answer: The current billing/collection vendor is:
Collecto, Inc. (dba EOS/CCA, Inc.)
700 Longwater Drive
Norwell, MA 02061

Fees paid for FY2011: \$21,275

Fees paid for FY2010: \$15,475

Fees are paid by the Department of Corrections and are based upon a percentage of the fees collected. No fees are assessed to the offender.

5. **Historical Data** – Please provide detailed data for 2010 and 2011 disclosing:

Year	# Payments Processed	Amount Processed (\$)	Amount Billed (\$)	# Offenders Billed
2011				
2010				

Answer: Above information is not available.

FY 12 monthly P&P supervision fees collected: \$104,897 (through 5/2012)

FY 11 monthly P&P supervision fees collected: \$153,798

Collection activities for outstanding balances for Community Confinement and Interstate populations have not been undertaken.

6. The RFP states "...if multiple vendors are selected..." Would the DOC be willing to limit the program to a single vendor to get the best possible price?

Answer: It is the department's intention to award this contract to one vendor.

7. Please estimate the amount collected in 2010 and 2011 through the debt offset program.

Answer: This process has not been implemented but is anticipated to begin in September 2012.

8. Outside of the debt offset program, does the DOC expect to process any payments for offenders outside of this service? Does the service only collect supervision fee payments on delinquent accounts, or all offender supervision fee payments? Please clarify.

Answer: The scope of service to be provided under this contract is for the billing and collection of offender fees. The major component of this contract will be for the monthly billing and collection of monthly probation supervision fees. Also as part of this contract, the DOC is seeking billing and collection of outstanding offender fees assessed while under community confinement supervision.

9. The RFP states that the DOC maintains a database with “...limited demographic information.” Does this include a current address and phone number for all supervised offenders?

Answer: The information contained in the DOC’s database may not be current. It is anticipated that the vendor shall be responsible for obtaining updated contact/address information as part of the scope of services.

10. The RFP states that the services provided shall include “Monthly billings mailed to the probationer/parolee...” Would the State consider a proposal the only sends mail to offenders with new accounts (new offender under supervision) and those that are delinquent? This would reduce cost since compliant, paying offenders will not receive a monthly mailed statement but would have easy access to account details either online or by phone.

Answer: See the response to question 2 above.

11. The RFP mentions “skip tracing”. Should the vendor assume that this will only be needed for absconding offenders as the DOC will be able to supply contact information for all non-absconding offenders?

Answer: It should be assumed that the vendor will need to verify the contact information and utilize all modern locator techniques currently used in the industry. The vendor should specify in their response what techniques will be utilized.

12. The fee proposal table specifies 4 different fee types (probation & parole, home confinement, inter-state, and other). Please clarify why the type of fee would result in a significantly different cost for the vendor. Why would a vendor need to charge \$x to process a home confinement fee vs. \$y to process an inter-state fee? Are there different requirements based upon fee type outside of reporting?

Answer: The major difference would involve the billing frequency for the Probation & Parole population. How that figures into a vendor’s response is up to the vendor to make that determination.

13. Is the DOC expecting the vendor to propose a dollar amount per transaction or percentage in the cost/fee table?

Answer: The current fee is based upon a percentage of the fees collected and the Department wishes to maintain that fee structure.

14. Is the DOC open to receiving a proposal based upon payment method? For example, \$x for payments by mail, \$y for payments by debit/credit.

Answer: See the response to Question 3.

15. Is the DOC open to a convenience fee paid for by the offender over and above the cost proposal fee in order to compensate for the additional credit card processing fees? If so, how will alternative pricing methods be scored?

Answer: See the response to Question 3.

16. Will the DOC accept multiple proposals from a single vendor with different features/pricing or can optional feature pricing be included in a single proposal?

Answer: Multiple proposals from a single vendor will be evaluated as well as any alternates proposed as long as the base requirements are addressed within a single proposal.