



HUMBOLDT COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 29, 2019
TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: D. Christian, Captain *DCR1322*
SUBJECT: RFP 19-001-SHF

This memorandum is to inform you of the RFP review committees' recommendation to enter into negotiations and submit for board approval for Integrated Security Controls, INC (ISC) to be the vendor for the Security System Upgrade at the Humboldt County Correctional Facility. Within this memorandum I will provide the reasons for the choice.

In evaluating ISC it was determined they had over 5 years' experience as a primary provider for correctional security systems, they had more than 3 references with good or better ratings, they met/exceeded requirements for Compliance with the Scope; Staffing; and Compliance with Service Level Agreement. They also partially met Projection Implementation Management as they couldn't comply with all aspects of it but most. Additionally, the overall cost of their proposal over a 6-year period was less than the other bidder.

In evaluating Cornerstone Detention Products, it was determined they had over 5 years' experience as a primary provider for correctional security systems, and they had more than 3 references with good or better ratings. They partially met the Compliance with Scope of Services by adjusting the implementation timeline to 800 business days, they partially met the Staffing as they do not have a local presence. They contract out of the bay area for camera issues and would have to send someone from Washington for programming issues. They partially met the Compliance with the Service Level Agreements as on their proposal they changed all the time frames set by the county. They partially met the Project Implementation Management as outlined above by having a timeline of 800 business days for implementation compared to the 120 business days requested by the county. Lastly the overall cost of their proposal was \$93, 637.00 more than the other bidder.

In conclusion ISC was determined to be the winning bidder based on the factors outlined above. The biggest reason being their ability to meet the implementation timeline and their ability to have a technician here for a system failure within 4-8 hours.

Attached: Scored Summary Evaluation and all Scoring Sheets

Evaluator Name: <u>JASON BINGE</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>		
Security Camera System, Vendor Name: <u>CORNUSTON</u>		61
REVIEW - SCORED EVALUATION - Scoring Questionnaire	Points	Evaluation Score
A. Relevant and Comparable Experience (30 Maximum Points)		
1. Experience (20 Points)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ≥ 5 Years Experience as a Primary Service Provider for SERVICES	20	20
<input type="checkbox"/> < 5 Years Experience as a Primary Service Provider for SERVICES	10	
2. References (10 Points)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ≥ 3 References with Good or Better Rating	10	10
<input type="checkbox"/> < 3 References with Good or Better Rating	5	
<input type="checkbox"/> No References with Good or Better Rating	0	
B. Ability to Provide Comprehensive High-Quality Services (30 Maximum Points)		
1. Compliance with Scope of Services (20 Points)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Met or exceeded requirements in Scope of Services for SERVICES - Proposer included additional features, customer support and technology applicable to County, and/or more value-added services. There are no exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements of the RFP.	20	10
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Less than 100% compliance with Scope of Services for SERVICES, or did not meet requirements of the Scope of Services. The Proposer listed a few exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements stated RFP.	10	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Complete non-compliance with Scope of Services for SERVICES, or did not meet requirements of the Scope of Services. Proposer has multiple exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements of the RFP.	0	
2. Staffing (10 Points)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Proposer has staff and local presence to provide SERVICES.	10	5
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Proposer does not have sufficient staff and/or no local presence to provide SERVICES.	5	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Proposer has no staff and no local presence to provide SERVICES.	0	
C. Service and Maintenance (30 Maximum Points)		
1. Compliance with Service Level Agreement (15 Points)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - 100% Compliance with Service Level Agreement	15	8
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Less than 100% compliance with Service Level Agreement	8	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Non-Compliance with Service Level Agreement	0	
2. Project Implementation Management (15 Points)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Met or Exceeded requirements in Project Implementation Management - Proposer included detailed Project Approach and Methodology (solid and detailed plan for providing Services, demonstrating understanding of the Scope of Work), proposed implementation plan and schedule, project team and organization chart, and integration of new services (detailed plans for the provision of necessary hardware and software, and the integration of the new system/equipment, while minimizing the impacts to current operations.	15	8
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Partially met the requirements in Project Implementation Management - One or more of the following requirements were not included or not enough details were provided: Project Approach and Methodology (solid and detailed plan for providing Services, demonstrating understanding of the Scope of Work), proposed implementation plan and schedule, project team and organization chart, and integration of new services (detailed plans for the provision of necessary hardware and software, and the integration of the new system/equipment, while minimizing the impacts to current operations.	8	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Did not meet the requirements in Project Implementation Management	0	
D. Value and Cost (10 Maximum Points)		
Lowest Overall Cost with most value (hardware, components, service, configuration)	10	0

SECTION TOTALS		
A. Relevant and Comparable Experience	30	0
B. Ability to Provide Comprehensive High-Quality Services	15	0
C. Service and Maintenance	16	0
D. Value and Cost	0	0

Evaluator Name: <u>Dennis Griffin</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> 1033		61
Security Camera System, Vendor Name: <u>Cornerstone Detention</u>		
REVIEW - SCORED EVALUATION - Scoring Questionnaire	Points	Evaluation Score
A. Relevant and Comparable Experience (30 Maximum Points)		
1. Experience (20 Points)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ≥5 Years Experience as a Primary Service Provider for SERVICES	20	20
<input type="checkbox"/> < 5 Years Experience as a Primary Service Provider for SERVICES	10	
2. References (10 Points)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ≥ 3 References with Good or Better Rating	10	10
<input type="checkbox"/> < 3 References with Good or Better Rating	5	
<input type="checkbox"/> No References with Good or Better Rating	0	
B. Ability to Provide Comprehensive High-Quality Services (30 Maximum Points)		
1. Compliance with Scope of Services (20 Points)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Met or exceeded requirements in Scope of Services for SERVICES - Proposer included additional features, customer support and technology applicable to County, and/or more value-added services. There are no exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements of the RFP.	20	10
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Less than 100% compliance with Scope of Services for SERVICES, or did not meet requirements of the Scope of Services. The Proposer listed a few exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements stated RFP. <u>Implementation time too long</u>	10	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Complete non-compliance with Scope of Services for SERVICES, or did not meet requirements of the Scope of Services. Proposer has multiple exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements of the RFP.	0	
2. Staffing (10 Points)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Proposer has staff and local presence to provide SERVICES.	10	5
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Proposer does not have sufficient staff and/or no local presence to provide SERVICES. <u>Response time longer</u>	5	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Proposer has no staff and no local presence to provide SERVICES.	0	
C. Service and Maintenance (30 Maximum Points)		
1. Compliance with Service Level Agreement (15 Points)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - 100% Compliance with Service Level Agreement	15	8
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Less than 100% compliance with Service Level Agreement <u>changed SLA times</u>	8	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Non-Compliance with Service Level Agreement	0	
2. Project Implementation Management (15 Points)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Met or Exceeded requirements in Project Implementation Management - Proposer included detailed Project Approach and Methodology (solid and detailed plan for providing Services, demonstrating understanding of the Scope of Work), proposed implementation plan and schedule, project team and organization chart, and integration of new services (detailed plans for the provision of necessary hardware and software, and the integration of the new system/equipment, while minimizing the impacts to current operations.	15	8
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Partially met the requirements in Project Implementation Management - One or more of the following requirements were not included or not enough details were provided: Project Approach and Methodology (solid and detailed plan for providing Services, demonstrating understanding of the Scope of Work), proposed implementation plan and schedule, project team and organization chart, and integration of new services (detailed plans for the provision of necessary hardware and software, and the integration of the new system/equipment, while minimizing the impacts to current operations. <u>Implementation schedule too long</u>	8	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Did not meet the requirements in Project Implementation Management	0	
D. Value and Cost (10 Maximum Points)		
Lowest Overall Cost with most value (hardware, components, service, configuration) <u>\$2,257,413</u>	10	0

SECTION TOTALS	
A. Relevant and Comparable Experience	0 30
B. Ability to Provide Comprehensive High-Quality Services	0 15
C. Service and Maintenance	0 16
D. Value and Cost	0 0

Evaluator Name: <u>Dwaine Christian</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> 1322		
Security Camera System, Vendor Name: <u>Cornerstone</u>		61
REVIEW - SCORED EVALUATION - Scoring Questionnaire	Points	Evaluation Score
A. Relevant and Comparable Experience (30 Maximum Points)		
1. Experience (20 Points)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ≥5 Years Experience as a Primary Service Provider for SERVICES	20	20
<input type="checkbox"/> < 5 Years Experience as a Primary Service Provider for SERVICES	10	
2. References (10 Points)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ≥ 3 References with Good or Better Rating	10	10
<input type="checkbox"/> < 3 References with Good or Better Rating	5	
<input type="checkbox"/> No References with Good or Better Rating	0	
B. Ability to Provide Comprehensive High-Quality Services (30 Maximum Points)		
1. Compliance with Scope of Services (20 Points)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Met or exceeded requirements in Scope of Services for SERVICES - Proposer included additional features, customer support and technology applicable to County, and/or more value-added services. There are no exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements of the RFP.	20	10
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Less than 100% compliance with Scope of Services for SERVICES, or did not meet requirements of the Scope of Services. The Proposer listed a few exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements stated RFP. <u>Implementation time</u>	10	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Complete non-compliance with Scope of Services for SERVICES, or did not meet requirements of the Scope of Services. Proposer has multiple exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements of the RFP.	0	
2. Staffing (10 Points)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Proposer has staff and local presence to provide SERVICES.	10	5
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Proposer does not have sufficient staff and/or no local presence to provide SERVICES. <u>Software response from WA</u>	5	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Proposer has no staff and no local presence to provide SERVICES.	0	
C. Service and Maintenance (30 Maximum Points)		
1. Compliance with Service Level Agreement (15 Points)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - 100% Compliance with Service Level Agreement	15	8
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Less than 100% compliance with Service Level Agreement <u>extended time frames</u>	8	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Non-Compliance with Service Level Agreement	0	
2. Project Implementation Management (15 Points)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Met or Exceeded requirements in Project Implementation Management - Proposer included detailed Project Approach and Methodology (solid and detailed plan for providing Services, demonstrating understanding of the Scope of Work), proposed implementation plan and schedule, project team and organization chart, and integration of new services (detailed plans for the provision of necessary hardware and software, and the integration of the new system/equipment, while minimizing the impacts to current operations.	15	8
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Partially met the requirements in Project Implementation Management - One or more of the following requirements were not included or not enough details were provided: Project Approach and Methodology (solid and detailed plan for providing Services, demonstrating understanding of the Scope of Work), proposed implementation plan and schedule, project team and organization chart, and integration of new services (detailed plans for the provision of necessary hardware and software, and the integration of the new system/equipment, while minimizing the impacts to current operations.	8	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Did not meet the requirements in Project Implementation Management	0	
D. Value and Cost (10 Maximum Points)		
Lowest Overall Cost with most value (hardware, components, service, configuration)	10	0

Six year total - \$ 2,257,413

SECTION TOTALS	
A. Relevant and Comparable Experience	30
B. Ability to Provide Comprehensive High-Quality Services	15
C. Service and Maintenance	16
D. Value and Cost	0

Evaluator Name: <u>JASON BENNETT</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>			
Security Camera System, Vendor Name: <u>ISC</u>			93
REVIEW - SCORED EVALUATION - Scoring Questionnaire		Points	Evaluation Score
A. Relevant and Comparable Experience (30 Maximum Points)			
1. Experience (20 Points)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ≥5 Years Experience as a Primary Service Provider for SERVICES	20	20	
<input type="checkbox"/> < 5 Years Experience as a Primary Service Provider for SERVICES	10		
2. References (10 Points)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ≥ 3 References with Good or Better Rating	10	10	
<input type="checkbox"/> < 3 References with Good or Better Rating	5		
<input type="checkbox"/> No References with Good or Better Rating	0		
B. Ability to Provide Comprehensive High-Quality Services (30 Maximum Points)			
1. Compliance with Scope of Services (20 Points)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Met or exceeded requirements in Scope of Services for SERVICES - Proposer included additional features, customer support and technology applicable to County, and/or more value-added services. There are no exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements of the RFP.	20	20	
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Less than 100% compliance with Scope of Services for SERVICES, or did not meet requirements of the Scope of Services. The Proposer listed a few exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements stated RFP.	10		
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Complete non-compliance with Scope of Services for SERVICES, or did not meet requirements of the Scope of Services. Proposer has multiple exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements of the RFP.	0		
2. Staffing (10 Points)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Proposer has staff and local presence to provide SERVICES.	10	10	
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Proposer does not have sufficient staff and/or no local presence to provide SERVICES.	5		
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Proposer has no staff and no local presence to provide SERVICES.	0		
C. Service and Maintenance (30 Maximum Points)			
1. Compliance with Service Level Agreement (15 Points)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - 100% Compliance with Service Level Agreement	15	15	
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Less than 100% compliance with Service Level Agreement	8		
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Non-Compliance with Service Level Agreement	0		
2. Project Implementation Management (15 Points)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Met or Exceeded requirements in Project Implementation Management - Proposer included detailed Project Approach and Methodology (solid and detailed plan for providing Services, demonstrating understanding of the Scope of Work), proposed implementation plan and schedule, project team and organization chart, and integration of new services (detailed plans for the provision of necessary hardware and software, and the integration of the new system/equipment, while minimizing the impacts to current operations.	15	8	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Partially met the requirements in Project Implementation Management - One or more of the following requirements were not included or not enough details were provided: Project Approach and Methodology (solid and detailed plan for providing Services, demonstrating understanding of the Scope of Work), proposed implementation plan and schedule, project team and organization chart, and integration of new services (detailed plans for the provision of necessary hardware and software, and the integration of the new system/equipment, while minimizing the impacts to current operations.	8		
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Did not meet the requirements in Project Implementation Management	0		
D. Value and Cost (10 Maximum Points)			
Lowest Overall Cost with most value (hardware, components, service, configuration)	10	10	

SECTION TOTALS			
A. Relevant and Comparable Experience		30	0
B. Ability to Provide Comprehensive High-Quality Services		30	0
C. Service and Maintenance		23	0
D. Value and Cost		10	0

Evaluator Name: <u>Dennis Griffin</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>		
Security Camera System, Vendor Name: <u>Integrated Security Controls</u>		93
REVIEW - SCORED EVALUATION - Scoring Questionnaire	Points	Evaluation Score
A. Relevant and Comparable Experience (30 Maximum Points)		
1. Experience (20 Points)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ≥ 5 Years Experience as a Primary Service Provider for SERVICES	20	20
<input type="checkbox"/> < 5 Years Experience as a Primary Service Provider for SERVICES	10	
2. References (10 Points)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ≥ 3 References with Good or Better Rating	10	10
<input type="checkbox"/> < 3 References with Good or Better Rating	5	
<input type="checkbox"/> No References with Good or Better Rating	0	
B. Ability to Provide Comprehensive High-Quality Services (30 Maximum Points)		
1. Compliance with Scope of Services (20 Points)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Met or exceeded requirements in Scope of Services for SERVICES - Proposer included additional features, customer support and technology applicable to County, and/or more value-added services. There are no exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements of the RFP.	20	20
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Less than 100% compliance with Scope of Services for SERVICES, or did not meet requirements of the Scope of Services. The Proposer listed a few exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements stated RFP.	10	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Complete non-compliance with Scope of Services for SERVICES, or did not meet requirements of the Scope of Services. Proposer has multiple exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements of the RFP.	0	
2. Staffing (10 Points)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Proposer has staff and local presence to provide SERVICES.	10	10
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Proposer does not have sufficient staff and/or no local presence to provide SERVICES.	5	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Proposer has no staff and no local presence to provide SERVICES.	0	
C. Service and Maintenance (30 Maximum Points)		
1. Compliance with Service Level Agreement (15 Points)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - 100% Compliance with Service Level Agreement	15	15
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Less than 100% compliance with Service Level Agreement	8	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Non-Compliance with Service Level Agreement	0	
2. Project Implementation Management (15 Points)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Met or Exceeded requirements in Project Implementation Management - Proposer included detailed Project Approach and Methodology (solid and detailed plan for providing Services, demonstrating understanding of the Scope of Work), proposed implementation plan and schedule, project team and organization chart, and integration of new services (detailed plans for the provision of necessary hardware and software, and the integration of the new system/equipment, while minimizing the impacts to current operations.	15	8
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Partially met the requirements in Project Implementation Management - One or more of the following requirements were not included or not enough details were provided: Project Approach and Methodology (solid and detailed plan for providing Services, demonstrating understanding of the Scope of Work), proposed implementation plan and schedule, project team and organization chart, and integration of new services (detailed plans for the provision of necessary hardware and software, and the integration of the new system/equipment, while minimizing the impacts to current operations. <i>Plan submitted not fully detailed</i>	8	
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Did not meet the requirements in Project Implementation Management	0	
D. Value and Cost (10 Maximum Points)		
Lowest Overall Cost with most value (hardware, components, service, configuration) <u>\$2,163,766</u>	10	10

SECTION TOTALS	
A. Relevant and Comparable Experience	30
B. Ability to Provide Comprehensive High-Quality Services	30
C. Service and Maintenance	23
D. Value and Cost	10

Evaluator Name: <u>Dilane Christian</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> 12/22			93
Security Camera System, Vendor Name: <u>Integrated Security Control</u>			
REVIEW - SCORED EVALUATION - Scoring Questionnaire		Points	Evaluation Score
A. Relevant and Comparable Experience (30 Maximum Points)			
1. Experience (20 Points)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ≥5 Years Experience as a Primary Service Provider for SERVICES	20		20
<input type="checkbox"/> < 5 Years Experience as a Primary Service Provider for SERVICES	10		
2. References (10 Points)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ≥ 3 References with Good or Better Rating	10		10
<input type="checkbox"/> < 3 References with Good or Better Rating	5		
<input type="checkbox"/> No References with Good or Better Rating	0		
B. Ability to Provide Comprehensive High-Quality Services (30 Maximum Points)			
1. Compliance with Scope of Services (20 Points)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Met or exceeded requirements in Scope of Services for SERVICES - Proposer included additional features, customer support and technology applicable to County, and/or more value-added services. There are no exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements of the RFP.	20		20
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Less than 100% compliance with Scope of Services for SERVICES, or did not meet requirements of the Scope of Services. The Proposer listed a few exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements stated RFP.	10		
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Complete non-compliance with Scope of Services for SERVICES, or did not meet requirements of the Scope of Services. Proposer has multiple exceptions that take away from the minimum requirements of the RFP.	0		
2. Staffing (10 Points)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Proposer has staff and local presence to provide SERVICES. <u>-4-8hr response</u>	10		10
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Proposer does not have sufficient staff and/or no local presence to provide SERVICES.	5		
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Proposer has no staff and no local presence to provide SERVICES.	0		
C. Service and Maintenance (30 Maximum Points)			
1. Compliance with Service Level Agreement (15 Points)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - 100% Compliance with Service Level Agreement	15		15
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Less than 100% compliance with Service Level Agreement	8		
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Non-Compliance with Service Level Agreement	0		
2. Project Implementation Management (15 Points)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Met/Exceeded - Met or Exceeded requirements in Project Implementation Management - Proposer included detailed Project Approach and Methodology (solid and detailed plan for providing Services, demonstrating understanding of the Scope of Work), proposed implementation plan and schedule, project team and organization chart, and integration of new services (detailed plans for the provision of necessary hardware and software, and the integration of the new system/equipment, while minimizing the impacts to current operations.	15		8
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met - Partially met the requirements in Project Implementation Management - One or more of the following requirements were not included or not enough details were provided: Project Approach and Methodology (solid and detailed plan for providing Services, demonstrating understanding of the Scope of Work), proposed implementation plan and schedule, project team and organization chart, and integration of new services (detailed plans for the provision of necessary hardware and software, and the integration of the new system/equipment, while minimizing the impacts to current operations.	8		
<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet - Did not meet the requirements in Project Implementation Management	0		
D. Value and Cost (10 Maximum Points)			
Lowest Overall Cost with most value (hardware, components, service, configuration)	10		10

Six year total \$ 2,163,766

SECTION TOTALS	
A. Relevant and Comparable Experience	30
B. Ability to Provide Comprehensive High-Quality Services	30
C. Service and Maintenance	23
D. Value and Cost	10