

County of Hunt

STATE OF TEXAS

PURCHASING DEPARTMENT
2507 Lee Street, Room 104
Greenville, TX 75401-1097



PHONE: (903) 408-4292
FAX: (903) 408-4242
thimes@huntcounty.net

ADDENDUM # ONE

RFP #266-25: Request for Proposals for Inmate Telephone Systems - Hunt County, Texas

September 2, 2025

The following information is being provided to clarify the proposal requirements and address questions received as of this date:

Questions:

- Please confirm the “Point-by-Point RFP Response” mentioned in section 2.2 Proposal Format includes only sections 2.7 – 2.13.**
Answer: Yes, the “Point-by-Point RFP Response” referenced in Section 2.2 shall include Sections 2.7 – 2.13 of the RFP.
- Please provide the average daily population for the last three months, broken down by month, if possible.**
Answer:
☐ July 2025: 330 inmates
☐ August 2025: 325 inmates
☐ September 2025: 319 inmates
- Please provide a copy of each agreement/contract and all amendments (if applicable) the County has executed with its incumbent inmate Telephone System (ITS) and Tablet provider(s).**
Answer: The County’s current Inmate Telephone and Tablet Provider is IC Solutions. Copies of the current contract and any amendments will be provided as attachments under separate cover.
- Does the County's agreement with their current ITS provider include a Minimum Monthly or Minimum Annual Commission Guarantee? If so, please describe.**
Answer: Yes. The current agreement includes a Minimum Annual Commission Guarantee. The amount is specified within the existing IC Solutions contract.

5. **Does the County's agreement with their current ITS provide include any additional financial incentives (e.g. annual technology grant, signing bonus)? If so, please describe.**
Answer: The current agreement provides an Annual Technology Grant; no signing bonus is included.
6. **The RFP does not appear to reference the provisioning of inmate Video Visitation System (VVS) services, which are typically included as part of an Inmate Telephone System/Tablet solicitation. Accordingly, we respectfully request clarification on the following: a) Does the County currently provide VVS services, and if so, who is the current provider? and b) Will the County consider the implementation of VVS services if proposed by a vendor? If so, please confirm where proposed VVS service details and commission rates should be included within the proposal response.**
Answer: a) The County does not currently utilize video visitation.
b) The County will consider vendor-proposed VVS solutions.
Please include proposed VVS service details and commission rates within the Commission Offer Form section of your proposal.
7. **The RFP does not appear to reference the provisioning of multi-function/video visitation kiosks. Accordingly, we respectfully request clarification on the following: a) Does the County currently have any multi-function/video visitation kiosks installed, and if so, how many? Does the County require vendors to provide multi-function/video visitation kiosks, and if so, how many?**
Answer: a) The facility does not currently have any multi-function kiosks supporting visitation.
b) Vendors may propose additional kiosks as part of their solution. Please specify number, functionality, and cost structure.
8. **The RFP indicates that the facility has an average daily population (ADP) of 341 inmates and is currently equipped with 120 inmate tablet devices, resulting in an approximate 1:3 tablet-to-inmate ratio. Please clarify whether this current distribution ratio is considered sufficient, or if the County would prefer vendors to propose a 1:1 tablet-to-inmate ratio.**
Answer: The existing inventory (120 total tablets: 81 in use, 20 under repair, 19 spare) reflects an approximate 1:3 tablet-to-inmate ratio, which the County finds sufficient. Vendors may propose a 1:1 ratio only if it is cost-neutral to the County.
9. **Please provide a breakdown by housing unit of the inmate capacity in each. The inmate capacity for each cell block is necessary for determining network requirements.**
Answer:
We have 4 separate Hallways
SE – 8 / 8-man cells - 2 / 12-man cells - 4 single cells – Total inmates 92 on Hallway
SW - 8 / 8-man cells - 2 / 12-man cells - 4 single cells – Total inmates 92 on Hallway
NW - 8 / 8-man cells - 2 / 12-man cells - 4 single cells – Total inmates 92 on Hallway
NE – 2 / 8-man cells - 4 / 6-man cells - 4 single cells - Total inmates 44 on Hallway
MAS – 1 portable phone
FAS – 1 portable phone
Intake – 1 portable phone

10. **Is the inmate banking/trust account managed through the commissary system or the Jail Management System (JMS) or other system? If other, please specify.**
Answer: Banking is managed through the Commissary System (Keefe); the Jail Management System (Tyler Odyssey) is used for inmate records integration.
11. **How is commissary currently ordered today?**
Answer: Commissary orders are placed via phone or tablet integrated with Keefe applications.
12. **What limits does the County place, if any, on use of the services in this RFP such as maximum number of ITS calls per week (or other interval), etc.?**
Answer: The County does not impose numeric call or session limits; usage follows standard facility rules and availability.
13. **The RFP's "Commission Offer Form" includes a column labeled "Commission % with Part/Full-Time Administrator." Smart Communications respectfully requests clarification on the following points: a) Is the administrator required to be physically located on-site within the facility?; b) How many working hours does the County define as "part-time"? and c) Since "Commission % with Part/Full-Time Administrator" is listed in a single column, it is unclear whether the commission percentage provided reflects a part-time or full-time administrator. To ensure a fair and transparent evaluation of vendor proposals, will the County require vendors to specify whether the listed commission percentage corresponds to a part-time or full-time administrator?**
Answer:
a) The Administrator must be physically on-site at the facility.
b) Part-time = 20 hours per week.
c) Vendors must clearly indicate whether each proposed commission percentage applies to a part-time or full-time administrator to ensure consistent evaluation.
14. **Please provide clarification regarding the "Tablet Commission Summary" included in the document titled "Tablet Commission – Site Summary – IC Solutions (04/01/25 – 04/30/25)." Specifically, the report lists "Message" as a commission product twice. In the first instance, the "Pricing Rate" is shown as \$0.00, while in the second instance, the "Pricing Rate" is listed as \$0.25. Could the County please explain the reason for the difference in pricing rates between these two "Message" entries?**
Answer:
☐ \$0.00 rate: System or administrative messages (non-revenue).
☐ \$0.25 rate: Standard paid inmate messages (commissionable).

15. Please provide clarification regarding the “Tablet Commission Summary” contained in the document titled “Tablet Commission – Site Summary – IC Solutions (04/01/25 – 04/30/25).” Within the “Commission Product” column, the report lists both “Tablet Session [Free]” and “Tablet Session [Standard].” Could the County please explain the distinction between these two categories—specifically, what qualifies as a “free” Tablet Session and what qualifies as a “standard” Tablet Session that generates revenue?

Answer:

- ☐ Tablet Session [Free]: Facility-authorized no-charge sessions (education, information, trials).
- ☐ Tablet Session [Standard]: Paid sessions generating commissionable revenue.

16. Please confirm whether the County will accept digital signatures in place of traditional ink (wet) signatures on required forms and documents. Allowing the use of digital signatures is consistent with current best practices, reduces administrative burden, and accelerates the submission process while maintaining legal validity and security. Digital signatures also ensure compliance with federal and state electronic signature laws (e.g., the ESIGN Act and UETA), which recognize them as legally binding. Acceptance of digital signatures would therefore provide efficiency and convenience without compromising the integrity of the procurement process.

Answer: Yes. The County accepts digital signatures compliant with the ESIGN Act and UETA, consistent with Section 2.2 submission requirements.

17. After the first round of questions is answered, will the County accept additional questions if clarification is needed for any of the County’s responses?

Answer: Per the RFP schedule (Section 2.1), the deadline for questions is October 14, 2025; no additional questions will be accepted after the County’s official Q&A release.

All vendors are required to sign and return a copy of this addendum with each Proposal for the Inmate Telephone Systems – Hunt County, Texas

Company Name: _____

Print Name& Title: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____