



Jail Management System:

JMS RFP Proposal Due Date: September 15, 2026

JMS RFP Vendor Questions & Dakota County Responses

Introduction

Thank you for submitting your questions regarding Dakota County's Jail Management System (JMS) Project Request for Proposal (RFP). Dakota County acknowledges & appreciates the time necessary to build comprehensive RFP responses & hope that the following answers will provide any clarity needed. Below, you will find the responses to all submitted questions.

1. Would it be possible to get the RFP request document in Word?

[The official RFP is available in PDF format & has been posted on the Dakota County website.](#)

2. RFP page 9 (Item G) and RFP page 33 (Attachment H) state that both a paper and digital copy must be submitted if trade secret information is noted. RFP page 10 (Item A), however, simply instructs proposers to submit one (1) electronic copy of the proposal.

If a bid/proposal does contain trade secret information, can a vendor simply submit one *digital* copy of the bid or proposal from which the confidential trade secret information has been excised?

[An electronic copy of the Trade Secret Form should suffice for the submittal of a proposal, unless a paper copy is requested.](#)

3. How many beds are there in the facility?

[270 Bed Count](#)

4. How many jail staff?

[58 Correctional Deptues](#)

[11 Jail Sgts.](#)

[8 Control Room Officers](#)

[10 Support Staff](#)

[2 Captains](#)

5. What is the current JMS that data will be converted from?

Police Central Inc. is the current JMS.

6. How many databases will be converted?

Two databases will be converted, with Police Central serving as the primary system. A small add-on may be required for JMSTI (JMS Transaction Interface), provided it supports all required accounting functions.

7. Incumbent System: What are the current JMS, warrant, civil process, inmate accounting, and booking systems in use today, and which modules are expected to be replaced versus integrated with the proposed solution?

- Police Central Warrants is in use and expected to be replaced.
- Warrants have integrations points as well.
- Police Central Civil Process is in use and expected to be replaced.
- Dakota County does have components that work with the Civil Process and at a minimum these components should integrate if they cannot be replaced such as:
 - Online Civil Request website is a Dakota County built system, and we would like to be able to push data to the Civil Module, but this currently does not push to existing system.
 - Civil Forms - ideal solution - will be able to have automatically created forms with data available for the civil module and store documents as needed. At a minimum we would need to be able to push and pull data as well as final documents.
- Dakota County Built Jail Management Transaction interface is coupled with Police Central JMS. (JMSTI) The ideal solution would be able to replace all accounting and automation in transaction needs. - Automate taking payments by communication with Turnkey API (Work Release, Pay to Stay and Booking fee) on different schedules as needed. Also be able to automatically create the Pay to Stay fee for a booking upon inmate release and perform final checks to Turnkey prior to writing off the remaining booking fee as that can only be collected while in custody.
- At a minimum we would have to establish if an integration would be possible with the JMSTI
- Police Central Booking System is in the JMS and is in use and expected to be replaced. There are many expected integrations with the JMS as outlined. If functionality is not in the offering to a satisfactory level, it is expected that integration will be possible. LiveScan and other integrations have been outlined in the integrations tab.

8. Mandatory vs. Desired Requirements: Of the requirements listed in Attachment A, are all "High" priority requirements mandatory for award, or will the County evaluate vendors

based upon overall best value and roadmap alignment if certain requirements are proposed through future phases?

County will evaluate vendors based on overall best value and roadmap alignment. Gap analysis will be complete on area and need.

- 9. Phased Implementation: Please identify which functional areas are expected in Phase 1 versus later phases (Jail, Warrants, Civil, Inmate Accounting, Public Websites, Program Management, etc.).**

Planning and phasing are still to be determined; however, all core systems should be included in Phase 1, including Jail, Warrants, Civil, Inmate Accounting, data access, and API endpoints.

- 10. Existing Workflows: Should vendors prioritize exact replication of current workflows, screen layouts, reports, and numbering conventions, or may vendors propose equivalent best-practice workflows that achieve the same business outcome?**

We are looking for equivalent best practice workflows to achieve most efficient business outcomes. Some processes will have to be exact to meet process needs, and others will be more flexible. Ideally screen layouts will be configurable.

- 11. Numbering Requirements: Which historical numbering schemes are mandatory to preserve operationally versus historical reference purposes only?**

I do not believe any numbering scheme needs to be maintained other than historical reference. We will want to ensure that new numbers for Booking, Jackets and other similar unique IDs will not overlap in the future so our numbering will likely start at a certain value.

- 12. Reporting: Has Dakota County completed a report inventory and identified which reports are business critical versus informational or legacy reports?**

There are reporting sections in the requirements document. A complete inventory for day 1 mission critical items will need to be identified.

- 13. Integration Inventory: Can the County provide an interface inventory identifying:**

- **Current source system**
- **Destination system**
- **Interface type (API, file, database, stored procedure)**
- **Transaction volume**
- **Criticality**

This functionality will only be available in later phases. Upon vendor selection, additional documentation will be provided. Please include this work as a separate line item in your high-level professional services estimate.

- 14. Stored-Procedure Integrations:** For integrations currently implemented through direct SQL access or stored procedures, will the County accept API-based replacement architecture?
Yes, however, functionality and usability will need to be determined for completeness, performance and ease of use by the Dakota County development team in partnership with the company's technical staff.
- 15. Guardian Command Cloud:** Is Guardian Command Cloud expected to remain as the inmate movement platform, or would Dakota County consider native inmate movement capabilities provided by the JMS solution?
We would have to review your product offering and determine if the solution meets Dakota County Sheriff's Office need.
- 16. Turnkey:** Is Turnkey considered a mandatory retained solution for commissary, inmate accounts, telephony, and payment workflows?
Turnkey is considered a mandatory retained solution for the items identified. Integration with Turnkey will be required to support opening and closing accounts, as well as processing payment transactions following a balance inquiry, through the Turnkey API.
- 17. PS Portal:** Does Dakota County require direct PS Portal transaction creation within the JMS, or will middleware/integration services be acceptable provided end-user workflows remain seamless?
Seamless workflows should be supported by a clean, intuitive, and easy-to-use interface that enables efficient tracking and management. We are looking for an efficient way to interact with the State, which currently appears to be facilitated through PSPortals.
- 18. Automated Warrant Prioritization Logic:** The requirements reference automated warrant prioritization based on UOC priorities. Can Dakota County provide documentation or business rules governing the prioritization logic currently in use?
Vendor is expected to understand the MN warrant process for continued support. Only one active warrant can be submitted to the state at a time. NCIC rules dictate that the highest-level warrant is the one submitted to NCIC. The one that is submitted- is the highest level of offense warrant. If there are additional warrants, they are noted in a comment box but not pushed to NCIC.
- 19. Minnesota-Specific Compliance:** Can Dakota County provide examples of current PS Portal transactions, acceptance messages, exception messages, and reconciliation workflows that vendors are expected to support?
Vendor is expected to have an understanding of this process. Dakota county can assist in testing if development is needed.

20. Civil System Scope: Is Dakota County seeking a fully integrated Civil Process Management platform or would tightly integrated third-party Civil solutions be acceptable?

Ideal solution will be fully integrated.

21. eFile/MGA: Has Dakota County confirmed available APIs and integration standards with MNCIS, MGA, and Minnesota eFile/eServe platforms for this project?

Dakota County expects vendors to have and maintain these relationships.

22. Civil Accounts Receivable: Is native Civil Accounts Receivable functionality preferred, or will integrated ERP-connected accounting modules receive equal evaluation consideration?

Looking for Native Civil Account receivable.

23. Historical Data Scope: How much historical Jail, Civil, Warrant, Accounting, and Document data is expected to be converted (i.e., GB, TB)?

This will need to be a discussion at a later point. There may be multiple options that are acceptable, please provide a rough estimate for data conversions in GB ranges.

24. Source Data Access: Will vendors be given access to data dictionaries, record counts, entity relationship diagrams, and sample extracts from legacy systems during evaluation?

Yes, we can provide some but may not have all or be allowed to share vendor specific items.

25. Document Conversion: Approximately how many files currently reside within OnBase and other repositories that are expected to be migrated or linked?

This will need to be a discussion at a later point. There may be multiple options that are acceptable, please provide a rough estimate for data conversions in document ranges.

26. Evaluation Scoring Methodology: Will Dakota County provide weighting percentages for:

- Functional requirements
- Technical architecture
- References
- Implementation approach
- Cost
- Demonstrations

This has yet to be determined.

27. Demonstration Requirements: Will shortlisted vendors be required to demonstrate specific scripted workflows, and if so, will the County provide the demonstration script in advance?

Dakota County will provide a list of items we want to see demonstrated or explained in advance.

28. Requirements Scoring: How will requirements marked as "Custom" versus "Standard" be scored during evaluation?

The standard expectation is that the functionality is included out of the box, as needed. Custom functionality will receive partial credit, and the proposed customization process will need to be explained in greater detail.

29. Purpose: What are the biggest challenges the County has faced with its current JMS system and processes?

The biggest challenge will be finding a solution that provides the flexibility we need. Over the years, we have been able to quickly adapt and customize many of our business processes to meet evolving needs. Ensuring that the new solution can accommodate those business requirements and remain flexible will be key to our success.

30. Purpose: What is the anticipated budget/spend for this new JMS?

At this time, the budget for this project is TBD.

31. How many users are required to access the new JMS? How many of those users require full system access?

At this time, there are ~118 staff who will need access to & trained on the new JMS solution.

32. How is OnBase currently used within the Sheriff's Office? Would the County consider building the new JMS as part of the existing OnBase environment if the vendor could prove that this is an effective and efficient approach in place of a separate COTS solution?

No, we will not entertain an OnBase buildout. Currently we have some document storage and a few work view applications on smaller items.

33. With the functionality of Warrant Processing, Civil Processing and Squad Car Mobiles, how many Mobile Data Terminals will need this functionality?

Please share your mobile pricing. The lower-end estimate, based on the numbers, is 10.