



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

FINANCE DIVISION

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-7739 • Fax 415-865-7217 • TDD 415-865-4272

RONALD M. GEORGE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

WILLIAM C. VICKREY
Administrative Director of the Courts

RONALD G. OVERHOLT
Chief Deputy Director

STEPHEN NASH
Director, Finance Division

TO: **POTENTIAL PROPOSERS**

FROM: ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
EXECUTIVE OFFICE PROGRAMS DIVISION

DATE: March 12, 2008

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)**
The purpose of this document is to publish the AOC's Responses to Vendors' Questions, directed to the Solicitations@jud.ca.gov by March 10, 2009, no later than 3 p.m.

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposal (RFP), as posted at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/>:

Project Title: **FELONY TRIAL AND HEARING DATE CERTAINTY**
RFP Number: EOP 02-09 Felony Trial and Hearing Date Certainty-LM

DATE AND TIME PROPOSAL DUE: Proposals must be received by **Monday, March 30, 2009, no later than 3 p.m. (PST)**.

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: Proposals must be sent to:
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP No. EOP 02-09 Felony Trial and Hearing Date Certainty-LM
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

AOC RESPONSES TO VENDORS' QUESTIONS

1. Page 1 of the RFP presents information about prior work that led to this RFP. We are interested in knowing the following:
 - a. Who administered the 2003 survey of the superior courts?
AOC Staff – Fred Miller
 - b. If possible, please provide a copy of the 2003 survey findings.
The detailed findings are not available. The survey instrument, “Survey of Court Consulting Services,” is a supplement to this document.

Some 75 % of California’s 58 trial courts responded to the survey. The greatest need for assistance identified was in the area of court security. Under the category of caseflow management issues, criminal caseflow management was the most frequently cited operational area in need of assistance.
 - c. In 2005, who provided the technical assistance to the 12 courts to improve criminal caseflow management?

Greacen Associates, LLC of Regina, New Mexico with AOC staff, and trial court judges and staff.
 - d. If possible, please provide a copy of the report documenting the lessons learned from the 2005 technical assistance provided.

The final summary, “Developing Effective Practices in Criminal Caseflow Management - Summary of Observations and Recommendations from Technical Assistance Engagements” is a supplement to this document.
2. Page 3 of the RFP states that the participating courts will host a 5-day visit "... at which the contractor and AOC staff will likely observe felony case processing, interview judicial officers, court staff and participating attorneys..." Will contractor staff be able to assign specific responsibilities to the AOC staff during the site visits and thus, potentially, increase the scope of the data collection effort?

Yes, as mutually agreed upon.
3. Attachment 2 of the RFP specifies 16 deliverables and page 16 of the RFP asks us to submit a detailed budget for each of the 16 deliverables. Eight of the 16 deliverables are for site visits. If we propose visiting fewer than 8 courts, how do you want us to prepare the cost proposal? For example, if we propose visiting 7 instead of 8 courts, do you want a detailed budget for 15 deliverables?

Yes.

4. Are materials or documentation for any of the 3 prior activities listed under 1.2 of the RFP (workshop, technical assistance, follow-up workshops) available to the contractor for a) developing the proposal and/or b) conducting the study?

Workshop materials attached:

The revised manual, "Developing Effective Practices in Criminal Caseflow Management" is a supplement to this document.

The final report, "Developing Effective Practices in Criminal Caseflow Management" is a supplement to this document.

Technical assistance summary attached per question above.

5. Will it be the responsibility of the contractor in whole or in part to determine the extent of the on-site data to use in the on-site presentations?

It will be the responsibility of the contractor to see that the attorney surveys and the statistical case specific data have been collected and analyzed before the individual trial court site visit takes place, to the degree that this is possible. These findings will inform the more subjective data and information gathered during the site visit. It will be the contractor's responsibility to work/consult with the on-site team to formulate findings and recommendations and to prepare the presentation in adequate time for a review by the on-site team prior to presentation to the court.

[Remainder of page left blank intentionally]