



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
Center for Families, Children & the Courts Division

DATE: April 18, 2008

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
The Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC), a division of the Administrative Office of the Courts, seeks the services of a consultant to provide technical assistance around a DUI court cost study including: establishing a comparison group and developing data collection tools.

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

Project Title: CALIFORNIA COLLABORATIVE JUSTICE COURT DUI COST STUDY PROJECT

RFP Number: CFCC 02-08 JUSTICE COURT DUI STUDY-LM

QUESTIONS TO THE SOLICITATIONS MAILBOX: Questions regarding this RFP should be directed to solicitations@jud.ca.gov by **Monday, April 28, 2008, no later than 3 p.m. (PST)**.

DATE AND TIME PROPOSAL DUE: There will not be a pre-proposal conference for this RFP.
Proposals must be received by **Friday, May 2, 2008, no later than 3 p.m. (PST)**.

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: **Proposals must be submitted to:**
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP No. CFCC 02-08 Justice Court DUI Cost Study-LM
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 BACKGROUND

1.1.1 The Judicial Council of California, chaired by the Chief Justice of California, is the chief policy making agency of the California judicial system. The California Constitution directs the Council to improve the administration of justice by surveying judicial business, recommending improvements to the Courts, and making recommendations annually to the Governor and the Legislature. The Council also adopts rules for Court administration, practice, and procedure, and performs other functions prescribed by law. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is the staff agency for the Council and assists both the Council and its chair in performing their duties.

1.2 THE CENTER FOR FAMILIES, CHILDREN & THE COURTS

1.2.1 The Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC), a division of the AOC, provides a range of services to Courts in California, including research and technical assistance for juvenile and family Courts, collaborative justice Courts, cases involving self-represented litigants, and cases involving family violence.

1.2.2 The Collaborative Justice Program (CJP) is one of the units within the CFCC, a division of the AOC. CFCC is dedicated to improving the quality of justice and services to meet the diverse needs of children, youth, families, and self-represented litigants in the California courts. CJP staff is responsible for providing support to the Judicial Council's Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee (CJCAC). The CJCAC is responsible for monitoring and recommending improvements to California's collaborative justice or treatment courts through advisory duties to the Judicial Council.

1.3 COLLABORATIVE JUSTICE PROJECTS

1.3.1 This RFP encompasses one AOC Collaborative Justice Project: The California DUI Court Expansion Project. The AOC is seeking a consultant with experience with the Drug Court Cost Study to provide technical assistance on the project, including identifying a comparison group for DUI courts, adapting an existing cost-benefit methodology, and assisting with data collection tools for the courts.

1.3.1.1 Background: California Drug Court Cost Study Project

The AOC contracted with NPC Research, Inc. to conduct a statewide cost benefit study of adult drug courts. The study is being conducted in *three phases*. *Phase I* consisted of an in-depth cost analysis of three case study

courts and developed the methodology for conducting the statewide study. *Phase II* applied and tested the methodology in six additional courts and resulted in the development of a drug court cost self evaluation tool. *Phase III*, currently underway, trains adult drug courts in using the cost self evaluation tool so that they can do their own assessments of costs.

1.3.1.2 California DUI Court Expansion Project

The Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Center for Families, Children & the Courts received a grant from the California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) to implement the California DUI Court Expansion Project. The project is designed to assist in the development, expansion and evaluation of DUI courts in California. The selected DUI courts will apply a collaborative justice model to their DUI case processing and will adhere to the National Drug Court Institute's (NDCI) *The Ten Guiding Principles of DUI Courts* (see Section 3.5). This grant funded five (5) new DUI court expansion pilot sites throughout California. The courts are funded for a two year period.

1.3.2 The AOC built an evaluation component into the Office Of Traffic Safety funded DUI Court Expansion Project and will be conducting a cost-analysis study. The evaluation is designed to measure the costs of the DUI Court Programs, and compare them to traditional DUI case processing.

1.3.3 The goal of the cost-study is to measure the economic impact the DUI Court model and to continue building the evidence base for collaborative justice programs.

2.0 TIMELINE FOR THIS RFP

2.1 The AOC has developed the following list of key events from the time of the issuance of this RFP through the intent to award contract. All dates are subject to change at the discretion of the AOC.

EVENT	KEY DATE
RFP issued to http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/ :	April 18, 2008
Deadline for questions to solicitations@jud.ca.gov	Monday, April 28, 2008 No later than 3 p.m.
Latest date and time proposal may be submitted (See “Submission of Proposal” on cover sheet)	Friday, May 2, 2008 No later than 3 p.m.
Evaluation of proposals (<i>estimate only</i>)	May 2, 2008 through May 6, 2008
Notice of Intent to Award (<i>estimate only</i>)	May 12, 2008
Negotiations and execution of contract (<i>estimate only</i>)	May 22, 2008

3.0 PURPOSE OF THIS RFP

- 3.1 The AOC seeks for the services of a consultant of high professional repute with expertise in cost analysis and identifying comparison groups. The consultant should have experience with drug/DUI courts, or California courts, more generally, and report writing.
- 3.2 The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to secure a contract to perform a variety of research and evaluation tasks for two cost studies. Research activities will include collecting comparison group data; assisting with interview protocol development; developing a web-based data collection tool, and; technical assistance as needed.
- 3.3 The Contractor will be responsible for the following:
 - 3.3.1 Collect data to establish a statewide comparison group for the DUI Court Expansion Project that will be used in cost-benefit analyses conducted by AOC;
 - 3.3.2 Collect data to establish a statewide comparison group for the Drug Court Cost Study Project that will be used in cost-benefit analyses conducted by AOC;
 - 3.3.3 Participate in on-going technical assistance to AOC project staff on cost study portion of the DUI Court Expansion Project, including answering questions about comparison group methodology and assisting with discrete data analysis tasks;
 - 3.3.4 Write a report detailing recommendations on developing a web-based self-assessment tool for DUI courts.
 - 3.3.5 Create web-based self-assessment tool to measure costs and benefits of DUI courts. Web-based tool must have capacity to auto-calculate costs and benefits.

4.0 RFP ATTACHMENTS

4.1 Included as part of this RFP are the following attachments:

4.1.1 Attachment 1 - Administrative Rules Governing Request for Proposals. Proposers shall follow the rules, set forth in *Attachment 1, in preparation and submittal of their proposals.*

4.1.2 Attachment 2 - Contract Terms. Contracts with successful firms will be signed by the parties on a State of California Standard Agreement form and will include terms appropriate for this project. Terms and conditions typical for the requested services are attached as *Attachment 2 - Contract Terms* and include: *Exhibits A through E.*

4.1.3 Attachment 3 - Vendor's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms. Proposers must either indicate acceptance of Contract Terms, as set forth in *Attachment 2 – Contract Terms*, or clearly identify exceptions to the Contract Terms, as set forth in this *Attachment 3.*

4.1.3.1 If exceptions are identified, then proposers must also submit (i) a red-lined version of *Attachment 2 – Contract Terms*, that clearly tracks proposed changes to this attachment, and (ii) written documentation to substantiate each such proposed change.

4.1.4 Attachment 4 - Payee Data Record Form. The AOC is required to obtain and keep on file, a completed Payee Data Record for each vendor prior to entering into a contract with that vendor. Therefore, vendor's proposal must include a completed and signed *Payee Data Record Form, set forth as Attachment 4.*

5.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

5.1 Proposals will be evaluated by the AOC using the following criteria, in order of descending priority:

5.1.1 Quality of work plan submitted.

5.1.2 Experiences on similar assignments, particularly those involving cost studies or program evaluations of court programs.

5.1.3 Reasonableness of cost projections.

5.1.4 Credentials of staff to be assigned to the Project.

5.1.5 Ability to meet timing requirements to complete the Project.

6.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

- 6.1 Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted above. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the state's instructions, requirements of this RFP, and completeness and clarity of content.
- 6.2 The following information shall be included as the technical portion of the proposal:
 - 6.2.1 Quality of work plan submitted.
 - 6.2.1.1 Method to complete the Project.
 - 6.2.1.1.1 Proposed strategy for identifying statewide comparison group(s) for 5 new DUI courts
 - 6.2.1.1.2 Proposed strategy for identifying statewide comparison group for non-Prop 36 Adult Drug Courts.
 - 6.2.1.1.3 Proposed technical assistance plan for methodological assistance and strategies for data collection as it relates to the DUI Court Expansion Project.
 - 6.2.1.1.4 Proposed plan to create web-based data collection tool to be used by DUI Courts to estimate costs and benefits.
 - 6.2.1.2 Contact information. Provide proposer's point of contact, including name, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone and facsimile numbers.
 - 6.2.1.3 Tax recording information. Complete and submit *Attachment 4 - Payee Data Record Form*. Note that if an individual or sole proprietorship, using a social security number for tax recording purposes, is awarded a contract, the social security number will be required prior to finalizing a contract.
 - 6.2.1.4 Compliance with Contract Terms. Complete and submit *Attachment 3 - Vendor's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms*. If changes to *Attachment 3* are proposed, then also submit red-lined version of *Attachment 3- Vendor's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms* as well as written justification supporting any such proposed changes.

- 6.3 Experience on similar assignments.
 - 6.3.1 Provide the names, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of two (2) clients for whom the proposer has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by the proposer.
 - 6.3.2 Experience with cost benefit studies or court program evaluations.
 - 6.3.4 Experience working with a Court or related setting [desirable but not necessary].
- 6.4 Reasonableness of cost projections. See below, *RFP: 7.0 Specifics of a Responsive Cost Proposal*.
- 6.5 Credentials of staff to be assigned to the Project. Describe key staff's knowledge of the requirements necessary to complete this project. Provide professional qualifications and experience of key staff, as well as each individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities. Submit hardcopy of key staff's information in proposal as well as electronically. (*See RFP: 8.0 Submissions of Proposals*)
- 6.6 Ability to meet timing requirements to complete the Project. Overall plan with time estimates for completion of all work required.

7.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE COST PROPOSAL

- 7.1 The following information shall be included as the cost portion of the proposal:
 - 7.1.1 Reasonableness of Cost Projections.
 - 7.1.1.1 As a separate document, submit a detailed line item budget showing total cost of the services for each of the five Deliverables specified in *Attachment 2 Contract Terms, Exhibit D - Work to be Performed*. This budget should identify unique hourly rates, titles, and responsibilities for each "Key Personnel," but can group this information for other personnel in a more general manner. Staff rates should be fully burdened, including indirect costs, overhead and profit. The cost proposal should also include separate line items for postage/ mailing costs and travel and lodging. Fully explain and justify all budget line items in a narrative entitled "Budget Justification."
 - 7.1.1.2 The total cost for consultant services will range between **\$125,000.00 - \$165,000.00** inclusive of personnel, materials, overhead rates, and profit. The method of payment to the consultant will be by cost reimbursement for each of the five (5) deliverables specified in *Attachment 2 Contract Terms, Exhibit D - Work to be Performed*.

8.0 SUBMISSIONS OF PROPOSALS

- 8.1 Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted in items *RFP: 6.0 Specifics of a Responsive Technical Proposal* and *RFP: 7.0 Specifics of a Responsive Cost Proposal*, above. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the state's instructions, requirements of this RFP, and completeness and clarity of content.
- 8.2 Proposers will submit ***one (1) original and three (3) copies*** of the technical proposal and cost proposal signed by an authorized representative of the company, including name, title, address, and telephone number of one individual who is the responder's designated representative.
- 8.3 Proposals must be delivered to the individual listed under Submission of Proposals, as set forth on the cover memo of this RFP.
- 8.4 Only written responses will be accepted. Responses should be sent by registered or certified mail or by hand delivery. Proposers will request proof of delivery by a time-stamped submittal receipt.
- 8.5 In addition to submittal of the original and three copies of the proposals, as set forth in items 8.2, above, ***proposers are also required to submit an electronic version of the entire proposal on CD-ROM.***

9.0 RIGHTS

- 9.1 The AOC reserves the right to reject any and all proposals, in whole or in part, as well as the right to issue similar RFPs in the future. This RFP is in no way an agreement, obligation, or contract and in no way is the AOC or the State of California responsible for the cost of preparing the proposal. One copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and becomes a public record.

10.0 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

- 10.1 It may be necessary to interview prospective service providers to clarify aspects of their submittal. If conducted, interviews will likely be conducted by telephone conference call. The AOC will notify prospective service providers regarding the interview arrangements.

11.0 CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

- 11.1 The Administrative Office of the Courts policy is to follow the intent of the California Public Records Act (PRA). If a vendor's proposal contains material noted or marked as confidential and/or proprietary that, in the AOC's sole opinion, meets the disclosure exemption requirements of the PRA, then that information will not be disclosed pursuant to a request for public documents. If the AOC does not consider such material to be exempt

from disclosure under the PRA, the material will be made available to the public, regardless of the notation or markings. If a vendor is unsure if its confidential and/or proprietary material meets the disclosure exemption requirements of the PRA, then it should not include such information in its proposal.