



**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:** June 12, 2008

**SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO:** **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**  
To publish questions and answers from Bidders' Conference held June 5, 2008 and from Solicitations mailbox submitted by June 12, 2008.

**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: **REPRESENTATION IN JUVENILE COURT PROCEEDINGS, SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA**  
RFP Number: **CFCC 09-08 DRAFT-Santa Clara-LM**

**PRE-PROPOSAL BIDDERS' CONFERENCE:** A pre-proposal bidders' conference was held on **Thursday, June 5, 2008, at 12:00 p.m. (PST)** at 111 N. Market Street, Suite 950, San Jose.

**QUESTIONS TO THE SOLICITATIONS MAILBOX:** Questions regarding this RFP were directed to the [Solicitations@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Solicitations@jud.ca.gov) by **Thursday, June 12, 2008, at 3:00 p.m. (PST)**.

**DATE AND TIME PROPOSAL DUE:** Proposals must be received by **Monday, June 30, 2008, no later than 3:00 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. CFCC 09-08 DRAFT-Santa Clara-LM**  
**455 Golden Gate Avenue, 7th Floor**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102-3688**

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FROM  
BIDDERS' CONFERENCE OF JUNE 5, 2008 AND FROM  
SOLICITATIONS MAILBOX BY JUNE 12, 2008**

- Question # 1: The AOC's caseload guidelines were not attached to the RFP. How much weight will be given to the guidelines?*
- Answer # 1: The Caseload Standards were not attached because bidders are not required to adhere to the standards. Currently, there is not sufficient funding available to implement the Caseload Standards on a statewide basis; the standards are a target rather than a mandate.*
- Question # 2: The RFP specifies that providers will be required to report statistical data. Will funding for the management of that data be provided?*
- Answer # 2: The workload required for providing the required statistics on a quarterly basis each year should be reflected in the staffing levels delineated in proposals, primarily in the form of clerical support. The AOC is seeking funding to make a web-based data collection system ("JCATS"), available in the new DRAFT courts. The availability of JCATS would result in a lower workload as related to data submission, as compared to the Excel spreadsheets that were provided as part of the RFP.*
- Question # 3: Should staffing related to writ work be reflected in bids?*
- Answer # 3: Yes, writ work is included in the scope of services delineated in the RFP.*
- Question # 4: The RFP specifies that substitute counsel must be prepared to address substantive case issues. While this is possible in the case of planned absences such as vacations, do the AOC and the court recognize that unforeseen emergency circumstances may lead to situations in which this isn't possible?*
- Answer # 4: Yes, it is understood that an emergency situation may arise which would necessitate a continuance.*
- Question # 5: The RFP specifies that a list of proposed substitute counsel must be provided. Is such a list required?*
- Answer # 5: No. This requirement applies more to solo practitioners who would need to arrange for substitute counsel in the case of absences. It is assumed that a bid from an organizational provider would include substitute counsel from within the organization.*
- Question # 6: When submitting a bid that includes subcontractors, is it necessary to include a detailed budget for the subcontractors?*

- Answer # 6:* As much detail as is available should be provided. At a minimum, the caseload and compensation levels for each subcontractor's attorney staffing must be provided.
- Question # 7:* *Can budget information for the current provider be released?*
- Answer # 7:* Detailed line item budget information is not available; the contract amount for Fiscal Year 2007-08 is \$2,813,459.
- Question # 8:* *At how many locations are dependency cases heard?*
- Answer # 8:* The court hears dependency cases at the Terraine Street courthouse in San Jose, as well as at the South County courthouse in San Martin (Fridays only). Long cause trials and occasional lengthy hearings are assigned to the Civil Trial Division at 191 North First Street, San Jose.
- Question # 9:* *The RFP states that proposals should take into account the likelihood of the court establishing a fourth dependency department. What should be assumed in terms of the calendar and workload associated with a fourth department?*
- Answer # 9:* The fourth dependency department would have substantially the same calendar as the current three main dependency departments.
- Question # 10:* *Issues have been raised regarding the availability of attorney staff to keep courtrooms running efficiently. How should coverage issues be addressed in the proposals?*
- Answer # 10:* Bidders should submit multiple proposals reflecting varying staffing levels and models, e.g., dedicated attorneys by department versus attorneys shared by multiple departments.
- Question # 11:* *How much staff time can we expect that the 0-3 and Dependency Drug Treatment Court will require?*
- Answer # 11:* Information about the amount of staff time required by the specialized courts is not available. The statistics provided in the RFP reflect that, of 1,875 parent clients, there were 51 new participants in Dependency Drug Court in 2005 and 48 in 2006.
- Question # 12:* *How many children are under the jurisdiction of the dependency court?*
- Answer # 12:* There are presently approximately 2,660 children under the jurisdiction of the dependency court.
- Question # 13:* *The number of participants in Dependency Drug Treatment Court has decreased over the past two years. Is there more information available upon which to base bids?*

Answer # 13: The following is statistical information for prior years:

FILINGS, DISPOSITIONS AND HEARINGS

<b>Fiscal Year:</b>	<b>2003-2004</b>	<b>2004-2005</b>
<b>A. No. of Juveniles Subject of Dependency Petitions:</b>		
Original	773	786
Subsequent	2	3
<b>Total Filings</b>	<b>775</b>	<b>789</b>
<b>B. Juvenile Cases Disposed of:</b>		
1. Before Hearing		
Original	16	12
Subsequent	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>
2. After Hearing		
a. Uncontested		
Original	922	1,396
Subsequent	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>922</b>	<b>1,397</b>
b. Contested		
Original	223	124
Subsequent	6	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>124</b>
3. Disposition Total		
Original	1,161	1,532
Subsequent	6	1
<b>Total Dispositions</b>	<b>1,167</b>	<b>1,533</b>
<b>C. Other Data</b>		
1. Detention Hearings	834	1,450
2. Semi-annual Reviews	202	565

DEPENDENCY DRUG TREATMENT COURT

<b>Calendar Year:</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008 (Jan – Mar)*</b>
1. New Participants						
Men	1	3	5	1	2	2
Women	18	39	46	47	42	9
<b>Total New Participants</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>11</b>
2. Children Involved	41	81	107	68	76	20

\*This figure may be lower because potential participants are diverted to Family Wellness Court. Currently, there are 18 parents in Family Wellness Court.