



**Judicial Council of California**  
**Administrative Office of the Courts**

Center for Families, Children & the Courts  
455 Golden Gate Avenue ♦ San Francisco, CA 94102-3660  
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*

MICHAEL BERGEISEN  
*General Counsel*

DIANE NUNN  
*Director*

**TO:** POTENTIAL BIDDERS

**FROM:** Administrative Office of the Courts  
Center for Families, Children & the Courts

**DATE:** April 30, 2002

**SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO:** REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
MODEL SELF-HELP CENTERS PILOT PROGRAM EVALUATION

**ACTION REQUIRED:** You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposals ("RFP"):  
  
Project Title: Self-Help Center Pilot Evaluation  
RFP Number: CFCC 4-30-02

**DEADLINE:** **Proposals must be received by 5 p.m. PDT on May 31, 2002**

**SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL:** Proposals should be sent to:  
**Judicial Council of California**  
**Administrative Office of the Courts**  
**Attn: Bonnie Rose Hough, Supervising Attorney**  
**455 Golden Gate Avenue**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**

**CONTACT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:**

|              |              |              |                                |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>NAME:</b> | <b>TEL:</b>  | <b>FAX:</b>  | <b>E-MAIL:</b>                 |
| Bonnie Hough | 415-865-7668 | 415-865-7217 | <i>bonnie.hough@jud.ca.gov</i> |

## **1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION**

### **1.1 Background on Requesting Agency**

The Judicial Council of California (“Council”), 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.

The Center for Families, Children, & the Courts (CFCC), a unit of the AOC, will coordinate this project. 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. CFCC focuses on juvenile and family projects that improve the lives of children through positive changes in the trial and appellate courts’ handling of matters involving children. Through CFCC, the AOC administers many juvenile and family projects as well as projects designed to assist self-represented litigants. Several projects aid the courts in responding effectively to the increasing numbers of self-represented litigants in family law cases. These include the Child Support Project (Assembly Bill 1058 family law facilitator and child support commissioners), the Equal Access Project, the Family Violence Prevention and Intervention Project, the California Courts Self-Help Web Site, the Family Law Information Center Pilot Project, planning grants for courts to respond to the needs of self-represented litigants, and the Model Self-Help Center Pilot Programs.

### **1.2 Background on Model Self-Help Centers Pilot Program**

California courts are facing an ever-increasing number of litigants who go to court without legal counsel, largely because they cannot afford representation. These self-represented litigants are not familiar with court procedures and forms, nor with their rights, which leaves them disadvantaged in court and consumes a significant amount of court resources. As part of an effort to meet its goal of increasing access to the courts, the Judicial Council has provided funding for projects that will address the needs of self-represented litigants.

The 2001 State Budget Act provided funding totaling \$832,000 to begin five pilot self-help centers (“Centers”) which would provide various forms of assistance, such as basic legal and procedural information, help with filling out forms, and referrals to other community resources, to self-represented litigants. This project is

aimed at determining the effectiveness of court-based self-help programs and providing information to the legislature on future funding needs. The Judicial Council has recently selected one of each of the five (5) following models to begin funding in May 2002.

1. *Regional model, with the Superior Court of California, County of Butte*

This is a regional program that is intended to serve at least two (2) smaller counties. This model will explore how counties that may not be able to afford a full-time attorney at a self-help center can share resources effectively with other counties. What agreements are necessary? What special challenges exist, and what can be done to overcome them?

The Superior Court of California, County of Butte is partnering with the Glenn and Tehama courts to provide assistance to self-represented litigants in the areas of small claims, unlawful detainer, eviction, fair housing, employment, SSI, enforcement of judgments, guardianships, name changes, family law issues not addressed by the Family Law Facilitator, bankruptcy, criminal appeals, Marsden-Public Defender substitutions, probate, general civil procedures, tax, tenant housing, and senior law issues. An attorney coordinator will conduct workshops and clinics through the use of real-time videoconferencing, enabling self-represented litigants in three counties to receive assistance simultaneously. The program anticipates serving approximately 200 people<sup>1</sup>, exclusive of family law crossover cases (time frame not specified).

2. *Urban collaboration model, with the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles*

This is a program intended to coordinate self-help centers in a large jurisdiction. In some jurisdictions a number of self-help centers operate in or near the court, often with limited communication or sharing of resources. This is likely to lead to duplication of efforts and confusion for litigants. The urban collaboration model seeks to coordinate resources and provide a more seamless service delivery system for litigants.

The Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles will create a centralized Self-Help Management Center that will develop partnerships with the court, the local bar, local schools, and local social service organizations; coordinate self-help activities on a county-wide basis; and standardize self-help intake procedures and protocols throughout the county. Services rendered by the center include the provision of informational materials about the court and its proceedings and procedures; instructions on how to complete forms; and

---

<sup>1</sup> The number of people estimated to be served by each of the model programs is preliminary and could change once the Centers are operational. These estimates are only intended to give the contractor a general sense of the scope of the project.

the provision of reference materials regarding legal service providers, social service agencies, and government agencies, as well as other educational material. Clients can attend workshops or receive one-on-one assistance. An estimate was not provided as to the anticipated number of people to be served by the program.

3. *Technology model, with the Superior Court of California, County of Contra Costa*

This is a program intended to emphasize the use of technology in providing services. As the number of self-represented litigants increases, technological solutions are being explored for completion of forms, provision of information, meeting with litigants at a distance, and other needed services. This model will utilize and evaluate the effectiveness of at least two (2) methods of utilizing technology to provide services.

The Superior Court of California, County of Contra Costa will combine and deliver expert information and assistance via the Internet, computer applications, and real-time videoconference workshops to create a Virtual Self-Help Law Center for self-represented litigants with dissolution, child custody and visitation, domestic violence, civil, and guardianship cases. Virtual Self-Help Law Center resources will help parties navigate the court process; complete, file, and serve court forms; handle their court hearings; understand and comply with court orders; and conduct certain mediations at a distance. Program staff estimate that workshops will serve around 4,000 people per year and that about 25 mediation sessions per year will be held via videoconferencing.

4. *Spanish-speaking model, with the Superior Court of California, County of Fresno*

The large number of Spanish-speaking litigants in California presents special challenges for self-help programs. This model will seek to provide cost-effective and efficient services for a primarily Spanish-speaking population while exploring techniques for educating litigants about the legal issues and procedures in their cases.

The Spanish Self-Help Education and Information Center developed by the Superior Court of California, County of Fresno will serve self-represented litigants in the areas of guardianship, unlawful detainer, civil harassment, and family law. The center will provide daily access to Spanish language self-help instructions, establish a volunteer interpreter bureau, provide a Spanish-speaking Court Examiner to review court documents, and sponsor clinics with rotating "how-to" lectures for the areas of law specified above. Taking together all of these various forms of assistance, the program will serve an estimated 250 people per week.

5. *Multilingual model, with the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco*

California has a diverse population with a large group of immigrants and litigants who speak many different languages and have significantly different experiences. This model will seek to provide self-help services to litigants who speak a wide variety of languages and develop materials and techniques to address the needs of a multilingual, multicultural population.

The Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco's program establishes a Multi-Lingual Court Access Service Project which will assist self-represented litigants in family law, dependency mediation, probate, small claims, civil harassment, child support, and other general civil cases. The center will create formal partnerships with community-based organizations that provide services to ethnic populations and those that address legal issues for self-represented litigants. A bilingual attorney will work with clients to ensure adequate services for them within the court and provide referrals to appropriate community and legal agencies. Additional services include the translation of court materials, the development of a multi-lingual computerized self-help directory, and recruitment and coordination of multi-lingual interpreters. Approximately 300 people will be served in the first year, increasing to 450, then 650 in the following two years.

These five (5) programs will provide models for replication in other counties in addition to translated materials and technological solutions.

1.3 Evaluation Requirement

The Judicial Council is required to submit an evaluation to the Legislature by March 1, 2005, on the efficiency and effectiveness of the Model Self-Help Pilot Programs in assisting self-represented litigants.

The AOC will contract with the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco ("Court") to oversee the evaluation of the five (5) pilot self-help centers. The Court will assemble a "Project Team" comprised of the AOC Project Manager for the Model Self Help Pilot Projects, AOC research staff, as well as representatives from the project counties.

## 2.0 PURPOSE OF THIS RFP

### 2.1 Introduction

The AOC seeks the services of a consultant to evaluate the five pilot programs. The evaluator should have expertise in conducting and managing large-scale research/data collection projects that involve a wide range of both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Experience working collaboratively to create a research design is also highly desirable. Due to the broad scope of this project, it may be necessary for the consultant to subcontract with other firms for certain portions of the research.

The evaluation presents a unique challenge—but also a unique opportunity—in that there has been relatively little research on the population of self-represented litigants. Moreover, the expected outcomes for the programs have, in large part, not been measured before. As such, the research design will be a collaborative process, and the outcomes, measures (including baseline data), and methodologies will be developed in conjunction with AOC and program staff.

Another distinctive and challenging aspect of the evaluation is that it involves both multiple sites and multiple programs. While each of the programs is very different, they are designed to address very similar outcomes. Applicants should carefully consider this issue when developing the research design and data collection methods.

### 2.2 Research Questions and Objectives

The primary goal of the research is to measure the overall effectiveness of the Centers in several arenas. The Centers may address several or all of the following outcomes.

- *Increased understanding of, and compliance with, the terms of court orders*  
Self-represented litigants, lacking an attorney to explain the system to them, often misunderstand orders made by the court. Self-help centers are expected to better educate self-represented litigants about the legal system and legal procedures so they will be more likely to understand the court orders and the consequences for noncompliance. They will also be more likely to believe that the court has been fair in its decision, leading them to take more responsibility in following its orders.
- *Increased access to justice*  
Much of the target population is unable to penetrate the court system due to geographic/transportation and language barriers, financial constraints, and a lack of knowledge and resources. As a result, many people who want to bring

their cases to court simply cannot, and others may not even be aware that they have legal recourse. The self-help centers seek to bridge these gaps so that self-represented litigants will be better able to navigate and make proper use of the court system.

- *Increased likelihood of “just” outcomes in cases involving self-represented litigants*

Many self-represented litigants come to court ill prepared and do not know how to properly present their cases. As a result, the court may lack information or have inaccurate information upon which to base its rulings. In turn, litigants may not get the outcome they were seeking and end up feeling that the system is unfair. Self-help centers will educate users so that they can present their best case and feel that their voice has been heard.

- *Increased user satisfaction with the court process*

When self-represented litigants have improved access to the assistance they need, learn how to navigate the court system, and are better prepared to present their cases, the system can respond more appropriately to their needs and they will be more satisfied with their experiences.

- *Increased efficiency and effectiveness of the court system*

Self-represented litigants often come to court with forms that are improperly filled out, or with the wrong forms altogether. They are uninformed about court procedures. These types of problems slow down court proceedings and may cause the matter to be continued or taken off calendar. Self-help centers will provide assistance in filling out forms and educate self-represented litigants on procedures so they are better prepared to handle their matters and so their cases will move more smoothly through the system.

- *Increased education for court users so that their expectations are reasonable in light of the law and facts*

Self-help centers will educate clients on the court system, legal terms, procedures, and their rights and responsibilities. When the mystery is removed from the process, self-represented litigants will have a more realistic view of the merits of their case and potential recourse.

Secondary goals of the research include developing a profile of Center users and determining which services and delivery methods are most helpful/effective.

Though the evaluation is largely intended to measure the impact of the Centers, the fact that these are innovative pilot programs requires that some process evaluation elements be incorporated into the research. This primarily comprises documenting the development of the Centers and tracking changes that might affect outcomes over time; describing program operations, including how the Centers are set up

and how services are delivered; and assessing the outreach efforts and visibility of the Centers. Additionally, a key objective of the project is to provide models for replication across the state, so the documentation should be sufficiently detailed to permit replication of the programs in other counties.

### 2.3 Research Design

The complexity of both the research questions and the programs themselves necessitates the use of a combination of research methods, both quantitative and qualitative. Prior research in this and similar areas makes a case for using a pre-post design and/or a comparison group design (i.e., self-represented litigants who receive assistance from self-help centers vs. those who do not). Applicants are encouraged to consider these designs, as well as any others that may be appropriate, and recommend an approach.

### 2.4 Baseline Data Collection

An integral component of the impact assessment, to be undertaken before the Centers are up and running, is the collection of baseline (court/system) data to facilitate the pre/post measurement of the program's impact. Applicants should consider the various measures that may be suitable for the evaluation and recommend those that would best speak to desired program outcomes.

The availability of baseline data has not been fully explored, will vary from county to county, and is expected to be minimal. The nature and extent of technology available for data collection at each of the sites is also unknown. In the initial stages of the project, the evaluator will work with program staff and make site visits to identify and gather data that are readily obtainable and develop strategies for collecting data that are not readily obtainable.

### 2.5 Data Collection Methods

In order to measure the outcomes outlined above, it will be necessary to collect data from a variety of sources using a variety of methods. Potential data sources and data collection strategies may include, but are not limited to:

#### *Client and case information*

- ◆ client intake and exit forms;
- ◆ client surveys;
- ◆ post-hearing interviews;
- ◆ case file review; and
- ◆ case tracking forms.

#### *Court information*



- ◆ court staff surveys, interviews, and/or focus groups; and
- ◆ courtroom observation.

*Program operations information*

- ◆ Center observation; and
- ◆ collaborator/service provider surveys, interviews, and/or focus groups.

Applicants should explore these and other potentially suitable methods and propose a strategy.

Data collection should be as consistent as possible across all five (5) sites. However, since each of the Centers is unique in terms of geographic location, target population, services offered, and service delivery methods (among other factors), it is expected that some measurements will be possible in some sites and not in others. The project team will work with the evaluator to establish mandatory and optional data elements.

### **3.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES**

3.1 The consultant will be asked to:

- 3.1.1 Meet and work with the Project Team shortly after the contract has been awarded to develop the research design and an evaluation plan as well as to determine the best measures to assess the impact of the Centers. Factors to be considered in deciding upon measures include how readily obtainable the data are and whether they will accurately provide measures of the effect of the Centers.
- 3.1.2 Develop and provide a written evaluation, research, and analysis plan based on the results of the meetings in 3.1.1.
- 3.1.3 Define outcome measures, study groups, and evaluation methods for the impact evaluation and develop a design for the process evaluation.
- 3.1.4 Identify and/or develop and field test data collection instruments.
- 3.1.5 Identify what baseline data (if any) are available at each of the courts where the Centers are located. Gather existing baseline data and develop methods for collecting baseline data where additional needs/gaps are identified.
- 3.1.6 Perform ongoing data collection related to measures chosen above.
- 3.1.7 Design, maintain, and clean databases containing all project-related data.
- 3.1.8 Hold periodic meetings/conference calls with Project Team to ensure consistency and adherence to project goals as well as to discuss overall progress of research efforts.
- 3.1.9 Provide the Project Team with interim progress reports including preliminary findings.
- 3.1.10 Perform all analysis and provide final presentation materials for the report to the Legislature. Coordinate with the Project Team to determine how to best present final results. Provide all analysis data sets to the AOC.

#### **4.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL**

The following information shall be included in the proposal:

- 4.1 Name, address, telephone and fax numbers, and social security number or federal tax identification number.
- 4.2 Please submit one (1) original and seven (7) copies of the proposal signed by an authorized representative of the bidder. The proposal shall include the name, title, address, and telephone number of the individual who is the responder's designated representative.
- 4.3 One (1) original copy of the proposal **MUST** be submitted that bears the original signature of the bidder, a corporate officer, or an authorized agent of the bidder. Signature facsimile stamps will not be accepted.
- 4.4 Resumes describing the background and experience of key staff, as well as each individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities.
- 4.5 Describe the qualifications and relevant experience of any subcontractors to be used. If subcontractors are included as key staff, resumes must be provided under 4.3.
- 4.6 Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of two (2) clients for whom the consultant has conducted similar services, as well as any work product associated with the projects. The AOC may check references listed by the consultant.
- 4.7 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 AOC's instructions, requirements of this RFP, and completeness and clarity of content.
- 4.8 Overall plan with time estimates for completion of all work required.
- 4.9 Method to complete the project:
  - 4.9.1 Proposed methodology. Discuss research methods appropriate to this project, the outcomes/research questions they are intended to address, and the rationale for choosing them. In cases where more than one method may be appropriate for a particular measure, address each along with its benefits and drawbacks.

- 4.9.2 Proposed baseline measures. Describe the measures that would best address expected outcomes, as well as how you will work with the sites to obtain the data.
- 4.9.3 Proposed data collection methods/protocols. For the research methods proposed above, describe how data collection will be carried out, including the types of instruments to be used and database development and maintenance.
- 4.9.4 Proposed quality control measures. Describe what steps will be taken to ensure the accuracy and consistency of data collected, including how data collection efforts will be supervised.
- 4.9.5 Proposed analysis and reporting. Describe what types of analyses will be performed, how they will address the research questions, and how results will be presented.
- 4.9.6 Confidentiality plan. Describe your plan for maintaining the confidentiality of all data collected during the evaluation.
- 4.9.7 Strategy for dealing with a multi-site project. As noted in the project description, five (5) unique self-help centers will be located in five (5) different counties throughout the state. Discuss how you will address evaluating different programs in different locations and how the research can most effectively be coordinated, paying particular attention to maintaining as much consistency as possible across the Centers.
- 4.9.8 Proposed project and team organization. Outline the staff members to be involved and their specific duties on the project. If subcontractors will be used, discuss which components of the evaluation they will be handling and how work with them will be coordinated.

## **5.0 COST PROPOSAL**

Submit a detailed line item budget showing total cost of the services. Fully explain and justify all budget line items in a narrative entitled "Budget Justification" which is to include at a minimum:

- Total number of hours required to complete each component of the project
- Hourly rate for each key project staff person
- Number of hours each key project staff person will spend on each RFP task/segment
- Operating and expenses costs including all incidentals
- Travel costs including expected airfares, car mileage, local transportation costs, lodging and meals

➤ Consultant/contractual costs

The budget should propose a set amount for each component of the project as described in the scope of services (3.1). The total cost for consultant services will be evaluated by the AOC. However, in no event will the cost exceed \$400,000 inclusive of personnel, materials, computer support, travel, lodging, per diem, and overhead rates. The method of payment to the consultant will be by cost reimbursement based on the set amount for each component of the project.

## **6.0 RIGHTS**

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 (1) copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and becomes a public record.

Only written responses will be accepted. Responses should be sent by registered, certified, or express mail or by hand delivery. The consultant may send the AOC an advance copy by facsimile or e-mail to the Project Manager at the fax number/e-mail address listed in Section 7.0, below. However, sending an advance copy by fax does not satisfy the submission requirements of paragraph 4.2.

## **7.0 PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

The Project Manager for this RFP process is:

Bonnie Rose Hough, Supervising Attorney  
Center for Families, Children & the Courts  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660  
415-865-7668  
415-865-7217  
bonnie.hough@jud.ca.gov

## **8.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS**

An evaluation team will review in detail all proposals that are received to determine the extent to which they comply with the RFP requirements. Proposals will be evaluated by using the following criteria:

- a. Quality of methodology and work plan submitted

- ♦ Statement of purpose. Demonstrates an understanding of the scope of services to be provided and major issues surrounding dealing with self-represented litigants in the courts.
  - ♦ Study approach and proposed methodology. Contains items specified in section 3.1 of the RFP and appears reasonable, given the scope and time frame of the study.
  - ♦ Work plan. Work plan is reasonable, given study objectives and RFP requirements.
- b. Experience on assignments that are similar in scope, subject matter, and/or research methods
  - c. Familiarity with the California court system/processes
  - d. Credentials of staff/subcontractors to be assigned to the project
  - e. Ability to meet timing requirements to complete the project
  - f. Reasonableness of cost projections
  - g. Compliance with the RFP guidelines

## 9.0 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### 9.1 Bidders' Conference

A bidders' conference will be held to clarify aspects of this RFP and provide bidders with an opportunity to ask questions about the project. Attendance at the conference is not mandatory. A conference is set for **11 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. PDT on May 7, 2002** at the Judicial Council office in San Francisco. Please RSVP to Bonnie Hough at 415-865-7668 or by e-mail at [bonnie.hough@jud.ca.gov](mailto:bonnie.hough@jud.ca.gov), no later than **5 p.m. PDT on May 6, 2002**, if you plan to attend the bidders' conference, in person or by conference call. The toll-free conference call number will be 1-888-318-9100.

Applicants are strongly encouraged to submit questions concerning the RFP in writing prior to the date of the conference. Questions should be directed to Bonnie Hough and may be submitted via e-mail ([bonnie.hough@jud.ca.gov](mailto:bonnie.hough@jud.ca.gov)) or fax (415-865-7217).

A summary of the issues and questions answered at the bidders' conference, as well as a summary of previously submitted questions and respective responses will be prepared in writing and posted to the CFCC website [www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc).

### 9.2 Clarification of Bids

Applicants may be asked for clarification or additional information before or after selection.

#### 9.2.1 Interview

It may be necessary to interview one (1) or more bidders to clarify aspects of their submittal or to select from two (2) or more bidders. Interviews will be scheduled on an as-needed basis and will likely take place in person or by conference call.

### 9.3 Insurance Requirements

Prior to execution of a contract, the vendor shall file with the Court endorsements from the insurer(s) certifying to the coverage of all insurance required herein. All evidences of insurance must be certified by a properly authorized officer, agent, general agent or qualified representative of the insurer(s) and shall certify the name of the insured, the type and amount of insurance, the location and operations to which the insurance applies, the expiration date, and that the Court receives notice at least forty-five (45) days prior to the effective date of any cancellation, lapse or material change in the policy. The vendor shall, upon demand of the Court, make available to the Court at the vendor's local office all such policies of insurance and the receipts of payment of premiums thereon. Failure to provide such policies of insurance within a time acceptable to the Court shall entitle the Court to suspend or terminate negotiations with the firm and enter negotiations with the next highest ranked proposer.

9.3.1 The vendor shall obtain and maintain at a minimum the limits of insurance set forth below. By requiring such minimum insurance, the Court shall not be deemed or construed to have assessed the risks that may be applicable to the vendor under the agreement. The vendor shall assess its own risks and, if it deems appropriate and/or prudent, maintain greater limits and/or broader coverage.

9.3.2 Each insurance policy shall be written on an "occurrence" form; excepting that insurance for professional liability, errors and omissions, when required, may be acceptable on a "claims made" form. If coverage is approved and purchased on a "claims made" basis, the vendor warrants continuation of coverage, either through policy renewals or the purchase of an extended discovery period, if such extended coverage is available, for not less than three years from the date of completion of the work which will be the subject of the agreement.

9.3.3 If, in order to meet the requirements of this section, the vendor must rely on the insurance to be provided by one or more subcontractor(s), then such

subcontractor(s) shall be required to meet all of the requirements herein applicable to the insurance they are providing, and must include the Court as additional insureds on their liability insurance policies.

9.3.4 Provided the affected insurance policies permit the following waiver without voiding coverage, the vendor and the Court shall waive all rights against each other to subrogation for damages covered by property insurance.

9.3.5 Minimum Scope and Limits of Insurance.

The vendor shall maintain coverage at least as broad as, and with limits no less than, the following:

a) ***General Liability:***

(1) Limits: \$1,000,000 combined single limit per occurrence for bodily injury, personal injury and property damage. If a general aggregate limit is used, then either the general aggregate limit shall apply separately to the agreement, or the general aggregate limit shall be twice the required occurrence limit.

(2) Coverage: Insurance Services Office form number (CG 00 01 Ed. 11-88) covering Commercial General Liability.

b) ***Automobile Liability:***

(1) Limits: \$1,000,000 combined single limit per accident for bodily injury and property damage.

(2) Coverage: Insurance Services Office form number (CA 00 01 Ed. 12/90) covering Business Auto Coverage, symbol 1 "any auto"; or the combination of symbols 2, 8, and 9.

c) ***Worker's Compensation/Employers Liability:***

(1) Limits: Statutory requirements of the state of residency.

(2) Coverage: as required for this work by applicable federal or "other states" state law.

9.3.6 Deductibles and Self-Insured Retention

Any deductibles or self-insured retentions must be declared to, and approved by, the Court. The deductible and/or self-insured retention of the policies shall not limit or apply to the vendor's liability to the Court and shall be the sole responsibility of the vendor.

### 9.3.7 Other Insurance Provisions

The insurance policies that are required in the agreement are to contain, or be endorsed to contain, the following provisions:

#### ***General Liability Policy:***

- (1) The Court, its officers, officials, employees, agents and the AOC, are to be covered as additional insured as respects liability arising out of activities performed by or on behalf of the vendor in connection with the agreement.
- (2) To the extent of the vendor's negligence, the vendor's insurance coverage shall be primary insurance as respects the Court, its officers, officials, employees, agents, and the AOC. Any insurance and/or self-insurance maintained by the Court, its officers, officials, employees, agents, or the AOC shall not contribute with the vendor's insurance or benefit the vendor in any way.
- (3) The vendor's insurance shall apply separately to each insured against whom a claim is made and/or lawsuit is brought, except with respect to the limits of the insurer's liability.

### 9.3.8 Acceptability of Insurers

Unless otherwise approved by the Court, insurance is to be placed with insurers with an A.M. Best's rating of no less than A:VII, or, if not rated with A.M. Best Company, with minimum surpluses the equivalent of A.M. Best's financial size category: VII.

- 9.3.9 If at any time any of the foregoing policies shall be or become unsatisfactory to the Court, as to form or substance, or if a company issuing any such policy shall be or become unsatisfactory to the Court, the vendor shall, upon notice to that effect from the Court, promptly obtain a new policy, and shall submit the same to the Court for approval with the appropriate certificates and endorsements.

## **10.0 PROPOSED CONTRACT TERMS AND ADMINISTRATIVE RULES**

Contracts with successful firms will include terms appropriate for this project. Generally, the terms of the contract will include, but are not limited to: (1) completion of the project within the timeframe provided; (2) no additional work authorized without prior approval; (3) no payment without prior approval; (4) funding availability subject to Legislature; (5)



termination of contract under certain conditions; (6) indemnification of the Court; (7) approval by the Court of any subcontractors; (8) national labor relations board, drug-free workplace, nondiscrimination, and ADA requirements; and (9) minimum appropriate insurance requirements.

Incorporated in this RFP, and attached as Attachment A, is a document entitled "Administrative Rules Governing Requests for Proposals. Consultants shall follow these rules in preparation of their proposals.

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES GOVERNING REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS**

**A. General**

1. This solicitation document, the evaluation of proposals, and the award of any contract shall conform with current competitive bidding procedures as they relate to the procurement of goods and services. A vendor's proposal is an irrevocable offer for thirty (30) days following the deadline for its submission.
2. A nondiscrimination clause will be included in any contract that ensues from this solicitation document.
3. In addition to explaining the RFP's requirements, the solicitation document includes instructions which prescribe the format and content of proposals.

**B. Errors in the solicitation document**

1. If a vendor submitting a proposal discovers any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission, or other error in this solicitation document, the vendor shall immediately provide the AOC with written notice of the problem and request that the solicitation document be clarified or modified. Without disclosing the source of the request, the AOC may modify the solicitation document prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals by issuing an addendum to all vendors to whom the solicitation document was sent.
2. If prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals a vendor submitting a proposal knows of or should have known of an error in the solicitation document but fails to notify the AOC of the error, the vendor shall bid at its own risk, and if the vendor is awarded the contract, it shall not be entitled to additional compensation or time by reason of the error or its later correction.

**C. Questions regarding the solicitation document**

1. If a vendor's question relates to a proprietary aspect of its proposal and the question would expose proprietary information if disclosed to competitors, the vendor may submit the question in writing, conspicuously marking it as "CONFIDENTIAL." With the question, the vendor must submit a statement explaining why the question is sensitive.

## Attachment A

If the AOC concurs that the disclosure of the question or answer would expose proprietary information, the question will be answered, and both the question and answer will be kept in confidence. If the AOC does not concur regarding the proprietary nature of the question, the question will not be answered in this manner and the vendor will be notified.

2. If a vendor submitting a proposal believes that one (1) or more of the solicitation document's requirements is onerous or unfair, or that it unnecessarily precludes less costly or alternative solutions, the vendor may submit a written request that the solicitation document be changed. The request must set forth the recommended change and vendor's reasons for proposing the change. Any such request must be submitted to the Project Manager, **Bonnie Hough**, at the Administrative Office of the Courts by **5 p.m. PDT on May 10, 2002**.

### **D. Addenda**

1. The AOC may modify the solicitation document prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals by faxing an addendum to the vendors to whom the solicitation document was sent. If any vendor determines that an addendum unnecessarily restricts its ability to bid, it must notify the Project Manager, **Bonnie Hough**, at the Administrative Office of the Courts no later than one (1) day following the receipt of the addendum.

### **E. Withdrawal and resubmission/modification of proposals**

1. A vendor may withdraw its proposal at any time prior to the deadline for submitting proposals by notifying the AOC in writing of its withdrawal. The notice must be signed by the vendor. The vendor may thereafter submit a new or modified proposal, provided that it is received at the Administrative Office of the Courts no later than **5 p.m. PDT on May 31, 2002**. Modification offered in any other manner, oral or written, will not be considered. Proposals cannot be changed or withdrawn after **5 p.m. PDT on May 31, 2002**.

### **F. Evaluation process**

1. An evaluation team will review in detail all proposals that are received to determine the extent to which they comply with solicitation document requirements.
2. If a proposal fails to meet a material solicitation document requirement, the proposal may be rejected. A deviation is material to the extent that a response is not in substantial accord with solicitation document

## Attachment A

requirements. Material deviations cannot be waived. Immaterial deviations may cause a bid to be rejected.

3. Proposals that contain false or misleading statements may be rejected if in the AOC's opinion the information was intended to mislead the state regarding a requirement of the solicitation document.
4. During the evaluation process, the AOC may require a vendor's representative to answer questions with regard to the vendor's proposal. Failure of a vendor to demonstrate that the claims made in its proposal are in fact true may be sufficient cause for deeming a proposal nonresponsive.

### **G. Rejection of bids**

1. The AOC may reject any or all proposals and may or may not waive an immaterial deviation or defect in a bid. The AOC's waiver of an immaterial deviation or defect shall in no way modify the solicitation document or excuse a vendor from full compliance with solicitation document specifications. *The AOC reserves the right to accept or reject any or all of the items in the proposal, and award of the contract may be made in whole or in part.* Moreover, the AOC reserves the right to make no selection if proposals are deemed to be outside the fiscal constraint or against the best interest of the government.

### **H. Award of contract**

1. Award of contract, if made, will be in accordance with the solicitation document to a responsible vendor submitting a proposal compliant with all the requirements of the solicitation document and any addenda thereto, except for such immaterial defects as may be waived by the AOC.
2. The AOC reserves the right to determine the suitability of proposals for contracts on the basis of a proposal's meeting administrative requirements, technical requirements, its assessment of the quality of service and performance of items proposed, and cost.

**I. Decision**

1. Questions regarding award of any business on the basis of proposals submitted in response to this solicitation document, or on any related matter, should be addressed to:

Bonnie Rose Hough, Supervising Attorney  
Center for Families, Children & the Courts  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

**J. Execution of contracts**

1. A reasonable effort will be made to execute any contract based on this solicitation document within thirty (30) days of selecting a proposal that best meets its requirements.
2. A vendor submitting a proposal must be prepared to use the government's contract form rather than its own contract form. If a vendor's proposal is predicated upon acceptance of the vendor's contract form or the vendor's proposed terms and conditions, the vendor's response may be considered non-responsive.

**K. Protest procedure**

1. The Administrative Office of the Courts intends to be completely open and fair to all vendors in selecting the best possible solution within budgetary and other constraints described in the solicitation document. In applying evaluation criteria and making the selection, members of the evaluation team will exercise their best judgment.
2. A vendor submitting a proposal may protest the award if it meets all the following conditions:
  - a. the vendor has submitted a proposal which it believes to be responsive to the solicitation document;
  - b. the vendor believes that its proposal meets the AOC's administrative requirements and technical requirements, proposes items or service of proven quality and performance, and offers a competitive cost; and
  - c. the vendor believes that the AOC has incorrectly selected another vendor submitting a proposal for an award.

Attachment A

3. A vendor submitting a proposal who is qualified to protest should contact the Contract Officer at the Administrative Office of the Courts at the address given below or call him at 415-865-7989.

Stephen Saddler  
Contracts Officer  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

4. If the Contract Officer is unable to resolve the protest to the vendor's satisfaction, the vendor should file a written protest within five (5) working days of the contract award notification. The written protest must state the facts surrounding the issue and the reasons the vendor believes the award to be invalid. The protest must be sent by certified or registered mail or delivered personally to:

Grant Walker  
Business Services Manager  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

A receipt should be requested for hand-delivered material.

**L. News releases**

1. News releases pertaining to the award of a contract may not be made without prior written approval of the Project Manager.

**M. Disposition of materials**

1. All materials submitted in response to this solicitation document will become the property of the AOC and will be returned only at the AOC's option and at the expense of the vendor submitting the proposal. One (1) copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and become a public record. However, any confidential material submitted by a vendor that was clearly marked as such will be returned upon request.

**N. Payment**

1. Payment terms will be specified in any agreement that may ensue as a result of this solicitation document.

Attachment A

2. **THE AOC DOES NOT MAKE ANY ADVANCE PAYMENT FOR SERVICES.** Payment is normally made based upon completion of tasks as provided in the agreement, if any. The Court may withhold ten percent (10%) of each invoice until receipt of the final product. The amount of the withhold may depend upon the length of the project and the payment schedule provide in the agreement, if any.