## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

## **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

RFP Title: Consultant for AB 1981 Jury Pilot Program RFP-OCR23-152RB

## **September 15, 2023**

\_\_\_\_\_\_

- **1. QUESTION**: Has the California Judicial Council identified the participating courts for the AB 1981 Jury Pilot Program?
  - a. If so, please share that information.
  - b. If not, what are the selection criteria? Will the Consultant be expected to assist the Judicial Council in selecting participating sites?

**ANSWER:** Currently, the confirmed participants are Alameda, El Dorado, Fresno, Imperial, San Bernardino, and Shasta.

**2. QUESTION**: Jury Compensation Pilot Program relies heavily on the cooperation/active collaboration with court staff in the participating courts for data collection. How will the Judicial Council ensure the cooperation of the participating courts in this effort?

**ANSWER:** The JCC solicited voluntary participation with the courts and have given them an overview of their court staff involvement. Each court CEO has agreed to participate based on this understanding. The JCC's assigned staffer for the pilot program would assist and facilitate this day-to-day process alongside each court's designed staff contact.

**3. QUESTION**: Many of the RFP objectives would best be achieved through in-person site visits with the participating courts. Must site visits be conducted in Phase 1 (design and preparation)? or can they be delayed until Phase 2 (baseline data collection)?

**ANSWER:** The need for site visits in Phase 1 and Phase 2 may be adjusted based on pilot program needs. There may be a need for limited site visits at specific courts to better understand implementation needs for the pilot program.

**4. QUESTION**: What are the Judicial Council expectations concerning the frequency and scope of communication about the status of data collection during the baseline data collection and/or the pilot program phases?

**ANSWER:** The JCC's expectations around communication during the course of the pilot program would be weekly updates at a minimum, typically via email and/or videoteleconference. The JCC understands there may not be significant developments to report on a weekly basis and, conversely, some weeks may require more frequent updates.

**5. QUESTION**: How is mileage currently calculated by the superior courts?

**ANSWER:** Juror mileage is currently set by statute, specifically Cal. CCP Section 215. The exact calculation is \$0.34 per mile actually traveled to and from court based on the juror's residence as listed on their summons. For those jurors using public transit, the exact methodology is determined by the court but limited to a maximum of \$12.00 per day.

**6. QUESTION**: Can the content of the juror questionnaire shown in Attachment A be modified?

**ANSWER:** Yes, the contents of the questionnaire may be modified.

7. **QUESTION**: The implementation plan states there will be a six-month period to collect data but the time period referenced (January – May 2024) offers only five months of data. Is that accurate or should the baseline data collection period be January 1-June 30, 2024?

**ANSWER:** The final baseline collection period is estimated to be between three and five months. This timeline is based on ensuring adequate time to collect reliable baseline data.

**8. QUESTION**: Does the AB 1981 Jury Pilot Program include funding for participating courts to modify their jury management systems to collect baseline and/or pilot program data? Or to extract raw data from JMS?

**ANSWER:** Some of the funding available for the pilot program may be used for administrative costs for participating courts. Funding was not secured for modifying courts' JMS platforms.

**9. QUESTION**: Will the Consultant be involved in negotiating with local public transportation agencies to secure free access for prospective jurors?

**ANSWER:** No, that specific task is outside the scope of this pilot program and is the responsibility of each individual trial court.

**10. QUESTION**: Please clarify the role of the Consultant as described in Section 2(A) of the RFP. Is the primary role to advise the Judicial Council and the participating courts on how to best achieve the goals of the pilot project and to report on the project's effectiveness? Or is the anticipated role closer to contracted staff who will operate at the direction of the Judicial Council?

**ANSWER:** The role of the consultant is advisory and operational. The consultant will help the JCC determine how to best implement the pilot program and leading the effort with JCC support to complete the pilot program.

**11. QUESTION**: What is the expected budget for the Consultant services?

**ANSWER:** The JCC does not have an expected budget.

**12. QUESTION**: We would appreciate any information about what you like to see in a proposal of this nature. We see that it is to be "concise" and to have a technical and cost portion. But within, e.g., the technical portion, how long is the proposal in terms of word count or pages? If you have sample proposal from a different project, that would be particularly helpful. (I understand if that cannot be shared, but I just wanted to inquire.)

**ANSWER:** We do not have a word or page count. We defer to each individual vendor to determine how much information they need to provide for their proposal. We would appreciate it if proposals could be as detailed as possible.

**13. QUESTION**: As academics, we are typically very interested in publishing results from a consultation for the good of the scholarly and court community. Will it be possible to publish data on the results of any project we work on?

**ANSWER:** The results of the pilot program will be published and sent to the California State Legislature as a legislatively mandated report. As such, the findings of the pilot program will be public.

**14. QUESTION**: When it comes to a budget, it sounds as if every possible piece of the project should be included as costs. As an example, when New Jersey collected data from its juries, it developed a system in which ID numbers were created to link a demographic survey with the JMS outcome record. That required including peel-off numbers that were affixed to a juror badge and to a survey the juror filled out. If we proposed a similar system, there would be costs associated with generating the peel-off numbers. Those types of costs are to be included, correct?

**ANSWER:** Yes, please include any costs for materials that may be necessary to complete the pilot program based on your proposal.