



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
(AOC)**

REGARDING:

COST BENEFIT AND QUALITATIVE
EVALUATION OF PILOT PROJECTS UNDER
THE SARGENT SHRIVER CIVIL COUNSEL ACT

RFP: CFCC 12-13-LM

PROPOSALS DUE:

MAY 22, 2014

NO LATER THAN 2:00 P.M. PACIFIC TIME

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (“RFP”)

- 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 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 (“CFCC”), housed in the AOC’s Judicial and Court Operations Services Division, is dedicated to improving the quality of justice and services to meet the diverse needs of children, youth, and self-represented litigants.
- 1.3 This RFP is the means for prospective service providers to submit their qualifications and request selection as a selected service provider for the Work of this RFP, as defined in *Attachment 2, Exhibit D, Work to be Performed*. The services sought are those of a person or entity with expertise in social science, civil justice research and/or public entity cost-benefit analysis with 5-10 years of professional experience in program evaluation. A prospective service provider should be familiar with California trial courts, particularly in the areas of housing, child custody, and probate and should have experience in gathering and synthesizing information from multiple datasets. The selected service providers (person or entity) will provide the AOC with the Deliverables set forth in *3.0 Description of the Services*.
- 1.4 It is the intention of the AOC to award contracts to selected service providers to assist with the design and implementation of the cost-benefit study. The Work of Phase 1 is estimated to begin **June 23, 2014** and conclude February 28, 2015 (“**Initial Term**”). The compensation for Initial Term shall range from \$250,000 to \$290,000. The AOC, at its sole discretion, may exercise an additional Term of twelve (12) months. The Work of Phases I and II shall comprise the additional Term (“**First Option Term**”) of March 1, 2015 through February 29, 2016. The compensation for the First Option Term shall range from \$250,000 to \$400,000. The total of both Terms is nineteen (19) Deliverables.

2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The Sargent Shriver Evaluation Project. AB 590 (Feuer) establishes a pilot project to be administered by the Judicial Council for the appointment of legal representation for unrepresented low-income parties in civil matters involving critical issues, such as domestic violence, child custody, housing and elder abuse so that judicial decisions are made on the basis of the necessary information and the parties have an adequate understanding of the orders to which they are subject.

Expanding representation will not only improve access to the courts and the quality of justice obtained by these individuals, but will allow court calendars that currently include many unrepresented litigants to be handled more effectively and efficiently. The legislation is located at: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill/asm/ab_0551-0600/ab_590_bill_20091011_chaptered.pdf

- 2.2 Nine pilot projects were selected by the Judicial Council and began operation in early 2012. The pilot projects are in the following counties: Los Angeles (two pilot projects), San Diego (two pilot projects), Santa Barbara, Kern, San Francisco, Yolo and Sacramento. All projects involve legal service providers working in collaboration with local superior courts to provide representation and other assistance to low income Californians who are facing a represented party. Five of the pilot projects provide representation in housing matters; three programs focus on family cases with a disputed child custody matter; and one provides services in guardianship and conservatorship proceedings. Under the terms of the legislation, the pilot projects may be renewed or changed commencing October 1, 2014.

In all pilot projects, the legal service providers collaborate closely with the California Superior Court to ensure that a range of services is available to pilot program participants, including those services currently operated by the court such as self-help centers, family law facilitators, workshops and other educational services. In addition, the pilots have established new systems in the court such as early settlement calendars, specialty housing staff and new mediation services.

- 2.3 AB 590 requires the Judicial Council to conduct an evaluation to demonstrate the effectiveness and continued need for the pilot programs, and to report its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature on or before January 31, 2016.

- 2.4 **Phase 1.** Phase 1 of the evaluation began in 2012, and includes the following components:

2.4.1 **Process Evaluation:** Includes data collection on client demographics and outcomes (Administrative Data) and preliminary site visits to document program structure and court innovations. Pilot program sites enter or import de-identified client data directly into the Administrative Data using the online survey tool, Qualtrics. The contractor provides support to the program sites, manages data quality assurance, and submits monthly extract files to the AOC.

2.4.2 **Comparative Studies:** Customized for eight of the nine sites using a variety of methodologies that best fit the program. Single group design and naturalistic design are used in several sites. Random assignment is used in two housing programs and one custody program to compare full representation to routinely offered self-help services. Follow up client interviews will be conducted at the three random assignment sites.

Additional site visits for in-depth program study and stakeholder interviews and court file review are also employed for comparative study sites.

2.4.3 Phase 1 data sources available to the evaluator include the following:

2.4.3.1 Two year de-identified client database including demographic and outcome data

2.4.3.2 De-identified follow up client interview database

2.4.3.3 Court case file review database

2.4.3.4 Quarterly narrative reports submitted by programs and courts

2.4.4 Phase 1 shall continue throughout the project and the data from Phase I shall be incorporated into the Report to the Legislature.

2.5 **Phase 2.** Phase 2 of the evaluation will focus on a cost-benefit analysis of the pilot programs utilizing the Phase 1 qualitative and quantitative data, as well as additional data collected during Phase 2. In addition, the contractor will continue to support the Administrative Data collection implemented during Phase 1. It is possible that new pilot sites will be added so the Administrative Data collection component could involve bringing new sites onto the system, which involves setting up accounts, providing training, and ongoing technical assistance. AB 590 outlines the following areas of interest for the cost-benefit study.

2.5.1 Improved court effectiveness and efficiency. For example, shorter hearings, fewer improper defaults, fewer incorrect pleadings, fewer continuances, greater likelihood of settlement, and preserved judicial neutrality.

2.5.2 Improved outcomes for litigants that result in reduced need and lower costs for other state and local services. Examples may include agencies that provide temporary housing, social services, law enforcement, physical health services, mental health services, unemployment services, and school district costs associated with children changing schools.

2.5.3 Identification of strategies to provide the appropriate services at the lowest cost. What approaches have been most effective in indentifying the right services for litigants?

2.5.4 Positive economic and other impacts to the community.

The primary Deliverable for Phase 2 is a draft Report to the Legislature presenting the findings and conclusions from both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the evaluation study. For an example of a recent Report to the Legislature, please see: <http://courts.ca.gov/documents/lr-SB-678-April-2013.pdf>. The review timeline for a legislative report is approximately six months, with at

least two preliminary drafts required. In addition to program staff review, the contractor will incorporate feedback from the Shriver Evaluation Advisory Board, convened prior to the launch of Phase 1.

2.6 **Phase 3.** Phase 3 of the project will involve reviewing all data sources and determining if any further information is needed to address the questions set out by the legislature in AB 590. It requires development of a plan to obtain any further data and to incorporate that additional data into the final draft of the Report to the Legislature.

2.7 **Website.** Additional information about the documents pertaining to this solicitation, including electronic copies of the solicitation documents, can be found on the California Courts' Website, at www.courts.ca.gov/rfps.htm.

3.0 DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES FOR THE INITIAL TERM

Deliverables 1-9 are in tangible form and submitted to the AOC Project Manager.

NO.	DELIVERABLE DESCRIPTION FOR THE INITIAL TERM
1.	Submit monthly extract of de-identified Administrative Data (continuation of Phase 1). Include a brief report on cases entered/edited during the report period and data quality assurance checks and results. Review data with AOC Project Manager and sites. Support existing pilot sites and any new sites by providing technical assistance with Qualtrics and conducting trainings.
2.	Submit a Phase 2 Research Plan that outlines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Cost-benefit analysis design that uses existing data sources where possible and proposes additional data collection to meet the study objectives. ➤ Project timeline.
3.	Meet with Pilot Programs, Project Manager and Shriver Evaluation Committee to discuss Research Plan, submit revised plan based upon feedback.
4.	Submit a data collection protocol report that outlines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Analysis of existing data sources and identification of gaps where additional data collection will be needed for the cost-benefit analysis. Examples of additional data collection may include use of outside data sources, additional Administrative Data, additional client interviews, additional stakeholder interviews, etc. ➤ Sources of data and methodology for data collection. ➤ Methods for data transfers. Include proposed methods for assuring data quality and maintaining data confidentiality. ➤ Training on protocol for Pilot Programs.
5.	➤ Submit monthly extract of Phase 2 data including qualitative data from interviews, case file review and other data collections as set out in approved Research Plan.

NO.	DELIVERABLE DESCRIPTION FOR THE INITIAL TERM
6.	<p>Submit a preliminary data analysis report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report shall address the following research questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Identifying the right service: The pilot programs offer a variety of services to litigants, including those offered by the courts and mediation providers. What strategies have been effective in matching litigants with the “lowest cost service”? What are the costs of the services? ➤ Vulnerable populations: What additional challenges exist for litigants with disabilities? What additional costs are associated with litigants who face disabilities and have pilot programs identified strategies for improving outcomes for this population? What is the impact on families and children? ➤ Cost of negative outcomes: What are the costs to litigants, courts, other public agencies, and communities associated with negative or less favorable physical, monetary, financial/credit, and legal outcomes? For example, what are short term and long term affects to adults and children who experience homelessness? What are the costs to courts of continuances? What is the cost to law enforcement to respond to family disputes over custody? ➤ Savings with positive outcomes: What are the savings for litigants, courts, other public agencies and communities associated with positive or more favorable physical, monetary, financial/credit, and legal outcomes? ➤ Community impacts: Can community factors be identified that impact litigant outcomes and/or that are impacted by litigant outcomes? What costs and savings are associated? ➤ Profile of successful program: What factors combine to offer the best opportunity for cost savings while achieving positive outcomes? What are the pilot program services, case characteristics, litigant characteristics, and community resources/support or other factors?
7.	<p>The report shall present findings and describe methods and statistical tests used to analyze data. Meet with Pilot Programs, Project Manager and Shriver Evaluation Committee to review preliminary data analysis report.</p>
8.	<p>Submit revised report based upon feedback regarding original draft of Data Analysis report.</p>
9.	<p>Provide quarterly reports on the evaluation to the AOC Project manager and attend meetings for the Shriver Evaluation Advisory Board and Shriver Implementation Committee to review data, answer questions, and obtain feedback on progress to date on evaluation and future plans.</p>

4.0 DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES FOR THE FIRST OPTION TERM

Deliverables 10-19 are in tangible form and submitted to the AOC Project Manager.

NO.	DELIVERABLE DESCRIPTION FOR THE FIRST OPTION TERM
10.	Submit monthly extract of de-identified Administrative Data (continuation of Phase 1). Include a brief report on cases entered/edited during the report period and data quality assurance checks and results. Review data with AOC Project Manager and sites. Support existing pilot sites and any new sites by providing technical assistance with Qualtrics and conducting trainings.
11.	Submit a Phase 3 Research Plan that addresses any unanswered questions from Phases 1 and 2, which are required for the report to the legislature or would be of assistance to the legislature and Judicial Council in determining next steps with the project. Develop timeline for completion.
12.	Meet with Pilot Programs, Project Manager and Shriver Evaluation Committee to review and obtain feedback on proposal for Phase 3. Submit revised plan.
13.	Submit a data collection protocol report for Phase 3 that outlines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Sources of data and methodology for data collection. ➤ Methods for data transfers. Include proposed methods for assuring data quality and maintaining data confidentiality. ➤ Training on protocol for Pilot Programs.
14.	Submit monthly extract of Phase 2 data including qualitative data from interviews, case file review and other data collections as set out in approved Research Plan.
15.	Submit monthly extract of Phase 3 data as set out in approved Research Plan including any qualitative data from interviews, literature reviews, case file review and other data collections.
16.	Submit Draft 1 of the Report to the Legislature with complete data analysis from Phases 1, 2 and 3 of data collection using the specified Report to the Legislature template. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data analysis report shall address the following research questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Identifying the right service: The pilot programs offer a variety of services to litigants, including those offered by the courts and mediation providers. What strategies have been effective in matching litigants with the “lowest cost service? What are the costs of the services? ➤ Vulnerable populations: What additional challenges exist for litigants with disabilities? What additional costs are associated with litigants who face disabilities and have pilot programs identified strategies for improving outcomes for this population? What is the impact on families and children? ➤ Cost of negative outcomes: What are the costs to litigants, courts, other public agencies, and communities associated with negative or less favorable physical, monetary, financial/credit, and legal outcomes? For example, what are short term and long terms impacts to adults and children who experience homelessness? What are the costs to courts of continuances? What is the cost to law enforcement to respond to family disputes over custody?

NO.	DELIVERABLE DESCRIPTION FOR THE FIRST OPTION TERM
16.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Savings with positive outcomes: What are the savings for litigants, courts, other public agencies and communities associated with positive or more favorable physical, monetary, financial/credit, and legal outcomes? ➤ Community impacts: Can community factors be identified that impact litigant outcomes and/or that are impacted by litigant outcomes? What costs and savings are associated? ➤ Profile of successful program: What factors combine to offer the best opportunity for cost savings while achieving positive outcomes? What are the pilot program services, case characteristics, litigant characteristics, and community resources/support or other factors? ➤ Unmet legal needs: What are the continuing unmet legal needs in the community? • The report shall present findings and describe methods and statistical tests used to analyze data.
17.	Meet with Pilot Programs, Project Manager and Shriver Evaluation Committee to review Draft Report. Submit revised report based upon feedback and additional data.
18.	Submit final draft of report to the Legislature as set out in Deliverable 16 based upon feedback and additional data gathered.
19.	Submit semi-annual reports and attend meetings for the Shriver Evaluation Advisory Board and Shriver Implementation Committee, providing a status report and preliminary findings. Agendas and meeting materials for other calls will be set in advance with project staff.

5.0 TIMELINE FOR THIS RFP

The AOC has developed the following list of key events related to this RFP. All dates are subject to change at the discretion of the AOC.

EVENT	DATE
RFP issued	April 28, 2014
Latest date and time for Questions to Solicitations@jud.ca.gov	May 12, 2014, no later than 2:00 PM (PT)
Questions and answers posted (<i>estimate only</i>)	May 14, 2014
Latest date and time proposal may be submitted	May 22, 2014, no later than 2:00 PM (PT)
Evaluation of proposals. This period includes interviews. (<i>estimate only</i>)	May 22 through June 2, 2014
Notice of Intent to Award (<i>estimate only</i>)	June 4, 2014
Negotiations and execution of contract (<i>estimate only</i>)	June 12 through June 19, 2014

EVENT	DATE
Contract start date (<i>estimate only</i>)	June 23, 2014
Contract end date (<i>estimate only</i>)	February 28, 2015

6.0 RFP ATTACHMENTS

The following attachments are included as part of this RFP:

ATTACHMENT	DESCRIPTION
Attachment 1: Administrative Rules Governing RFPs (Non-IT Services)	These rules govern this solicitation.
Attachment 2: AOC Standard Terms and Conditions	If selected, the person or entity submitting a proposal (the “Proposer”) must sign this AOC Standard Form agreement. NOTE: The provisions marked with an (*) within the Terms and Conditions are minimum contract terms and conditions (“Minimum Terms”).
Attachment 3: Proposer’s Acceptance of Terms and Conditions	On this form, the Proposer must indicate acceptance of the Terms and Conditions or identify exceptions to the Terms and Conditions. NOTE: The provisions marked with an (*) are minimum contract terms and conditions (“Minimum Terms”). On this form, the Proposer must indicate acceptance of Terms and Conditions or identify exceptions to the Terms and Conditions. NOTE: A material exception to a Minimum Term renders a proposal non-responsive.
Attachment 4: General Certifications Form	The Proposer must complete the General Certifications Form and submit the completed form with its proposal.
Attachment 5: Darfur Contracting Act Certification Form	The Proposer must complete the Darfur Contracting Act Certification and submit the completed certification with its proposal.
Attachment 6: Payee Data Record Form	This form contains information the AOC requires in order to process payments and must be submitted with the proposal.
Attachments 3-6 must be signed by an authorized representative of the Proposer.	

7.0 PAYMENT INFORMATION

7.1 Subject to the terms in *Attachment 2, Exhibit C, Payment Provisions*, the selected provider will be paid on a firm-fixed price per Deliverable basis.

- 7.2 The total cost for the Work of this RFP shall contain the following categories: position/classification titles funded, salary rates or ranges, percentage of time devoted to work, fringe benefits, operating expenses, travel expenses, overhead or indirect costs and other costs. Deliverables are specified in Attachment 2, Exhibit D, Work to be Performed.

8.0 PROPOSAL CONTENTS

The following information must be included in the Proposal. A Proposal lacking any of the following information may be deemed non-responsive.

- 8.1 **Technical Proposal.** The Technical Proposal must be double-spaced, using a standard 12-point font with at least 1-inch margins, and must not exceed 20 pages.
- 8.1.1 Describe the management structure and staffing for the project. For each key staff member: a resume describing the individual's background and experience, as well as the individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities.
- 8.1.2 Proposed methods to complete the work. Include proposed methods for all Deliverables in *Attachment 2, Exhibit D, Work to be Performed*, including the following:
- 8.1.2.1 Describe proposed data elements, data sources, and data collection strategies.
- 8.1.2.2 Describe procedures for data analysis and proposed statistical analyses to address each of the research questions listed in Section 2.5 of this RFP.
- 8.1.2.3 Describe all databases to be developed and discuss potential problems. Include proposed methods for assuring data quality and maintaining confidentiality.
- 8.1.2.4 List major milestones and activities for each Deliverable and create a timeline for completing individual tasks required for each Deliverable.
- 8.1.3 Provide the information requested for a minimum of three (3) clients for whom the Proposer has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by Proposer.
- 8.1.4 Proposer's name, address, telephone and fax numbers, and federal tax identification number. NOTE: If the Proposer is a sole proprietor using her or his social security number, the social security number will be required before finalizing a contract.

- 8.1.5 Name, title, address, telephone number, and email address of the individual who will act as Proposer's designated representative for purposes of this RFP.
- 8.1.6 Description of Proposer's competencies relevant to the project, familiarity with evaluation topic, and experience on similar assignments.
- 8.1.7 Acceptance of the Terms and Conditions
 - 8.1.7.1 Proposer must complete and submit with proposal *Attachment 3, Proposer's Acceptance of Terms and Conditions*. Proposer must complete by either indicating acceptance of the Terms and Conditions or clearly identify exceptions to the Terms and Conditions. An "exception" includes any addition, deletion, qualification, limitation or other change.
 - 8.1.7.2 *If exceptions identified*, the Proposer must also submit a redlined version of the Terms and Conditions that clearly tracks proposed changes, and a written explanation or rationale for each exception and/or proposed change.
- 8.1.8 Certifications, Attachments, and other requirements.
 - 8.1.8.1 Proposer must complete and submit with proposal *Attachment 4, General Certifications Form* to certify that no interest exists that would constitute a conflict of interest under California Public Contract Code §§10365.5, 10410 or 10411; Government Code §§1090 et seq. or 87100 et seq.; or rule 10.103 or rule 10.104 of the California Rules of Court, which restricts employees and former employees from contracting with judicial branch entities.
 - 8.1.8.2 Proposer must complete and submit with proposal *Attachment 5, Darfur Contracting Act Certification Form* to certify that Proposer is not a "scrutinized" company as defined in Public Contract Code §10476.
 - 8.1.8.3 Proposer must complete and submit with proposal *Attachment 6, Payee Data Record Form* or provide a copy of a form previously submitted to the AOC.
 - 8.1.8.4 If Proposer is a California corporation, limited liability company ("LLC"), limited partnership ("LP"), or limited liability partnership ("LLP"), proof that Proposer is in good standing in California. If Proposer is a foreign corporation, LLC, LP, or LLP, and Proposer conducts or will conduct (if awarded the contract)

intrastate business in California, provide proof that Proposer is qualified to do business and in good standing in California. If Proposer is a foreign corporation, LLC, LP, or LLP, and Proposer does not (and will not if awarded the contract) conduct intrastate business in California, proof that Proposer is in good standing in its home jurisdiction.

8.1.8.5 Proof of financial solvency or stability (e.g., balance sheets and income statements).

8.2 **Cost Proposal.** The following information must be included in the Cost Proposal.

8.2.1 A detailed line item budget for Compensation for Contract Work showing the fully loaded price per Deliverable and the total amount for all Deliverables as set forth in *Attachment 2, Exhibit D, Work to be Performed*. This budget will identify the Key Personnel, titles, hourly rates and number of hours. Cost is determined by multiplying hourly rate by the number of hours.

8.2.2 The firm fixed prices include all costs, benefits, expenses, fees, overhead, and profits payable to the Contractor for services rendered to the AOC.

NOTE: It is unlawful for any person engaged in business within this state to sell or use any article or product as a “loss leader” as defined in Section 17030 of the Business and Professions Code.

9.0 SUBMISSIONS OF PROPOSALS

9.1 Proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements of the “Proposal Contents” section below. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the RFP’s instructions, requirements, clarity and completeness of content.

9.2 The Proposer must submit its proposal in two parts, the Technical Proposal and the Cost Proposal.

9.2.1 The Proposer will submit **one (1) original and three (3) copies** each of the Technical and Cost Proposals. The originals of each Proposal must be signed by an authorized representative of the Proposer. The Technical Proposal original and copies shall be in a sealed inside envelope. The Cost Proposal original and copies shall be in a sealed inside envelope. Both Technical and Cost Proposals shall be in one (1) outside envelope. The RFP title and number shall be written on the outside envelope.

9.2.2 In addition to the Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal, submit one (1) original and one (1) copy of the original signed documents for the following:

- Attachment 2 – AOC Standard Terms and Conditions (submit if there are exceptions/modifications as indicated on Attachment 3)
- Attachment 3 – Proposer’s Acceptance of Terms and Conditions
- Attachment 4 – General Certifications Form
- Attachment 5 – Darfur Contracting Act Certification Form
- Attachment 6 – Payee Data Record Form

9.2.3 The Proposer must submit a complete electronic version of each proposal on CD-ROM. **The files contained on the CD-ROM should be in editable/unprotected Word or Excel formats as well as PDF.**

9.2.4 Only hard copy Proposals will be accepted. Proposals may not be submitted by facsimile or email. Proposals must be sent by registered or certified mail, courier service (e.g. FedEx), or delivered by hand to the address provided below.

9.3 Proposals must be delivered by the date and time listed on the coversheet of this RFP to:

Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Fiscal Services Office, Business Services
Attn: Nadine McFadden, **RFP: CFCC 12-13-LM**
455 Golden Gate Avenue 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

9.4 Late proposals will not be accepted.

9.5 Only written proposals will be accepted. Proposals must be sent by registered or certified mail, courier service (e.g. FedEx), or delivered by hand. Proposals may not be transmitted by fax or email.

10.0 OFFER PERIOD

A Proposer's proposal is an irrevocable offer for ninety (90) days following the proposal due date. In the event a final contract has not been awarded within this ninety (90) period, the AOC reserves the right to negotiate extensions to this period.

11.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

11.1 At the time proposals are opened, each proposal will be checked for the presence or absence of the required proposal contents.

11.2 The AOC will evaluate the proposals on a 100-point scale using the criteria set

forth in the table, below. Award, if made, will be to the highest-scored proposal.

CRITERIA	MAXIMUM POINTS
Quality of work plan submitted: Soundness of methodology and analytic and technical approach. Feasibility of proposed project and awareness of challenges. Adequacy of the plan to manage the project, including how various tasks are subdivided.	20
Experience on similar assignments: Demonstrated ability of proposed organization and staff to manage the project. Previous experiences of proposed staff. Credentials of staff to be assigned to the project: Qualifications and experience of proposed staff.	25
Cost: Cost-effective and complete proposed budget and budget justification.	30
Acceptance of the Terms and Conditions.	15
Ability to meet timing requirements to complete the project.	10

- 11.3 If a proposer is selected for award of this RFP, the AOC will post an Intent to Award notice on the Courts’ Website.

12.0 INTERVIEWS

The AOC shall conduct interviews with Proposers with higher initial scores to clarify aspects set forth in their proposals and to evaluate the performance of the control system software to assist in finalizing the ranking of top-ranked proposals. The AOC will not reimburse Proposers for any costs incurred in traveling to or from the interview location. The AOC will notify eligible Proposers regarding interview arrangements.

13.0 CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION PROPOSALS ARE SUBJECT TO DISCLOSURE PURSUANT TO APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC CONTRACT CODE AND RULE 10.500 OF THE CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT.

The AOC will not disclose (i) social security numbers, or (ii) balance sheets or income statements submitted by a Proposer that is not a publicly traded corporation. All other information in proposals will be disclosed in response to applicable public records requests. Such disclosure will be made regardless of whether the proposal (or portions thereof) is marked “confidential,” “proprietary,” and regardless of any statement in the proposal (a) purporting to limit the AOC’s right to disclose information in the proposal, or (b) requiring the AOC to inform or obtain the consent of the Proposer prior to the disclosure of the proposal (or portions thereof). Any proposal that is password protected, or contains portions that are password protected, may be rejected. Proposers are accordingly cautioned not to include confidential, proprietary, or privileged information in proposals.

14.0 DISABLED VETERAN BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION GOALS

The AOC has waived the inclusion of DVBE participation in this solicitation.

RFP Title: Cost Benefit and Evaluation

RFP No: CFCC 12-13-LM

15.0 PROTESTS

Any protests will be handled in accordance with Chapter 7 of the Judicial Branch Contract Manual (see www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbcl-manual.pdf). Failure of a Proposer to comply with the protest procedures set forth in that chapter will render a protest inadequate and non-responsive, and will result in rejection of the protest. The deadline for the AOC to receive a solicitation specifications protest is the proposal due date. Protests should be sent to:

AOC – Business Services
Attn: Protest Hearing Officer
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Sixth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

END OF RFP