



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
FINANCE DIVISION

DATE: October 26, 2009

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: The purpose of this document is to publish the AOC's Responses to Vendors' Questions, directed to the Solicitations@jud.ca.gov by October 12, 2009, at close of business.

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposal (RFP),
Project Title: REVIEW OF STATEWIDE UNIFORM CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINE
RFP Number: CFCC 15-09-LM

DATE AND TIME PROPOSAL DUE: There will not be a pre-proposal conference for this RFP.
Proposals must be received by **November 2, 2009, at close of business.**

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: Proposals must be sent to:
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP No. CFCC 15-09-LM
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

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

AOC RESPONSES TO VENDORS' QUESTIONS

Question 1: Please provide the relative evaluation weighting for SPSS knowledge and experience requirement. If a proposed staff has many years experience and expertise in using the Statewide Uniform Child Support Guidelines, and experience in statistical analysis, but does not have specific experience in SPSS, will that staff person be disqualified?

Answer: Section 6.3.1.2 of the RFP document requires experience in collecting and manipulating large data sets. Lack of knowledge and experience using SPSS could result in duplicative data entry for the project and affect the ability to meet the timelines. Lack of knowledge/experience with SPSS could result in a reduction of the points allotted for that criterion; but would not result in immediate disqualification. See RFP, section 5.3.

Question 2: Could the AOC extend the proposal due date to one week after AOC posts the responses to the bidders' questions due October 12, 2009? This would give potential bidders adequate time to incorporate AOC's responses to the questions.

Answer: Pursuant to Addendum 1, the period for submission of the proposal is extended two weeks to November 2, 2009, at close of business.

Question 3: The report of the 2005 guideline review says that AOC managed all data collection in the field. Will the AOC coordinate or hire data collectors and train them, collect completed forms, review forms for completeness, and send the forms to the contractor for data entry?

Answer: Yes, the AOC will coordinate or hire and train data collectors, collect and review completed forms and send them to the contractor for data entry.

Question 4: Regarding the focused discussion group described in paragraph 2.5 of Attachment 2, Exhibit D, will the AOC provide meeting space and pay travel expenses for the child support commissioner's focus group?

Answer: Yes, commissioner travel for the focus groups will be covered by the AOC. Meeting space will also be covered by the AOC.

Question 5: We have concerns that attendance of in-person focused discussion groups with representatives of stakeholders will be low. Would the AOC entertain surveys, telephone interviews, and/or other means for obtaining valued input from stakeholders instead of the focused discussion groups with representatives of parents' and children's advocacy groups?

Answer: Based upon advocate interest already expressed regarding this child support guideline review, the AOC is expecting sufficient in-person interest to gather the valued input of these stakeholders.

Question 6: Paragraph B on page 2 of the Attachment 2, Exhibit C says that the hourly rate “shall include all costs, fees, overhead, and profits payable to the Contractor.” It appears that the only allowable direct expense is travel. Please clarify how large direct expenses should be handled. Specifically, would it be possible to budget direct expenses that are not typically part of audited overhead rates (e.g., rental of hotel conference rooms and professional transcription and tapes for the focused discussion groups) as direct expenses and separate line items?

Answer: Allowable direct expenses include travel, meals, lodging, administrative and operating costs, such as transcription and tapes. See Addendum 2. Conference rooms for focus groups will be arranged by AOC staff.

Question 7: Family Code section 4054 has mandatory requirements above and beyond those listed in the RFP. May a Proposal include those additional mandatory requirements? In particular, and in addition to those listed in the RFP, Family Code section 4054(f) has mandatory requirements to consult with members of DCSS, Certified Family Law Specialists, Academicians specializing in family law, and Representatives of low-income parents and recipients of welfare, could a Proposal include those additional groups?

Answer: These requirements were not included in the RFP because AOC staff will meet those requirements by conducting outreach to those groups and requesting their input which will be included in the public comment portion of the study and incorporated into the body of the study as appropriate.

Question 8: In addition to those listed in the RFP, Family Code section 4054(g) has separate, mandatory requirement to seek Public Comment in developing recommendations, may a Proposal include Public Comment as part of its development of its recommendations? If so, may a Contractor utilize online survey services? If so, could the AOC Project Manager facilitate providing a link of the Court website to encourage broad participation of the Public?

Answer: The draft report and recommendations will be subject to a public comment period that will be available online on the AOC website. AOC staff will assemble these comments and AOC staff, in consultation with the Judicial Council’s Family & Juvenile Advisory committee, will provide responses to each comment. All public comments and responses will be included in the final report.

Question 9: May a Contractor propose and offer to perform additional, novel review options, e.g.:

- Review of Legislative response to prior recommendations;
- Review of Guideline in view of current economic crisis;
- Review of child support orders in cases in which both parents have high levels of responsibility for the children;
- Review of the treatment of the income of a subsequent spouse or non-marital partner;
- Review of the treatment of children from prior or subsequent relationships; and,
- Review of whether the Guideline affects child custody litigation or the efficiency of the judicial process?

Answer: A responsive proposal will satisfy the requirements set forth in RFP section 6.0, Specifics of a Responsive Technical Proposal and 7.0, Specifics of a Responsive Cost Proposal. A responsive proposal will be evaluated using the criteria set forth in RFP: 5.0, Evaluation of Proposals. The AOC will not

Project Title: Review of Statewide Uniform Child Support Guideline

RFP Number: CFCC 15-09-LM

evaluate other or additional options proposed. However, be advised that many of the topics suggested above may fall under the requirements of the RFP and others have been addressed in prior studies.

Question 10: May non-selected Proposers submit a competent and professional Peer Review, pro bono and in parallel with the contracted Review?

Answer: No, the existing process allows opportunity for critical input regarding the study. Public comments may be as extensive as the commentator chooses and will be appended to the study and become part of the public record.

Question 11: Might the proposal period be extended to sixty (60) days, which is the customary professional standard for the industry and the type of work being requested?

Answer: Pursuant to Addendum 1, the period for submission of the proposal is extended two weeks to November 2, 2009, at close of business.

END OF FORM