

Jury System Bidder's Conference Questions
April 21, 2006

Vendor Attendees: Kato Lin, Mary O'Donnell (JSI)
Steve Andrews (ACS)

Court Attendees: Tim Benton, Director, Information Technology
Rick Walery, Supervisor, Information Technology
Timothy Gee, Management Analyst III, Contracts

Tim Benton gave a background on the jury system and the jury system replacement project.

Tim Benton went through the RFB page by page.

Questions:

Procurement and Evaluation Process (page 2)

Section 2.1

Key dates reviewed

JSI noted the target "go live" date as November 2006.

Procurement and Evaluation Process (page 3)

Section 2.2

Tim Benton noted that in some of the distributed copies of the RFB, his email address was incorrect. The correct email address is: tbenton@sanmateocourt.org

Bid Format and Content (page 6)

Tim Benton noted that all vendors must follow the bid format as outlined in this section.

Vendor question: How many copies of the bid does the court require?

Court answer (TG): The original bid and 2 copies of the bid.

Statement of Work (page 9)

Section 4.1.2, C, 1, f

Vendor question: Please clarify the role of the courtroom clerks in the process of posting attendance in the courtroom

Court answer (TB): The court noted that the process is for the courtroom clerks to post attendance for trials.

Vendor question: One vendor noted that the number of courtroom clerks posting attendance at one time would be a factor in the number of licenses required for their product.

Court answer (TB): The court estimated that 15 concurrent licenses would be needed.

Vendor question: What source list would be used if the “go live” is November? And would there be a conversion of data from the old system to the new system?

Court answer (TB): The court does not currently desire to convert information from the current system.

Vendor comment: A court in Ohio manually entered jurors into Excel and that list was loaded in their system.

Vendor question: Does the court subscribe to the NCOA?

Court answer (TB): No, but the court is open to researching the possibility.

Vendor question: How many weeks in advance does the court summons jurors?

Court answer (TB): Six weeks in advance.

Vendor question: How many court locations does the court have?

Court answer (TB): The court has three court locations where jurors can be summoned.

Vendor question: Are court locations the same jurisdiction?

Court answer (TB): Yes, all are the Superior Court of California, San Mateo County.

Vendor question: Can the court determine permanent excusals?

Court answer (TB): No, the current system does not support this functionality. The only excusals tracked in the current system are twelve-month excusals.

Vendor question: Is the court able to capture the previous summons date?

Court answer (TB): Yes, it is possible for the court to capture the previous summons date.

Vendor question: How many annual summonses does the court send out?

Court answer (TB): The court sends out approximately 200,000 summonses annually.

Vendor question: How is the current court summons printing done?

Court answer (TB): The current printing is done in house. A data extract is sent to the County print shop and they merge the data onto a preprinted jury summons. The summons is 8.5” x 14” and needs to be folded and stuffed..

Vendor question: Does the County have any relationship with the US postal service for better rates?

Court answer (TB): The court does not know of any special rate for the county print shop.

Vendor question: Is the same notice used throughout all three locations?

Court answer (TB): Yes, the same notice template is used throughout all three locations.

Vendor question: How many staff will require training?

Court answer (TB): Approximately 70 users will require training. The court has successfully used the train-the-trainer model in the past. The court estimates 10 users using the system daily; the remainder of users would be part-time users (mainly in the courtroom).

Vendor question: Does the court currently have an IVR system?

Court answer (TB): Yes, the court currently has an IVR system. A juror voice message is placed onto the IVR system multiple times daily. The court would like the ability for jurors to access their specific status instead of just posting general appearance messages. The court would like this functionality for both the IVR and the website

Vendor question: Who is the IVR vendor?

Court answer (TB): Sonant is the court's IVR vendor.

Vendor question: Please define what the court means by "balance" in Section E, page 9. Does the court want an accounting system?

Court answer (TB): The court does not currently print jury checks. The court currently generates a payroll interface file and would like to continue to do so. The court is not on the CARS system. The current implementation date is November 2007 but the court is trying to move that forward to July 2007.

Vendor question: Does the court want a way for jurors to donate fees back to the county?

Court answer (TB): Yes.

Vendor question: Does the court want the ability to scan forms for data extraction? Court answer (TB): Yes, the court would like to harvest the data from the forms to reduce repetitive data entry and related stress injuries. The ability to scan forms for data extraction is not necessarily a must have requirement but it would be nice to have at a reasonable cost.

Vendor question: How does the court's current failure to appear list work?

Court answer (TB): Currently the FTA list is managed through a manual list. A pre-list is run and staff has the ability to change record status on the pre-list. The court requires the functionality to do an initial FTA and secondary FTA notice.

Vendor question: Does the court anticipate having a test environment?

Court answer (TB): The court plans to have a separate test environment for the jury application. The test environment will most likely have separate application and database servers. This environment will be used during the acceptance testing process. The court would like the system to be customizable using tables and configuration switches.

Vendor question: What is the time frame for test phase?

Court answer (TB): The implementation date is November. This is not a drop-dead date. The existing system is sufficient for a while, although unsupported. To determine the time frame for the testing phase; the vendor would need to work backwards from November.

Vendor question: How many court staff would be trained with a train the trainer model?
Court answer (TB): Most likely four court staff members.

Vendor question: How would the court support the system and how would vendor support be contacted? Would users contact the vendor directly?
Court answer (TB): The current court model is to have internal court experts support the product and then a single point of contact at the court will act as a liaison to the vendor's support network. Court end users do not normally contact vendor support; the court end users would contact the court's help desk.

Vendor question: Does the court want a description of each system and module?
Court answer (TB): The court would like that included in bid (modules, functions)

Court comment: The IVR and the website should have similar functionality.

Vendor question: Does the court have any requirements for multiple language or voice recognition?
Court answer (TB): Not at this time.
Court comment: Imaging is not a requirement but the court would like to have imaging.

Vendor comment: Vendor wanted to confirm that the court's primary database is Oracle and that licensing is not an issue.
Court answer (TB): Yes, Oracle is the court's database of choice. Currently the court maintains multiple versions of Oracle.

Vendor question: Does the court have an IVR processor license?
Court answer: Yes.

TB: explained process going forward.

Vendor demos are currently scheduled for the May 17th. That is the courts plan but the court can be flexible. The court wants to give vendors the proper amount of time to show their systems properly. If a vendor would like more time, please indicate that to the court. The court is willing to be flexible. The court prefers the demonstrations to take place the week of May 15th on Wednesday, Thursday or Friday. It is imperative for the vendors to bring all relevant staff experts to the demonstration. The court would like to see the system from start to finish. The court would like an agenda prior to the meeting. The court anticipates court staff from the jury, technology, and courtroom division being present at the demonstrations. At the demo the court would like the vendors to educate the jury staff on how to defend the jury system. This is critical. The court would also like the vendors to address the randomness of the jury selection process in their systems. The jury staff needs to be able to answer the question regarding the random selection of jurors from the master pool. This is very critical because the jury staff is asked this question every day. The court would also like a detailed implementation project plan.

Not necessarily specific dates but some type of high-level time frame. The court would like enough detail to know the necessary tasks for the implementation.