



ADDENDUM #1
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
2019-148

Case Management and Probation Services

TO: All Respondents
FROM: Colby Wattling
CLOSING DATE: July 24, 2019 at 3:00 PM (UNCHANGED)
REF NO.: 2019-148 RFP
DATE: July 17, 2019

The below are **questions** and **answers** which were received during the open question period.

Q1: The RFP states "The court wants an eighteen-month implementation plan," and also states "The Court will not accept any proposal and related scope of work which requires payment in advance for professional services or payment for software licenses prior to full implementation or "go-live"." Does this mean the Court expects the vendor to execute professional services for 18 months without being paid and payment will only be made after the system is live?

A1: Yes

Q2) The RFP states "The new CMS will be a single operating system that is web browser-based and supports remote filing (e-filing) from any supported device." Can you confirm that the Court desires the solution to integrate with the external court systems e-filing functionality?

A2: Yes- but see below.

Q3: As a follow on, can you confirm that 100% of the court systems with which the Court desires e-filing are run by Odyssey, or are there other e-filing consumers that the system needs to be compatible with?

A3: District Court does not currently have e-filing functionality. Superior Court has Odyssey but that is a separate court from District Court. There is no shared platform for a case management system.

Q4: Can we assume that the Court has internal resources that will be allocated to the project to facilitate and validate the data exchange process so that data exchange is compatible with the specifications in Appendix A?

A4: Yes. The court has advised the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) of our intent to leave the state system (JIS) and is awaiting analysis by the AOC of resources required to connect to the data exchange. The court and Kitsap County Information Services (IT) are aware of the complexities of this endeavor and will provide the needed resources.

Q5) The RFP states "The selected solution will include a robust and integrated eFiling capability and utility to offer controlled and secure case information access to the public, justice partners, and other public agencies." For each of these roles (public, partners, and other agencies) does the Court require non-authenticated access (a user can access information without having to login) or does the Court require or prefer both authenticated and unauthenticated access?

A5: Justice partners (anyone submitting documents) will be required to have authenticated access. A public portal should allow viewing without authentication.

Q6: If both or authenticated, does the Court require or desire the ability for internal Court to create and manage user accounts and access privileges for those external users?

A6: That functionality would be a requirement.

Q7: How many cases will be converted?

A7: There are currently 7510 active District Court Criminal cases. The need to convert all of those to a new system is a subject of discussion we look forward to having the input of the successful vendor. There are 3500 Active Civil Cases.

- **What systems are they converted from? SharePoint**
- **What will be converted from each system? Case Records**
- **Number of records, size? The size varies, but typically there are 5-8 PDF documents per case. A typical document is about 3-4 pages in length.**
- **Data converted? PDF's typically.**
- **Images converted? None.**

Q8: Can you confirm that there is one source of data for conversion?

A8: The majority of case data will be converted from SharePoint files. The court also stores some archival data in Stellant but we do not anticipate converting much, if any of this.

Q9: How many physical locations will be part of the implementation?

A9: One

Q10: How many cases are processed annually?

A10: Approximately 35,000
19,000 Traffic Infractions
2,000 Parking and non-traffic infractions
2,700 Misdemeanors
4,500 Civil Cases
5,000 Writs
500 Protection and Unlawful Harassment Orders

Q11: Does the RFP accurately represent the number of concurrent user listed as 35 on page 3? Will the County please break out the number of users by court users and probation users?

A11: We believe the number (35) of concurrent users is fairly accurate but would anticipate the number would increase with a good Case Management Solution. The court currently has 3 FTE's assigned to Probation. The court does not currently have Probation Officers, but rather monitors, who track offender's compliance with court ordered treatment and legal obligations.

Q12: Do you have a preference between Hosted or On Premises solution?

A12: On-premise is preferred but a hosted solution at a competitive price would be considered.

Q13: Has the Kitsap County District Court or any of their Team members evaluated any other vendors systems prior to the release of this RFP? If so, what companies and products were evaluated?

A13: Team members have previously investigated and evaluated other case management software solutions currently available on the market, with varying levels of scrutiny. However, in formulating their proposals, vendors should focus primarily on demonstrating the independent merits of their own case management systems, rather than on attempting to distinguish their system from those of other specific vendors.

Q14: The RFP States "The Court will not accept any proposal and related scope of work which requires payment in advance for professional services or payment for software licenses prior to full implementation or "go-live"." – What are the Court's usual payment terms following a "go-live" from its previous vendor implementations?

A14: The court has not engaged in previous vendor implementations as it relied on the state (AOC) system.

Q15: Please provide additional information what is meant by "Has the ability to run in a cloud scenario "in reference to "For an in- house, County hosted solution server-side or client-side".

A15: An optimal solution would be to have the software have the ability to run in a cloud scenario, hosted scenario, and an in-house scenario to meet future requirements.

Q16: Is the County District Court looking for a full conversion from all of the disparate system listed (Word, SharePoint, Stellent, JD Edwards, Quickbooks and several other in-house solutions) or just partial from some systems? Please list what system are expected to be converted and if they are full or partial conversions.

A16: The ideal Case Management System would eliminate all the disparate systems and consolidate them into a single Case Management System that exchanges data and would allow us to eliminate the use of other platforms such as JD Edwards, QuickBooks, SharePoint, etc. Our hope is to not have any partial conversions.

Q17: Are there existing data exchanges to any or all of the following systems?

A17:

- Washington State Patrol (SECTOR, e-tickets, Collisions, and criminal records) **Through the State JIS portal**
- Department of Licensing **Same**
- County Financials **No**
- AOC Data Exchange **No**
- Collections Company (currently Dynamic) **No**
- Payment Company (currently nCourt) **No**
- Superior Court (Odyssey) **No**
- Prosecutor (Damion) **No**

The optimal solution would have the ability to integrate with all data configurations to meet future requirements.

Q18: Please indicate what technologies that each of the data platforms (below) currently support (i.e. "XML" or "FTP", etc.) and if the exchanges desired will be one-way (from the host) or two-way (where District Court will also submit data back to hosts).

A18:

- Washington State Patrol (SECTOR, e-tickets, Collisions, and criminal records) **State JIS.**
- Department of Licensing **State JIS**
- County Financials **Internal, FTP. Externally SFTP**
- AOC Data Exchange **Unknown**
- Collections Company (currently Dynamic) **Unknown**
- Payment Company (currently nCourt) **Unknown**
- Superior Court (Odyssey) **State JIS viewing portal**
- Prosecutor (Damion) **Unknown**

The interfaces should not be limited to XML or FTP and have the ability to exchange data both "one way and two ways" in order to meet future requirements. The court downloads its data with WSP, DOL and other state partners through a JIS web portal to initiate cases.

Q19: Is this project funded? If Yes, please provide the Capital and Operational budgets.

A19: The project has been approved by the Board of County Commissioners. Funding is available. There is not a designated Capitol or Operational budget.

Q20: The RFP described a section in Minimum Requirements that “This includes unlimited additional licensing for use by public portal users, including attorneys, and unlimited use by other government agencies such as the Prosecutor, Public Defender, Superior Court, etc. and those accessing to use required interfaces such as data migration or conversion services.” Are all of these “unlimited additional licensing” categories read-only or do some need to submit data/documents back to District Court?

A21: Attorneys (including Prosecutor, Public Defender) will submit documents. Others will be read-only with some possible exceptions.

Q21: Do these groups need access to different data or is it intended that each different group would have access to specific information?

A21: Specific information.

Q22: Does the County intend to have users register to utilize the portal is it completely anonymous access to request data?

A22: Attorneys and litigants in some cases such as Small Claims should be able to submit documents. It is anticipated there will be a public portal for viewing and printing of case records.

Q23: What exact systems are utilized to support the District Court’s Civil, Criminal and Infractions cases?

A23: See Page 1, paragraph 1 in the Executive Summary.

Q24: How many civil, criminal and infractions cases are processed every year by the District Court?

A24: Approximately 34,000

Q25: What exact system(s) are currently utilized to support the District Court’s Probation Division?

A25: We do not have a dedicated system.

Q26: What is the average number of Probationers that are on active population?

A26: Approximately 5,000

Q27: Does the County supervise Misdemeanor and Felony Probationers?

A27: Misdemeanor only

Q28: What is the average caseload for a Probation Officer in Kitsap County DC?

A28: Approximately 2,500 (monitor only- not supervised)

Q29: What is the average breakdown of your probation population by Risk Level?

A29: We monitor compliance only and do not assign Risk

Q30: Does the District Court run any specialty or therapeutic courts?

A30: Behavioral Health Court and Human Trafficking Court

Q31: Would the court consider a “best-of-breed” solution by selecting different vendors for different Court Divisions and Services (i.e. one company that specializes in Probation, Migration and Data Exchange Services and Products” and another company that specializes in Court Case Civil and Criminal Systems and Services?

A31: That would be less than desirable to the court

Q32: Please provide the number of records to be converted from each the desired systems.

A32: There are approximately 7,500 active cases files, but the number needed to be converted to a new system would likely be considerably less.

Q33: Please provide the data dictionary and entity relationship diagram (ERD) for each of system to migrate.

A33: Not available. This information would have to come from the State AOC.

Q34: Are tabs acceptable to separate out the RFP sections?

A34: Yes

Q35: What are the TOTAL number of estimated users including those that access the application and public portal?

A35: Approximately 50 users. The right solution would allow a significant increase in public portal users.

Q36: If the County currently has a public portal, what is the estimated number of users/visitors accessing it in a year?

A36: 42,000 visits to the courts website in 2018

Q37: How do the Prosecutors, Public Defenders, Superior Court staff currently access each of the District Court applications to get the information they require?

A37: They only have access to SharePoint and Stellant, the courts document creation and storage system. Court records are accessed by Superior court using JIS.

END OF ADDENDUM # 1