

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA
Questions and Answers RFP # V1617-08
Case Management System

Question1: Attachment 15 - RFP Statement: Ventura Court Information lists Case Filings as 152,167. A) Is that cases per year? If not, what is the expected case load per year? B) How many cases will be converted?

Answer 1: A) That was the total number of cases filed in 2016.

B)

V3 Case Management System

Civil Limited – 203,348

Civil Unlimited – 96,007

Mental Health – 20,667

Probate – 21,134

Small Claims – 140,967

ICMS Case Management System

Family Law (Ventura) – 184,930

Family Law (Simi) – 31,450

Juvenile – 25,584

Adoption – 5,860

Question 2: How many cases will be converted?

Answer 2: See response to Q1B above.

Question 3: How many images will be converted?

Answer 3: The court currently is dependent on paper case files for processing and storage of all case types. ICMS stores no document images at this time; however, V3 stores all internally generated Minute Orders, Tentative Rulings, Receipts and Notices in image form. There are approximately 2.2 million images (PDF) stored by that system which are linked to their respective cases. The court may require many of those images to be converted or imported into the new CMS as part of implementation, but most likely not all of the images will require conversion (Receipts, for example.) Specifically which document images would and would not require conversion would be determined in early planning stages of the project.

Question 4: Can you confirm that there is one source of data for conversion?

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA
Questions and Answers RFP # V1617-08
Case Management System

Answer 4: There are two sources of case information to be converted. One is the V3 case management system hosted for the court by the Judicial Branch California Court Technology Center (CCTC,) which today is used by the court for management of all Civil, Small Claims, Probate, and Mental Health case information. Please note that this is essentially the same CMS (and same hosting situation) utilized for several years by the San Joaquin and Sacramento courts. The second source is a legacy locally-hosted ICMS case management system, originally developed and marketed by ISD Corp. (now Journal Technologies, Inc.,) which the court currently uses for management of all Family Law and Juvenile Dependency case information.

Question 5: Interfaces - Can the County identify all Interfaces that will be required?

Answer 5: The Court does not expect to create any direct (system-to-system or network-to-network) interfaces for the new case management system. To provide an interface for justice partners, the court's preference would be for a secure justice partner portal (webpage) to which justice partners could login and access permitted case information (based on security roles / profiles defined by the court).

Question 6: State Reporting - Can the County identify all State Reporting Interfaces required?

Answer 6: The court must adhere to all current statewide Court financial and JBSIS reporting requirements with the new CMS, and is seeking the most accurate and efficient programmatic environment possible for creation and maintenance of all reports. The preferred method would be that reports would be generated, reviewed, refined, and submitted by the court as needed (and when ready.) There is no requirement for a direct electronic interface to a state agency.

Question 7: Project Start -Does the County have a projected project start date?

Answer 7: The Court's preference would be to start as soon as possible; however, any specific start date would have to be negotiable dependent on the nature and extent of Court resources required in the earliest phases of the project, and estimated project duration (total time to completion.)

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA
Questions and Answers RFP # V1617-08
Case Management System

Question 8: Users - What is the expected number of concurrent users on the system?

Answer 8: The required number of concurrent users will be dependent upon how a system handles factors such as multiple sessions / windows in use at the same time by one user, users who during the course of a day could cover several different roles and / or case types, and license requirements for dedicated “scanning” or processing stations. For general project scoping purposes, the number of concurrent users required could be estimated at about 250 maximum.

Question 9: Item 3.1.1 of the Response Template says, “The original cost portion of the proposal (and the copies thereof) must be submitted to the Court on BidSync as indicated, as well as by mail in a single sealed envelope, separate from the non-cost portion.” BidSync submittal is not indicated anywhere else in the RFP documents. Is submittal of the Cost Portion through BidSync a requirement? If so, could the Court provide more information?

Answer 9: All documents, including the cost portion of the proposal should be mailed to the Court. We **are not** using BidSync for any portion of this solicitation.

Question 10: Please provide technical details (*e.g.*, DBMS, number of tables, *etc.*) for the data conversion of each legacy system (*i.e.*, V3, ICMS, *etc.*), including any document/imaging conversions. What case types are currently supported by each system?

Answer 10:

V3 Case Management System

Case Types: Civil (Limited and Unlimited,) Small Claims, Probate, Mental Health

Oracle Database 11g Enterprise Edition Release: 11.2.0.3.0 - 64bit

Number of tables: 472

Total Database Size: Approx. 190GB

(Please note that these metrics represent that database as it currently exists containing case information from several different courts. There is a unique field value used to designate the court. An initial step in the conversion process will be identifying and extracting all Ventura court data out of this shared database.)

Approximately 2.2 million electronic document images (PDF) are currently stored by this system, linked to their respective cases. It is likely that not all of the images will require conversion (Receipts, for example.) Specifically which document images would and would not require conversion would be determined in early planning stages of the project.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA
Questions and Answers RFP # V1617-08
Case Management System

ICMS Case Management System

Case Types: Family Law, Juvenile Dependency, Adoption

Oracle Database 11g Enterprise Edition Release 11.2.0.4.0 - 64bit

Number of tables: 278

(Please note this represents all ICMS USER tables. The court may not have data in all tables because ICMS has capability for other case types which the court does not use, such as Criminal/Traffic)

Total Database Size: Approx. 45GB

No electronic document images to convert

Question 11: Can you please provide a breakdown of the Court's full-time employees?

Answer 11: As of this writing, the court has 357 employees, 28 judges, and 4 commissioners.

Employee Breakdown

Records and Exhibits – 28.50

Family Law – 16

Criminal / Traffic – 17

Judicial Assistants and Secretaries – 59

Juvenile Courthouse (Appeals/Probate/Guardianship/Mental Health) – 24

Executive Administration – 5

Administration Support – 2

Legal Research – 11.6

Family Court Services – 17

Family Law Facilitators – 8.8

Self-help Center/Ventura – 2.775

Children's Waiting Room – 1.6

Civil, Small Claims, Mental Health, Appeals – 23

Finance and Planning – 5

Fiscal Services – 17.50

Facilities Management – 2

Collections – 61.75

Human Resources & Training – 6

Information Technology – 12

Interpreting Services – 8

Court Reporters and Jury Services – 29.10

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA
Questions and Answers RFP # V1617-08
Case Management System

Question 12: Is item 9.1.1 of Attachment 9 requiring integration to an additional third-party DMS? If so, please provide details regarding the third-party system.

Answer 12: No. The court is seeking complete implementation of a CMS with an integrated DMS; however, the court would consider solutions providing either a robust DMS solution incorporated within the CMS itself, or tightly integrating the CMS with an industry standard third-party DMS.

Question 13 Would it be possible for the Court to extend the deadline for submission by four weeks?

Answer 13. The Court is not able to extend the proposal submission deadline due to the time-line required by the State for the Court to be off of the existing case management system.