

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

New Orleans Police and Justice Foundation

OPISIS Project

**Magistrate Court Case Management System for Orleans
Parish Criminal District Court**

Issued November 3, 2009

Last revision 11/2/2009 10:33 AM

The New Orleans Police and Justice Foundation (NOPJF) in connection with its OPISIS project wishes to develop a non-proprietary Magistrate Court Case Management System (MCMS) for use by the Orleans Parish Criminal District Court and Court Clerk. The amount available for this project is a maximum of \$75,000.

1. Inquiries

Written questions and requests for clarification of this RFP should be forwarded by e-mail to Dr. Michael Geerken, NOPJF, at michael@nopjf.org. Please include the RFP page and paragraph number for comments and suggestions if appropriate. Any questions received after the deadline for questions (see below) will not be considered. All questions and responses will be available via NOPJF's web site (<http://www.nopjf.org/>). Responses to questions are to be considered official clarifications or modifications to this RFP. At its sole discretion NOPJF may choose to host a voluntary Bidder's meeting via a phone conference, online conference, or web meeting technology.¹ Potential bidders are requested not to contact or solicit officials of the New Orleans criminal justice system but to submit questions and suggestions for clarification to the MCMS Committee for their consideration through Dr. Geerken.

2. Method of Selection

NOPJF will use a competitive sealed proposals method of Bidder selection. An award, if made, will be made to the responsive and responsible Bidder whose proposal response is most advantageous to the Court and other agencies of the New Orleans criminal justice system and most likely to result in a quality Magistrate Case Management System (MCMS) application within the timeline specified. NOPJF will not use any other factors or criteria in the evaluation of proposals received. NOPJF will, as it deems necessary, conduct discussions with responsible Bidders determined to be reasonably susceptible of being selected for the purpose of clarification to assure full understanding of, and responsiveness to, solicitation requirements.

NOPJF may chose, at its discretion, to reject all submitted proposals.

\

¹ Date/time and instructions for the meeting, if any, will be posted on the NOPJF web site.

3. Criteria Used to Determine the Suitability and Responsiveness of Each Bidder

3.1 Suitability

Determination of suitability will be based on NOPJF's determination of answers to the following questions:

3.1.1 Does the Bidder demonstrate an understanding of the project, as well as a general understanding of the needs the project seeks to address?

3.1.2 Does the Bidder possess the ability, capacity, skill, and financial resources to provide the service?

3.1.3 Can the Bidder take upon itself the responsibilities set forth in the RFP (and resultant contract) and produce the required outcomes within the required timeline and the state cost limits of the project?

3.1.4 Does the Bidder have the character, integrity, reputation, judgment, experience, and efficiency required by the contract? Bidder will provide a list of partners and/or subcontractors with references for each. If used, partners and subcontractors must be approved by NOPJF and the Court.

3.1.5 Has the Bidder performed satisfactorily in previous contracts? The Bidder's past performance in all phases of contracting, application development, implementation, and support is relevant and will be evaluated.

3.1.6 Has the Bidder successfully deployed a product and performed services substantially similar to those requested in this RFP?

3.1.7 Has the bidder colluded with other bidders or otherwise sought to improperly influence the outcome of the RFP process? Has the bidder a conflict of interest that might interfere with impartial Bidder selection, contracting, or oversight of the implementation process?

Bidders not judged suitable by NOPJF will not be scored and will be eliminated for further consideration.

3.2 Responsiveness

Responsiveness is based on the Bidder's detailed responses to each of the system and implementation requirements outlined in Sections 5 and 6 below. For each requirement, the Bidder should affirm in its response that its services would include that element, feature, or capacity. Any requirement without such a response will result in rejection of the bid without scoring.

Some elements, features, or capacities described in this RFP may be clearly labeled as optional rather than requirements. The Bidder should indicate which, if any, of these preferences is part of its proposed services. Bidders willing to offer such services (within the time and cost limits stated in this RFP) will receive credit in the scoring process for these additional deliverables.

Additional Instructions:

1. To facilitate review by NOPJF, Bidder responses to the system and implementation requirements in sections 5 and 6 must be in the same order as presented in the RFP, and numbered/lettered to correspond to the RFP. Bids not structured in this way may be rejected without review.
2. An omitted response to a requirement will be scored as if excluded from the Bidder's proposal, i.e., outside the scope of the Bidder's proposed services.
3. If clarifications are needed, cross-reference to an attachment is allowed, but the use of clarifications through attachments should be minimal. Information provided in an attachment should clearly forward-reference the attachment page/paragraph number from the RFP item number/letter and backward-reference the attachment to the RFP item number/letter that it is a response.
4. Any bid which exceeds a cost of \$75,000 or for services that will not be completed within the stated time frame will be rejected without review or scoring.

4. Timetable

The following timetable applies to this RFP. NOPJF reserves the right to adjust this timetable as required during the course of the RFP process.

Event Date

RFP released Nov 3, 2009

Deadline for receipt of questions/requests for clarification Nov 17, 2009

Bids due Dec 3, 2009

Vendor interviews, reference checks, and presentations 12/3/2009 – 12/15/2009

Selection of vendor Dec 20, 2009

Statement of Work completed and signed: Jan 31, 2010

Application ready for testing: May 15, 2010

Final acceptance June 30, 2010

5. Bidder and Bidding Requirements

- 5.1 The Bidder must be capable of furnishing a reliable method for resolving software issues on a day-to-day basis after the go-live date. These services should be available for a minimum of 120 man-hours without charge or 6 months, whichever occurs first. Preferably a developer will be available via cell phone 24/7 to answer questions from NOPJF, Court, and Clerk IT personnel (not end-users) or fix software bugs not discovered during testing. These support hours will not be used to request application enhancements not specified in the RFP or SOW. At its discretion, the Court, Clerk, or NOPJF may later contract for additional support or application enhancement outside the scope of this RFP. The Bidder must define in their proposal the procedures, schedules, and time frames for responding to complaints, problems, and requests reported to them.
- 5.2 Each bidder must provide the names and resumes of the employees or contractors who will be directly involved in this project and their experience in providing such system solutions.
- 5.3 Each bidder must provide a list of clients where software developed by the Bidder (or the developers who will work on this project) is currently in use. This list should include the name and telephone number of the clients contact person and the type of application developed. The Bidder must include all clients for court-related projects within the last five years.
- 5.4 Each bidder must provide a list of clients for whom its software was used but has been replaced by another application, or where a software development project was abandoned before completion. This list should include the name and telephone number of the clients contact person and a statement of the reasons for replacement or abandonment.
- 5.5 Any warranty provided by the Bidder must be clearly stated.
- 5.6 The Bidder must provide a detailed project plan that includes a time line of milestones and deliverables within the stated time frames. The Bidder shall propose a payment plan (subject to negotiation with NOPJF) which reserves at least 35% of the total payment after completion and acceptance: 25% at acceptance and 10% after 90 days or 120 hours of support services (as described in 5.1 above)² whichever occurs first.

² If less than 120 hours has been expended by the end of the 90 day period, the Vendor will nevertheless be paid the full 10% as long as requested services have been provided.

5.7 The Bidder must provide a company overview including ownership, top executives, and history both for their company and any subcontractor companies, and financial information.

6. MCMS Requirements

Introduction

Orleans Parish Criminal District Court consists of twelve elected judges (sections A-L) with felony and state statute misdemeanor jurisdiction. In addition, there is one elected Magistrate Court judge with four appointed magistrate court commissioners (sections M1-M5) to manage bond setting, determinations of probable cause, and other matters occurring before the district attorney's charge filing decision. The magistrate sections are also responsible for complete disposition (hearings, trials, sentencing, etc.) on some misdemeanor cases at the discretion of the judges of general jurisdiction.

The Criminal District Court, Magistrate Court, and the Criminal District Court Clerk currently use a case management system (CMS) developed over a period of 20 years by employees and contractors of the Criminal Sheriff's Office. The CMS operates on the Criminal Sheriff's IBM AS400 (aka iSeries aka Power). This CMS includes a Magistrate Court module that is used to manage all pre-filing/allotment activity. Other programs perform the function of processing the district attorney's screening and charging documents and creating cases in the Criminal District Court docket modules. This non-proprietary legacy application written in RPG ILE uses the AS400's DB2 database. It is the intention of the Court and the Sheriff that all modules of the AS400 CMS be gradually replaced with a CMS developed as a modern web-based application managed by the staff and contractors of the Court and the Clerk while needed data remains available to the Sheriff's Jail Management System.

This Request for Proposal seeks bids to carry out the first stage of this migration/replacement process. In this stage, the Magistrate Court CMS module will be replaced with a web-based version that uses a SQL 2008 database very similar (in structure, field definitions, coding, etc.)³ to the current DB2 database on the AS400. (The structure of this database is diagrammed in Appendix A).

In essence, the new web-based application will be similar in functionality and the logic of business processes and rules to the current AS400 Magistrate Court system, except for the system enhancements described below.⁴ The application is required to be developed as non-proprietary (software work for hire)⁵ and completed within a strict timeline: all work required under this RFP must be completed by June 30, 2010.

³ The only differences between the new SQL db and the current AS400 db will be any additional fields or tables necessary to implement the enhancements described below.

⁴ Since it is completely non-proprietary, the RPG ILE source code for the current Magistrate Court application as well as detailed information on the associated AS400 files, file relationships, fields, data definitions, etc., will be available to developers of the new system. Since the AS400 files associated with the court applications have already been converted to SQL form through another project, the vendor can be provided with a SQL Export of these tables after the contract is signed.

⁵ The vendor will be required to sign a confidentiality agreement regarding use of the court's data and the court will be free to share the code developed under this project with other courts as it sees fit. However the vendor will not be restricted in its use of the code for development of products and performance of services for other clients. NOPJF and the Court will agree that to the extent Vendor uses proprietary tool sets, that information will be kept confidential as requested and designated by the Vendor.

Though Magistrate Court is responsible for all post-filing functions (motion hearings, trials, etc.) of some misdemeanor cases, this project will include only pre-filing and filing process functions⁶ except initial setting of bond and conditions of release at First Appearance: 48 Hour hearings, preliminary hearings, hearings related to fugitives and extradition, issuing and recall of bench warrants (alias capiases), hearings and monitoring related to Art 701 releases, processing of the DA's screening action form and Bill of Information, pre-allotment and allotment, recording/setup of grand jury indictments, and the production of forms related to these activities.

Overview of the current system:

Defendant and arrest charge information is posted to the current MCMS by the Criminal Sheriff's booking application and a first appearance list or "Magistrate Court List" is generated in the Sheriff's Intake and Processing Center. That list is used to assemble paperwork – arrest register, face sheet, gist sheet or warrant document – which is hand-carried to Magistrate Court. This list (with blank lines for bond information) is used by the MC minute clerk to record bond and other information, such as conditions of release and probable cause determination. The MCMS is then used to record this information in the form of both coded and text minute entries.

Minute information is managed by the MCMS from a single master screen (see appendix B) that allows the setting of multiple next events and entry of bond amounts. These entries generate text and the minute clerk can use a function key to view the text, modify it, and append additional comments and information. The minute clerk can use another function key to access a forms menu for remand, release, alias capias, and recall alias capias forms. (Examples in Appendix B)

A magistrate docket master can be viewed for a case, which provides case, defendant, and charge information and events along with the associated text entries.

The Clerk's functions related to MC prior to allotment fall primarily into two areas: processing of bond-related documents and processing of documents related to the DA's charging decisions (Screening Action Form (SAF) and Bill of Information (BI)) and Grand Jury indictments⁷. All bond processing functions will in the near future be handled by Bond Tracker and are thus excluded from this RFP. Processing of the SAF & BI is currently a combination of an automated and manual process. The Clerk uses an AS400 program to enter screening or indictment results by charge based on a copy of the SAF and a BI (if any charges are accepted) or the Indictment. If charges are accepted/indicted, they must be "bound-over" to a general docket case number, which is currently manually assigned through a random process. Once the physical file is created and transferred to the general docket clerk for the allotted section, the general docket clerk sets the case for arraignment.

⁶ Magistrate Court will continue to use the AS400 CMS for post-filing/allotment functions

⁷ If the Grand Jury indicts a person who has not been arrested and booked for the incident, the Clerk uses simple data entry screens (see Appendix B) to add the charges and select/add the defendant name to the file

New Magistrate Court Case Management System Requirements

- A. The new MCMS should be able to produce the same set of reports and forms current produced by the AS400 MCMS related to court activity prior to allotment of cases. The current user “green screen” interfaces for all Magistrate Court and Clerk AS400 functions occurring before case allotment will be replaced with web-browser based interfaces with improved functionality and new features described below.
- B. Based on the functionality of the current AS400 MCMS user interfaces the Vendor should develop web browser-based interfaces that use dynamic drop-down lists or windows to replace the AS400 Prompt function key for all coded fields, secondary windows to display, update, and append docket text entries generated from coded entries (currently the AS400 Text prompt), and additional codes for common text entries on existing forms. Available codes for events and forms should be specific to those events and forms.⁸ The user should also be able to open a window which lists the PDF documents associated with the case (see C & G below for details) and allows the user to open those documents.
- C. All forms currently printable from the AS400 MCMS (Remand, Release, Alias Capias, Recall Alias Capias⁹) will be printable from the new MCMS. Commonly used text (such as reasons for remand, alias capias, or recall) should be generated from coded entries. The dynamic data elements of all printed documents (including the codes used to produce text entries) should be stored as data elements in tables both in the MCMS and Data Exchange Server (DES) databases. Creation and printing of the forms should automatically generate appropriate minute entry text. In addition to dynamic data elements, the PDF copies of these documents will be stored both in the MCMS and DES databases to be shared with other agencies and associated event log entries¹⁰ will be placed on the Data Exchange Server (DES) - now under development in another project - for retrieval and processing.
- D. The reports currently generated by the AS400 MCMS for pre-allotment functions should be duplicated by the new system with minimal changes. Those reports include the Magistrate Court List (first appearance list), the Pre-Trial Docket

⁸ Tables detailing relationships between events, forms, and coded text entries will be provided by NOPJF and included in the Statement of Work.

⁹ The Capias, issued after bond setting at First Appearance, will be produced by the Bond Tracker application.

¹⁰ The Event Log is a table maintained on the Data Exchange Server which points to the PDFs and data posted to the DES by a particular agency’s application and includes user information, date and time stamps, and certain reference data. By monitoring Event Log entries, other applications become aware of the existence of needed data and documents on the DES, can retrieve the data and documents, and then post an Event Log record documenting the retrieval. The Event Log will not have to be created as part of this project (it is being developed as a separate project) but will have to be updated by the application developed under this RFP.

(Calendar Summary and Detail List), and Allotment Sheet (see examples in Appendix D)

- E. In addition to the automatic text currently generated in minute entries based on coded event entries and forms, the new MCMS should include the capability of generating a variety of other frequently used minute text entry snippets based on a click-select action either in a designated sector of the master minute entry screen (see Appendix B) or in a side window. The available codes should depend on the event or on the form being generated. Some of the text entries may require up to five formal parameter prompts to be replaced by actual parameters. Whenever a common entry selection is made, a record should be stored in a new table (not in the current AS400 db) with the associated case event information.¹¹
- F. A method of electronic signature (user/password labeling plus signature image) will be implemented for all documents. At minimum the signature should include user id, date and time stamp, and IP address information as well as the capability of placing a signature image on the document. Bidders are encouraged to suggest other electronic signature methods as options to this approach.¹²
- G. Under another project being implemented parallel to the MCMS, PDF files containing the Arrest Register, arrest warrant documents, and police reports submitted at booking will be stored at the DES at or before the completion of the booking process. The data files for scheduled first appearance events contain the information necessary for identifying the PDF files associated with those events. The capability to print these PDFs in case number order in court should be created.
- H. Since many files/tables used by the Magistrate Module (charges, judges, defendants, dispositions, charge code lookup table, etc.) are shared with the general docket CMS and the Sheriff's Jail Management System it will be necessary to implement routines that synchronize in real time the new SQL tables with the current AS400 DB2 files. All Magistrate Court data currently maintained in the AS400 database will continue to be maintained by the new MCMS, except that it will be maintained through a SQL->DB2 synchronization process rather than directly through a user interface or other routine.
- I. This project will not include functions related to subpoenas.

¹¹ The Vendor will not be required to determine the content or event-relationships of these text entries but only provide the ability for Court personnel to enter the text and formal parameter prompts into appropriate tables.

¹² If suggested methods involve use of devices such as signature capture pads or biometric devices, the cost of that additional hardware should be provided but will not be counted against the dollar limit stated in the RFP.

- J. First Appearance events and bond management for Criminal District Court will be performed by the Orion Bond Tracker application, but the Magistrate Court system developed under this RFP will have to interface with Bond Tracker via a web service. Bond Tracker will provide a data entry interface for all functions related to First Appearance Hearings and the setting or modification of bonds and conditions of release. For events other than First Appearance, as users are entering data in the magistrate docketing system, the magistrate system will need to be able to seamlessly navigate to the browser-based Bond Tracker solution to enter bond amounts of the related magistrate case without a username / password challenge. Conversely, if the user is working in the Bond Tracker solution, they will need to be able to navigate to the related case in the magistrate docketing system seamlessly without a username / password challenge. The Bidder can assume that the Bond Tracker system will provide to the vendor an API on the Microsoft .NET framework (v3.5) which contains methods to accept the globally unique identifier (GUID) assigned in Bond Tracker as an argument. This API can be used to launch, maintain, and terminate a cookie-anchored session. The Bidder should describe any APIs they have or will develop that allows an external application to submit a request to launch the vendor provided system.
- K. There are currently business rules governing the release of arrestees under Article 701 of the Louisiana Rules of Criminal Procedure that are used by the minute clerk to set “rule to show cause” hearings on deadline dates for DA screening decisions. These rules are based on the highest charge class (a field in IMCHGT and DEFCHG on the AS400 and the DES – see diagram in Appendix A) and whether the arrestee is incarcerated (a field in IMFLDR on the DES), can be used to set and modify these dates automatically (rules are described in the diagram in Appendix E). Also, when all charges have been disposed of prior to the 701 date, the related Rule to Show Cause event should not appear on the court docket for that date (as it currently does).
- L. Grand Jury Indictments are currently manually prepared and the Clerk uses special data entry screens to add defendant and charge information to the CMS if the defendant has not been already processed through Magistrate Court. The new Grand Jury Indictment entry screen should duplicate these functions.
- M. *Optional deliverable:* While not a requirement of this RFP, the Bidder may wish to offer (at no additional cost) to develop a module for creation of the Grand Jury Indictment document itself which would duplicate the functions of L above.
- N. The DA-filed Screening Action Form and Bill of Information will be available as data on the Data Exchange Server and also as PDFs. This means that the “bind-over” process can be almost completely automated after the data is reviewed and approved by the Clerk. The Clerk will choose SAF/BI submissions from a work queue, print the PDFs for the physical file, and approve the transaction. The

Clerk will then print an allotment list similar to the current AS400 list to start the allotment process.

- O. The new application will use SQL Server 2008 and be developed using .NET technology. It must be developed with Visual Studio 2008 and delivered as a Visual Studio 2008 Project. It must be compatible with Internet Explorer 5.0-7.0 and Firefox.
- P. Quality and extent of documentation should be sufficient to enable court/clerk IT employees with an appropriate skill set to maintain and modify the application. Bidder should describe in detail the documentation methodology to be used for this project.
- Q. The cost of hardware and licensing necessary to establish the platform for the application is not part of this RFP.
- R. The vendor will provide training on use of the application to designated testers and provide a user's manual but not be responsible for implementing online help applications or training end users.
- S. Bidder is free to suggest additional alternative (non-proprietary) approaches to achieving the functionality described above, but these approaches must be submitted as a supplemental option, not as a replacement for meeting the RFP requirements.

7. Project Planning and Implementation

7.1 Proposed Project Plan

The Bidder is required to submit an overall project plan in the response to the RFP. The plan should outline an overall strategy and approach, and include a detailed description of tasks, responsibilities, milestones, and timelines within the stated time limits. The Bidder's proposed project plan will be evaluated for completeness, comprehensiveness, and reasonableness. Given the tight timeline for this project, the Bidder should describe a suitable fast-track programming, testing, and implementation methodology, and a discussion of risk factors and alternatives. The project should be divided into a series of deliverables (to correspond to a payment schedule) that can be monitored on a weekly basis. For the benefit both of the Vendor and the NOPJF, it is important that the plan envision frequent interaction between developer(s) and NOPJF and Court IT personnel as design and coding is carried out. On occasion this interaction may include brief source code walkthroughs for NOPJF and Court IT personnel. Though the project timeline is for testing to begin no later than May 15, it would be preferable if the project were implemented in such a way that individual components could be reviewed, tested, and approved before that date.

7.2 Proposed Project Staff

The Bidder is required to include detailed information regarding the proposed project team that will be assigned to this project, including the distinct roles and responsibilities of each team member. The team members, percentage of time to be dedicated, experience level, years employed with Bidder, experience on similar projects, and technical knowledge will all be considered. Bidder will be required to disclose employee-supplied criminal history information on all employees connected to the project and provide sufficient information for police personnel to conduct criminal history background checks before contract signing.

7.3 Project Coordination

The Bidder should assign one person to act as a Project Manager. The Bidder's project manager should be solely responsible for contact and coordination with the NOPJF and Court project managers on all matters. All official communications between the Bidder and NOPJF should be directed through NOPJF's Project Manager.

7.4 It is the contractor's responsibility to follow schedules, for various milestones and deliverables set forth in the project plan unless failure to meet the schedule is the responsibility of NOPJF or a participating local agency.

7.5 Any change in the mutually agreed upon Project Scope will require the contractor to complete a change order request form, and obtain the appropriate NOPJF approvals prior to executing a Contract Amendment and providing the requested change.

7.6 The contractor must produce weekly status reports and weekly project timeline updates during the project.

7.7 The contractor will be responsible for working jointly and directly with relevant IT support staff on all data import from existing systems.

7.9 System Acceptance

Final System Acceptance will not occur until the Bidder has successfully delivered the system, including all of its components and the system is operating according to the specifications as agreed upon in the Bidder's contract and/or Statement of Work.

8. Instructions for Proposal

8.1 Compliance with the RFP

The proposal must be in strict compliance with this RFP. Failure to comply with all provisions of the RFP may result in disqualification.

8.2 Delivery of Proposals

All proposal responses are to be delivered to:

New Orleans Police and Justice Foundation
Attn: Dr. Michael Geerken
400 Poydras Street
Suite 2105
New Orleans, LA 70130

NOPJF will not accept any proposal responses received after the stated date and time, and should return such late proposal responses to the Bidder, or file the response unopened. Bidders must submit one (1) original, and nine (9) numbered exact copies of the proposal response (total of 10). Bidders must also submit two (2) electronic copies of the proposal response on CD. Proposals will be opened publicly in a manner to avoid public disclosure of contents; however, only names of Bidders will be read aloud.

8.3 Proposal and Presentation Costs

NOPJF will not be liable in any way for any costs incurred by any Bidder in the preparation of its proposal in response to this RFP, nor for the presentation of its proposal and/or participation in any discussions or negotiations.

8.4 Rejection of Proposals

NOPJF reserves the right to accept or reject in whole, or in part, any, or, all proposals submitted. NOPJF should reject the proposal of any Bidder that is determined to be unsuitable (see 3.1) or non-responsive (see 3.2). Bidders deemed unsuitable or proposals deemed non-responsive, in the judgment of NOPJF, will not be scored

8.5 Acceptance of Proposals

NOPJF will accept all proposals that are submitted properly. However, NOPJF reserves the right to request clarifications or corrections to proposals.

8.6 Requests for Clarification of Proposals

Requests by NOPJF for clarification of proposals should be by e-mail. Said requests should not alter the Bidder's pricing information contained in its cost proposal other than to provide more detailed breakdowns or explanation. Bidder should provide a single person and e-mail address to receive NOPJF correspondence about the proposal.

8.7 Validity of Proposals

All proposals should be valid for a period of not less than one hundred eighty (180) days from the proposal close date.

8.8 Proposal Format

To facilitate the fair evaluation and comparison of proposals, all proposals must conform to the guidelines set forth in this RFP. Any portions of the proposal that do not comply with these guidelines must be so noted and explained the Acceptance of Conditions section of the proposal. However, any proposal that contains such variances may be considered non-responsive. Proposals should be prepared simply and economically, providing a straightforward concise description of the Bidder's approach and ability to meet NOPJF's needs, as stated in the RFP. All copies of the proposal should be bound (in a non-bulky way) for ease of handling. Notebook rather than binder form is preferred. The items listed below should be submitted with each proposal and should be submitted in the order shown. Each section should be clearly labeled, with pages numbered and separated by tabs. Failure by a Bidder to include all listed items may result in the rejection of its proposal.

Tab I, Management Summary

Provide a cover letter, signed by an authorized officer of the firm, indicating the underlying philosophy of the firm in providing the service. Include the name(s), telephone number(s), and email address(s) of the authorized contact person(s) concerning proposal.

Tab II, Project Plan

Tab III Responses to RFP System requirements (Sections 1.5 and 1.6)

Tab IV, Key Personnel

Attach resumes of all managers and senior-level supervisors who will be involved in the management of the total package of services, as well as the delivery of specific services.

Tab V, Customer Listings

Provide a listing of all current and recent software services clients. Information provided for each client should include the following:

- Client name, address, and current telephone number
- Description of products and services provided
- Time period of the project or contract
- Client's contact reference name, current telephone number and email address

Failure to provide complete and accurate client information, as specified here, may result in the disqualification of your proposal or cancellation of the contract and your suspension or departments from further business with NOPJF.

Tab Va, Prior Customer Listings

Provide a listing of all previous clients who have terminated use of your applications or services. Information provided for each client should include the following:

- Client name, address, and current telephone number
- Description of services provided
- Time period of the project or contract
- Termination date
- Client's contact reference name, current telephone number and email address
- Client's reason(s) for the termination
- Client's subsequent Bidder of choice, if known

Failure to provide complete and accurate prior client information, as specified here, may result in the disqualification of your proposal or cancellation of the contract and your suspension or departments from further business with NOPJF.

Tab VI, Acceptance of Conditions

Indicate any exceptions to any of the conditions or requirements stated in the RFP.

Tab VII Cost Proposal

Provide a detailed outline of all costs, including the cost of a four-year maintenance and support plan after the end of the warranty period.

Tab VIII Supplemental Materials at Bidder's option (not to exceed 25 pages).

9. Evaluation of Proposals (Procedure)

An Evaluation Committee made up of the NOPJF Project Manager and both IT and operational personnel from the Criminal District Court and Clerk will evaluate these proposals. The Committee will first examine proposals to eliminate bidders that are unsuitable or proposals that are clearly non-responsive to the stated requirements or required format. Therefore, bidders should exercise particular care in reviewing the Proposal Format required for this RFP. The Committee may request clarifications from the Bidder before rejection at this initial stage.

The Committee may request presentations by selected bidders during its evaluation process and may conduct negotiations with a selected bidder for the purpose of obtaining best and final offers. NOPJF reserves the right to withdraw this RFP at any time and for any reason and to issue such clarifications, modifications, and/or amendments, as it may deem appropriate. Receipt of a proposal by NOPJF or a submission of a proposal to NOPJF confers no rights upon the Bidder nor obligates NOPJF in any manner. NOPJF reserves the right to waive minor irregularities in proposals, provided that such action is in the best interest of NOPJF or Criminal District Court. Any such waiver should not modify any remaining RFP requirements or excuse the Bidder from full compliance with the RFP specifications and other contract requirements if the Bidder is awarded the Contract.

If a bidder discovers any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission, or other error in the RFP, it should, by the stated deadline, immediately notify NOPJF of such error by e-mail and request modification or clarification of the document. NOPJF will make modifications by issuing a written revision and post those revisions to its website. Proposers are responsible for monitoring the website. The bidder is responsible for clarifying any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission, or other error in the Request for Proposals prior to submitting the proposal.

The specifications for the system are described in the RFP. Only bidders that can provide the mandatory features and services with the required specifications will be considered. Preference may be given to bidders with the ability to provide the additional features or services, and/or specifications in the RFP.

Each proposal bid will be evaluated for the economic feasibility, cost justification of the Bidder's product and services, the value of the Bidder's solution relative to the total cost of ownership (i.e., maintenance, support, etc.), and the total budget available. Bidders' proposals will not be evaluated solely on the initial acquisition and/or implementation costs, but also on the costs to expand and maintain the system over its life span.

The amount available for this project is a maximum of \$75,000. Any proposal for which the first year cost of all mandatory features exceeds \$75,000 will be excluded from consideration.

Bidder(s) may be requested to participate in demonstrations/discussion meeting(s) to assist NOPJF and the Evaluation Committee in gaining an accurate understanding of the proposal(s). Each bidder will be required to discuss its proposed system architecture, system interfaces, and project plan.


Proposal Evaluation Panel and Evaluation Factors

The Evaluation Committee, along with other participants who might be selected by NOPJF, will evaluate the proposals. Other agencies and/or consultants to the NOPJF may examine documents or provide comments. The factors to be considered in the evaluation of proposals are listed below with weighting.

- 1) Comprehensiveness, feasibility and quality of technical solution and project implementation plan – 30%
- 2) Bidder's experience in implementation of successful projects of similar type and scope, particularly justice system-related projects (as determined by references) – 50%
- 3) Cost – 20%

Appendix A

AS400 Magistrate Court File Structure



Appendix B

Magistrate Court AS400 Entry Screens:

Minute Clerk

- 1) Master Event Entry**

- 2) Docket Event Text Screen**

- 3) Remand Text Entry Screen**

- 4) Form Selection Screen**

- 5) Alias Capias (Bench Warrant) Entry Screen**

- 6) Recall Alias Capias Screen**

Docket Clerk

- 1) Allotment Sheet Print Screen**

- 2) Bind Over Screen**

stars400.opcs.org - Mocha W32 TN5250

File Edit View Settings Help

Open Close Cut Copy Paste Print About Dup Clear Erase Attn Sysreq Help Hex

10/06/09 15:15:34 MAGISTRATE COURT MINUTE ENTRY SCHIAFFINO CL1E60FM

Magistrate #: 507553 Docket Date: 10/05/2009

Defendant: JAMES REDMON Race: B Sex: M Date of Birth: 12/11/1959

Arrest Date: 10/04/2009

Arrest #	Charges	Disp	Bond	Description
11896424	RS 14 69 (A)	PEND	5000.00	ILL POSS STOLEN THINGS OVER

Notify Probation & Parole?: N

This Event: FAPPH FIRST APPEARANCE HEARING Result: RTSC RULE TO SHOW CAUSE

Reason: _____ Judge: 56 RUDY GORRELL, JR.

Code	Date	Time	Section	Description
RTSC	12/05/2009	3:00 PM	M3	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
48	10/07/2009	3:00 PM	M4	48-HOUR HEARING
Next Event:	_____	_____	_____	_____

F3=Exit F4=Prompt F7=Events F8=Release F9=Text F11=Forms F12=Previous

ONLINE 6,43

```

stars400.opcs0.org - Mocha W32 TN5250
File Edit View Settings Help
Open Close Cut Copy Paste Print About Dup Clear Erase Attn Sysreq Help Hex
10/06/09 15:21:17 MAGISTRATE COURT MINUTE ENTRY SCHIAFFINO CL1E60FM
Magistrate #: 507553 Docket Date: 10/05/2009
Defendant: JAMES REDMON Race: B Sex: M Date of Birth: 12/11/1959

- DOCKET TEXT -

10/05/2009
* FIRST APPEARANCE HEARING IN MAGISTRATE COURT SECTION M2
* BOND SET FOR $5,000.00
* RESULT-RULE TO SHOW CAUSE FOR 12/05/2009 AT 3:00 PM
* SCHEDULED -RULE TO SHOW CAUSE ON 12/05/2009 AT 3:00 PM, SECT M3
* SCHEDULED -48-HOUR HEARING ON 10/07/2009 AT 3:00 PM, SECT M4
48 HOUR AS TO WAS THE PROPERTY RECOVERED

More...


This Event: FAPPH FIRST APPEARANCE HEARING Result: RTSC RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
Reason: Judge: 56 RUDY GORRELL, JR.

Code Date Time Section Description
Next Event: RTSC 12/05/2009 3:00 PM M3 RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
Next Event: 48 10/07/2009 3:00 PM M4 48-HOUR HEARING
Next Event:

F3=Exit F10=Save & Print F11=Save Only F12=Previous

ONLINE 13,8

```



```
stars400.opcso.org - Mocha W32 TN5250
File Edit View Settings Help
Open Close Cut Copy Paste Print About Dup Clear Erase Attn Sysreq Help Hex
10/06/09 15:22:05 MAGISTRATE COURT SCHIAFFINO CL1E65FM
MAG # 507553 Docket Date: 10/05/2009 Defendant: JAMES REDMON
THIS EVENT Event Code: FAPPH FIRST APPEARANCE HEARING


FORMS SELECTION


1 REMAND DEFENDANT
2 RELEASE

4 ALIAS CAPIAS
5 RECALL ALIAS CAPIAS

ENTER A LINE NUMBER AND PRESS <ENTER> TO SELECT A FORM █

F3=Exit
ONLINE 20,61
```





Print Key Output Page 1
5722SS1 V5R4M0 060210 STARS400 10/23/09 11:41:53
Display Device : CLJ0AG30
User : MOTESC
10/23/09 11:41 AM CRIMINAL COURT CLJ0AG30 CLIE2502
DEFENDANT NAME SET-UP MOTESC
DEFENDANT LAST NAME FIRST NAME MI RACE SEX D. O. B.
CARTER JAMES B M
CHARGE DISPOSITION:
230 ACCEPTED 360 INDICTMENT

CHARGE BIND OVER
BIND CASE #
DOI DATE
DISPOSITION
(230,360)

F3 - TO END

Appendix C

AS400 Magistrate CMS: Forms

- 1) Remand**
- 2) Release**
- 3) Recall Alias Capias**
- 4) Capias**

SECTION "M5"
JUDGE RUDY GORRELL, JR.
MAGISTRATE NO.: M507966
DATE 10/15/2009
MOTION NO. 11543657

Present, the Honorable RUDY GORRELL, JR., judge of the said court.

THE STATE OF LOUISIANA
versus

BRYAN K GERARD

It is ordered that BRYAN K GERARD (born 8/21/1991)
stands before this Court with the above crime be released from custody without
delay FOR THESE CHARGES ONLY, FOR THIS CASE ONLY.

ONLY THESE CHARGES ARE AFFECTED:

REASON	VIOLATION	
**No Release	RS 14 34	AGGRAVATED BATTERY
<NO PROB.CAUSE>	RS 14 65	SIMPLE ROBBERY

For this date 10/15/2009

Minute Clerk

ORDER TO RECALL ALIAS CAPIAS

Page 1

STATE OF LOUISIANA, PARISH OF ORLEANS
CRIMINAL DISTRICT COURT

SECTION "M3"
JUDGE HARRY CANTRELL
CASE NO. 423-332
DATE 9/29/2009
MOTION NO. 1418547

Present, the Honorable HARRY CANTRELL, judge of the said court.

THE STATE OF LOUISIANA
versus

SEAN HUTCHINS

For VIOLATION

RS 40 966 (D) (1) POSS MARIJUANA 1ST OFFENSE

It is ordered that the Alias Capias issued for
SEAN HUTCHINS (born 4/01/1981) be recalled.

REMARKS

WITNESS _____ JUDGE,
presiding in the Criminal District Court, Section M3
for the Parish of Orleans, in the Hall of Sittings of
the same, in the City of New Orleans, this date 9/29/2009.

Minute Clerk

C A P I A S

STATE OF LOUISIANA, PARISH OF ORLEANS
HONORABLE GERARD J. HANSEN, PRESIDING

MAGISTRATE NO: 504795

TO THE CRIMINAL SHERIFF FOR THE PARISH OF ORLEANS ... GREETINGS:
YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED, IN THE NAME OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA AND OF
THE MAGISTRATE COURT FOR THE PARISH OF ORLEANS, TO ARREST THE BODY OF

RENEE G POWELL JR

FOLDER #: 2205126


AND BRING BEFORE SAID COURT TO ANSWER A CHARGE OF

ARREST#	CHARGE	BOND AMOUNT
11874077	RS 40 966 (C) (2) C23P	
	ECSTASY (MDMA) POS	\$10,000.00

THE CRIMINAL SHERIFF IS HEREBY FURTHER COMMANDED TO RELEASE THE ACCUSED,
UPON HIS FURNISHING BAIL IN THE SUM OF \$10,000.00
WITH GOOD AND SOLVENT SECURITY, CONDITIONED AS THE LAW DIRECTS. THE BOND
TO BE TAKEN AND SURETIES APPROVED BY THE CLERK OF THE CRIMINAL DISTRICT
COURT FOR THE PARISH OF ORLEANS OR BY ONE OF HIS DEPUTIES DESIGNATED BY HIM.

WITNESS RUDY GORRELL, JR. JUDGE

PRESIDING IN THE MAGISTRATE COURT,
FOR THE PARISH OF ORLEANS, AT THE
HALL OF SITTINGS FOR THE SAME,
IN THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS.


MINUTE CLERK
7/23/2009

REMARKS -----

FIRST APPEARANCE HEARING IN MAGISTRATE COURT SECTION M5

BOND SET FOR \$10,000.00

RESULT-RULE TO SHOW CAUSE FOR 9/21/2009 AT 3:00 PM

SCHEDULED -RULE TO SHOW CAUSE ON 9/21/2009 AT 3:00 PM, SECT M2

THE ODP WAIVED THE DEFENDNATS PRESENCE

7/23/2009

Appendix D

AS400 Magistrate CMS Reports

1) Magistrate Court List

2) Pre-Trial Docket Summary

3) Pre-Trial Docket Case Calendar

**4) Pre-Trial Docket Case Calendar Showing “Rule to Show Cause”
for ART 701 Dates**

5) Daily Allotment Sheets

NAME	R/S	ITEM #	CHARGE	DISPOSITION
ANTHONY JACOBS 2220288 PRE	MAGISTRATE #	-507959	B/M ARREST #: 11899468 A2380409 RS 14 67.3 UNAUTHORIZED USE ACCESS CARD OVER \$500	Expedited: N <i>Clerk</i>
LEON D CLARK 2220261 PRE	MAGISTRATE #	-507960	B/M ARREST #: 11899473 J2012709 RS 40 967 (C) (2) A40P POSS OF CRACK	Expedited: N
GLEN O THOMAS 2220269 PRE	MAGISTRATE #	-507961	B/M ARREST #: 11899461 C0140809 RS 14 72.2 A MONETARY INSTRUMENT ABUSE	Expedited: N
SHUNTROY BURBANK 2220174 PRE 2220174 PRE 2220174 PRE 2220174 PRE	MAGISTRATE #	-507962	B/M ARREST #: 11899501 C3646509 RS 14 62 A SIMPLE BURGLARY ARREST #: 11899501 C3646509 RS 14 69 (C) ILL POSS STOLEN THINGS UNDER \$300 ARREST #: 11899502 I1254309 RS 14 65 SIMPLE ROBBERY ARREST #: 11899502 I1254309 RS 14 34.1 2ND DEGREE BATTERY	Expedited: N
MICHAEL ALLEN 2197241 OPP B1	MAGISTRATE #	-507963	B/M ARREST #: 11899536 H1683109 RS 14 34.1 2ND DEGREE BATTERY	Expedited: N
DAVID M FERNANDEZ 2220344 PRE	MAGISTRATE #	-507964	B/M ARREST #: 11899531 J2075709 RS 14 35 SIMPLE BATTERY	Expedited: N
JERMAINE CURRY 2220294 PRE	MAGISTRATE #	-507965	B/M ARREST #: 11899506 J2009609 RS 14 35.3 DOMESTIC ABUSE BATTERY	Expedited: N
BRYAN K GERARD 2220209 BKG	MAGISTRATE #	-507966	B/M ARREST #: 11899478 J1505909 RS 14 34 AGGRAVATED BATTERY	Expedited: N

Section: PM
Date: 10/15/2009

PRE-TRIAL DOCKET
Calendar Summary
Defendants Scheduled

Run Date: 10/14/2009
Time: 12:13:57
Page: 2

Orleans Parish Magistrate Court

<u>Mag No.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Defendant Name</u>	<u>Calendar Event</u>
507239	7	ALLEN, CARL	BOND REDUCTION HEARING
505713	12	BORLAND, ALLAN L	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
506697	14	BRANCH, YANCY	STATUS HEARING
507463	7	BROWN, CLEAVON (Cont'd)	PRELIMINARY HEARING
504564	9	COMPTON, ELESTON T	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
505726	14	DAY, MICHELLE M	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
504563	8	ESCOBEDO, ROBERT	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
505700	11	FIELDS, COREY M	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
504566	9	GAINES, BARRIE	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
505716	13	HAYWOOD, TROY W	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
505697	11	KIRK, KEITH D	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
505708	12	KIRK, KEVIN K	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
502031	8	MATHERNE, JUSTIN M	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
505687	10	MAURICE, CRAIG	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
505696	11	MCCREE, JOE	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
505715	13	MELANCON, ANDREA K	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
505694	10	MEREDITH, HENRY S	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
505689	10	MILLER, ANDREW	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
500815	8	MITCHELL, BRANDON C	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
506893	7	PHILLIPS, EDWARD J	PRELIMINARY HEARING
505718	13	RAVY, RICCARDO	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
505722	13	SIMMONS, DARRYL M	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
504728	7	STREET, CHARLES P	PRELIMINARY HEARING
504567	9	SYKES, ROBERT E	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
505712	12	VARISTE, RONALD C	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE
504605	10	WILLIAMS, ZELDA M	RULE TO SHOW CAUSE

=====
End of PM Calendar Summary
=====

26 Events Listed

Section: PM
Date: 10/15/2009

PRE-TRIAL DOCKET
Case Calendar
Orleans Parish Magistrate Court

Run Date: 10/14/2009
Time: 12:13:57
Page: 7

=====

BOND REDUCTION HEARING

=====


M507239 Jail 3:00 PM ALLEN, CARL
Item No. I3600309 RS 14 35.3
DOMESTIC ABUSE BATTERY
PENDING

=====


PRELIMINARY HEARING

=====

M504728 Jail 3:00 PM STREET, CHARLES P
Item No. G2049009 RS 14 35.3
DOMESTIC ABUSE BATTERY
REFUSED
RS 14 34.1
2ND DEGREE BATTERY
REFUSED
RS 14 30.1
SECOND DEGREE MURDER
PENDING



M506893 3:00 PM PHILLIPS, EDWARD J
Item No. I1908109 RS 14 42.1
FORCIBLE RAPE
REFUSED



M507463 Jail 3:00 PM BROWN, CLEAVON
Item No. D2224109 RS 14 80
FELONY CARNAL KNOWLEDGE OF A JUVENILE
PENDING

Section: PM
Date: 10/15/2009

PRE-TRIAL DOCKET
Case Calendar
Orleans Parish Magistrate Court

Run Date: 10/14/2009
Time: 12:13:57
Page: 11

=====

RULE TO SHOW CAUSE

=====

M505696 Jail 3:00 PM MCCREE, JOE
Item No. H1912609 RS 40 967 (B) (1) A40PD
PWIT DISTRIBUTE CRACK
ACCEPTED Case No. 491-263 Sect
RS 40 966 (A) (2) C21D
PWIT MARIJUANA
ACCEPTED Case No. 491-263 Sect
RS 14 91.13
ILLEGAL USE OF CDS IN PRESENCE UNDER 17
REFUSED



M505697 Jail 3:00 PM KIRK, KEITH D
Item No. H1905809 RS 14 30.1
SECOND DEGREE MURDER
PENDING

M505700 3:00 PM FIELDS, COREY M
Item No. H191509 RS 14 69 (A) A
ILL POSS STOLEN AUTO
REFUSED
RS 14 67 (A) A
THEFT AUTO OVER \$500
REFUSED
RS 14 108.1
FLIGHT FROM AN OFFICER
REFUSED
RS 14 63
CRIMINAL TRESPASS
REFUSED



New Orleans, LA., 10/23/2009

DAILY ALLOTMENT

This is to Certify that the following prosecutions, instituted in the Criminal District Court, were this day apportioned among the Judges thereof by lot and fell to the Judges of Sections A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K and L respectively, as hereinafter recorded, in accordance with Article VII, Section 86, LA Constitution, to-wit:

SEQC	DEFENDANT(S)	CHARGE(S)	SEC
<u>CASE CLASS: 2</u>			
1	NORMAN G COBBINS MAG # 507631	RS 40 967 (C) (2) A40P	
	EUGENE ALLEN MAG # 507655	RS 40 967 (B) (1) A40D RS 40 967 (B) (1) A04PD	
2	JASON DAUZART MAG # 505846	RS 14 95.1	
3	DARREL JENKINS JR MAG # 506774	RS 14 64	
4	CHRISTINA LAGARDE MAG # 506388	RS 40 966 (C) (1) B11P	
5	DONALD LEWIS MAG # 507940	RS 40 966 (A) (2) C21D RS 40 967 (C) (2) A04P	
6	JASON MATTHEWS MAG # 505767	RS 14 95.1	
7	MINA L MARSHALL MAG # 505581	RS 40 966 (A) (2) C21D	
<u>CASE CLASS: 3</u>			
8	JEWELL E HOOKS MAG # 505841	RS 40 971.1	

Assistant District Attorney

Deputy Clerk

Appendix E

Article 701 Rules Document

//

Case #	Case Status	Case Type	Arrest Date	Judge Section	Case Location	Case ADA
Name	Race	Sex	DOB	Role	Custody Status	Magistrate Nbr
C-09010036	Await Screen Disp	Criminal, NARCOTICS	08/04/09		Orleans	FRANK LABRUZZO
PEPE, STERLING G	Black	Male	05/25/89	Defendant		505270
- 3 40:966A05P MARIJUANA, TETRAHY POS - Referred --						

701 NOTICE

701	FELON	MISD
IN JAIL	60 / 120	45
ON BOND	150	90

701 DATE 9/20 TIME AMPM MAGISTRATE 1

SCREENING DISPOSITION:
YOU MUST ACCOUNT FOR EACH AND EVERY CHARGE BOOKED

ACCEPTED: _____

REFUSED: _____

REFERRED: _____

DIVERTED: _____

NO DISPOSITION: _____

REQUIRES SIGNATURE OF CHIEF OF SCREENING

Appendix F

Screen (Window) Work Flow Diagram

Magistrate Court Data Flow

