

# ANTHONY J. DATILIO

## CLERK OF COURTS

### COLUMBIANA COUNTY, OHIO

## Columbiana County Request for Proposal 2015-CCC-1 Questions and Answers

1. The RFP page 2 Section 2.01.g states the CMS will: “Be internet-based and accessible over the public infrastructure”. If the CMS is not internet-based will this bid be rejected?

NO. No system or solution will be rejected strictly on any one feature. The committee will accept all types of systems for review and rank them according to the best overall system for the Clerk of Courts. Although, it is expected that the system has an internet based public search section at a minimum.

2. The RFP states bid due September 29, 2015 and bid award is October 28, 2015. This is extremely fast and does not appear to leave room for the County to evaluate all bids, see a demonstration of competing CMS vendors, receive any BAFO and negotiate a final contract in this time frame. Has the county already determined a preferred CMS vendor?

NO. The Clerk of Courts Office has not selected a preferred vendor. We have reviewed many systems leading up to the creation of the RFP in an effort to see what features are currently available, and to have a better understanding of what the committee would like to see in a new system. This is a very aggressive time frame because the Clerk of Courts is in need of upgrading its aging system. As the RFP states, the Clerk of Courts makes no commitments to meeting those dates and will take whatever time is needed to make a determination he feels is correct.

3. The RFP page 17 Section 7.18 states that the “Contractor may be required to submit a Performance Bond, or other suitable security, in the amount equal to the total cost proposal”. Will a Performance Bond be mandatory? What is “other suitable security”?

The Clerk of Courts will discuss the various types of security necessary to protect the Clerk of Courts and Columbiana County with the chosen vendor. The issue of a Performance Bond is one of several different efforts that may be used to ensure that the County is protected until a complete product is implemented. Other methods could be cash hold backs based on benchmarks with a lump sum due 30 days after implementation.

4. Appendix B Section 5.0 Financial & Accounting 5.1.1 states the System shall be compliant with GAAP and GASB. This implies a double-entry (debits and credits) accounting system. Shall the System ONLY be a double-entry accounting system?

While this system is the preferred system of the State Auditor's Office the current system in place by the Clerk of Courts Office is not a GAAP compliant. Again the RFP is a list of features the Clerk of Courts desires, but no system will be rejected simply on any one category, systems will be ranked according to the Clerk of Courts needs as a whole.

5. Appendix B Section 5.2 Accounts Receivable. Do you allow an Accounts Receivable for court filing fees and not get payment in full at time of filing the case?

NO. The Clerk of Courts requires that the initial filing fees must be paid in full, of course we are at the mercy of the Judge and initial fees may be waived with an accepted indigency affidavit.

6. Appendix B Section 5.8 Deposit Accounts. Is this like a pre-paid account for attorney to draw from to pay for court filing fees?

YES. Deposit accounts are accounts that are set up where money can be placed on individual cases for the purpose of future distribution. This distribution can be either by applying deposits to court costs or generating a check to a party.

7. Appendix B Section 7 Probation. Are you looking for a fully-integrated Probation case management system or to integrate with an existing probation case management system? Are there other functional requirements for the probation case management system other than Section 7?

We are looking for a system that has the specifications listed in Section 7, and can be utilized by our Probation Departments for the purpose of tracking and distributing restitution. We do not currently have a Probation Case Management System and would want whatever solution offered to work in conjunction with the Clerks Case Management System.

8. Appendix B Section 8 Jury Management. Are you looking for a Jury Management system or to integrate with an existing jury management system? Are there functional requirements for the jury management system other than Section 8?

The Clerk of Courts would prefer a new Jury Management Solution. We currently have an outdated Jury management system and would look to upgrade that with the rest of the Case Management System. To the best of my knowledge all specifications for the jury system are listed in Section 8.

9. Page 2 1.03 CMS solution shall reside and operate on the existing computer hardware owned by the Clerk of Courts.

Comment: I did not find this information and configuration, so will it be provided?

Currently the Clerk of Courts Office is licensed to run SQL Server 2005, and is running Windows Server 2008 or newer on all servers. The Clerk of Courts Office is licensed to run Windows Server 2012. Any other information will be provided upon request.

10. Page 2 2.01 (g) What is the Internet speed and wire, fiber and what "firewall" access speed?

Currently the Clerk of Courts network runs on a County owned Fiber network, the firewall, fiber and switches are all GIG speed.

11. Page 3 2.03 (d) Will the County/Municipal Court be participating in the OHP e-citation project?

Yes. The Columbiana County Municipal Court will be participating in the OHP E-Citation Project, and the CMS will need to meet all the criteria established by the State of Ohio to participate in this project.

12. Page 3 2.04 (d) Will the Court be using on-site disaster recovery or remote? If remote, where located?

Disaster Recovery is located on site, data is stored at two separate locations.

13. APPENDIX B-2 2.20 Attorney Tracking

7. System ..... defendant was previously (sentence incomplete)

System shall provide the ability to check for conflicts when a public defender is assigned to a defendant's case (e.g., a PD cannot represent a defendant if that defendant was previously represented by that PD)

This information is available by increasing the cell size on the row containing the information. If you need assistance on how to view this information please contact me.

14. 2.5 Party Management

9. 2nd line .... has been used for (statement not complete)

System shall have the ability to separate one person record into multiple records and retain associations to each person's cases if it is determined that the person's record has been used for different people.

This information is available by increasing the cell size on the row containing the information. If you need assistance on how to view this information please contact me.

15. Conversion Info Will the Court be providing the current data for conversion or will they simply start out with the new system data?

How will the data be presented (format) ?

Yes. The court is expecting to have data converted from its current database. Data is currently in a SQL Server database

16. Are the Court fines and costs current and balanced to case file?

YES. Court fines and costs are current and all balanced to each case file and number.

17. Are there Imaged documents to be converted?

YES. The Common Pleas Court currently has just over 2 million images that will need converted. The Municipal Court does not currently have any images to convert.

18. Would the RFP selection committee consider keeping the existing netDMS imaging system?

YES. The committee is open to working with any proposed imaging system at this point.

19. How many images and pages are their currently with netDMS and are there redactions and/or annotations?

The County has over 2 million (2, 024,986) images as of September 9th, 2015. There are no redactions and or annotations at this time.

20. RFP States 1.01 SCOPE. The Case Management System Project shall encompass the following:

- A) Common Pleas Court, General Division;
- B) Common Pleas Court, Domestic Relations Division;
- C) Columbiana County Municipal Court

1. Will you please advise total number of users for all courts?

Total approximate number of users for the Courts and Clerk of Courts are sixty two (62).

Any questions or concerns regarding this information can be directed to:

Chief Deputy Shane Patrone at [spatrone@ccclerk.org](mailto:spatrone@ccclerk.org)