

**Questions and Answers Submitted for the MIDC's Request for Proposals:
Michigan Public Defense Caseload Standards Study
Second Round of Questions**

- 1. Regarding the answer to Question #11 [in the first series of answers], it speaks of a requirement that by fall of 2017, each indigent defense system in the state must submit certain information about the number and identity of attorneys in their programs. When would MIDC expect to have such information available for the successful bidder?**

The MIDC should be able to make this information available by the end of the 2017 calendar year at the latest, presuming the MIDC's statutory timeline and process is followed by the executive branch and local systems.

- 2. Does the Fall 2017 requirement mentioned in the answer to question #11 include a requirement on the part of local systems to also provide information to MIDC on the number of indigent defense appointments made or representations accepted by each system?**

It is unlikely that this information will be included. Our sense is that many indigent defense systems are not currently able to calculate this number. It will be possible to get this from a select group of courts/counties but the MIDC does not anticipate having this information from all systems across the state by this deadline.

- 3. Regarding the answer to question #15, does the standard JIS case management system used in approximately 80 percent of the courts contain a field in criminal cases that records whether counsel has been appointed for the defendant by the court?**

The JIS case management system does have a data field for this variable; however, we have learned that many of the courts are not utilizing the field. One of our first orders of business is to encourage courts to start using this field to track appointments.

- 4. Regarding the answer to question #20, does the meeting space at the MIDC office in Lansing have Wi-Fi that could be accessed by 30 computing devices used by non-MIDC staff at the same time?**

Yes.

- 5. Regarding the answer to question #23, there is an expected deliverable of an "assessment of historical caseloads and staffing in Michigan indigent defense systems." But according to the answer to question #8, MIDC does not have information on the current caseloads for local indigent defense programs, and one would assume historical numbers would be equally unavailable. Does this deliverable require an assessment that covers all 180 or so local programs or**

would limiting the assessment to selected programs that have such information readily available satisfy the requirement?

The deliverable refers to an assessment of what has been available where that information is known as well as an explanation of what has not historically been tracked.

- 6. Regarding the answer to question #24, it states that “the MIDC expects Michigan to adopt a caseload standard in the spring of 2018 and we hope to augment this standard with results from the caseload study within approximately one year of its passage.” What type of “caseload standard” will be adopted in the spring of 2018 given that the caseload standards study that is the subject of this RFP might not be finalized by that time? Is that anticipated standard similar to the “appropriate caseload/workload standards in the state of Michigan” that will be the product of the proposed research?**

The proposed caseload standard that will be released will address the importance of workload limits, the reasoning behind this, and the expectation that local indigent defense systems will address this issue in their reform efforts. As an interim measure until this caseload study is complete, the proposed standard makes reference to the ACCD recommended caseload limits. The proposed standard makes explicit mention of this current study and that its finding will be used to directly inform a revised version of the standard. The MIDC hopes to release the tentative text of the caseload standard (called “Standard 6: Indigent Defense Workloads”) on its website during the week of April 24th, 2017. This initial text is only proposed at this point and is subject to public comment and further commission revision.

- 7. The RFP on P.5 indicates “The “Proposal Narrative” shall not be more than 20 pages, and must include capabilities of the responding organization, and the case-weighting plan (including number of participating counties or courts, project length, etc.).” The RFP goes on to state that “All proposals must also include a full budget and a budget narrative that describes every category of expenses listed in the budget.” In “Appendix A: Suggested Proposal Format” under “II. PROPOSAL NARRATIVE,” the following sections are described: “A. Plan of action,” “B. Proposer Capability and Personnel,” and “C. Budget and Cost.” Does the 20 page limit apply in total to all of Appendix A’s suggested sections for the Proposal Narrative (including the capabilities and personnel statement, budget narrative, and the budget itself), or does it just apply to “A. Plan of action”?**

The page limit applies to suggested sections A and B, so everything other than the budget and budget narrative.