

OCA-DGCP-049 Attorney for the Child Services, Juvenile Defense, Alternative Providers, New York City

Questions and Responses

The New York State Unified Court System (UCS) thanks the vendors that submitted the questions below concerning OCA-DGCP-049 Attorney for the Child Services, Juvenile Defense, Alternative Providers, New York City, issued on August 29, 2025.

Below are responses to the questions UCS received in connection with this RFP.

Questions:

- 1) Does OCA have a yearly estimate for the number of total cases in Bronx Family Court that fall within the designated categories of representation (PINS, JDs, AO/JOs) for each of the last 3 years?
- 2) What was the total number of JD and Designated Felony petitions filed on non-AO/JO removal cases in New York County for each year of the preceding contract?
- 3) What was the total number of PINS cases filed in New York County for each year of the preceding contract?

UCS Response:

Yes. The UCS publishes the [Family Court Caseload Activity report](https://app.powerbigov.us/view?r=eyJrIjoiMTEwOWU2ZWVtNWMyNi00MGU1LTllMmYtODY4OTU5MDA4YjJmIiwidCI6IjM0NTZmZTkYLVNiZDEtNDA2ZC1iINWEzLTUzNjRiZWwYTgzMyJ9):
<https://app.powerbigov.us/view?r=eyJrIjoiMTEwOWU2ZWVtNWMyNi00MGU1LTllMmYtODY4OTU5MDA4YjJmIiwidCI6IjM0NTZmZTkYLVNiZDEtNDA2ZC1iINWEzLTUzNjRiZWwYTgzMyJ9>

Questions:

- 1) As I understand the RFP, any organization submitting a proposal must be taking on representation in all of the designated categories of representation (as opposed to just one or two of the categories). Is that correct?
- 2) Will proposals to handle solely AO/JO removals (and not JD/PINS) be considered? If so, will they be looked upon less favorably than proposals to handle all project services?

UCS Response:

No. Applicants may submit proposals for any of the designated categories. UCS reserves the right to award multiply contracts in any given county.

Question:

Page 5 states “UCS anticipates making one or more contract awards per county.” The funding available for each respective county detailed in Exhibit 7 does not suggest more than one meaningful award can be made to provide holistic representation. Is there any possibility additional funding will be allocated beyond what is referenced in Exhibit 7?

UCS Response:

No. Initial 12-month allocations for all contracts awarded in a given county will not exceed the allocation amounts referenced in Exhibit 7

Question:

How does OCA intend to utilize the 18b panel in each county?

UCS Response:

The role of the Office of Court Administration is limited to providing resources to institutional provider contracts and appellate division AFC offices. Local court administrators determine protocols for assigning cases.

Questions:

- 1) As stated, Juvenile Defense cases often require multiple providers to represent youth arrested in concert or when individual interests may not be aligned. How was the 90% determined?
- 2) The RFP states that the primary provider in each county handles 90% of the cases and indicates that this RFP is therefore for representation on the remaining 10% of cases. In New York City, Legal Aid Society is the primary provider and they handled 75% of the cases under the award pursuant to RFP #072. Does this RFP envision that Legal Aid Society will continue to handle 75% of the cases? If

so, is this RFP to determine representation on the remaining 25% of cases? Is it expected that some portion of that 25% will be handled by 18-b panel attorneys?

UCS Response:

The 90% estimate is a city-wide estimate that was provided for general information purposes only. Applicants should focus on submitting proposals that demonstrate a staffing model that provides capacity to provide quality representation. Programs will be monitored to allocate resources to promote capacity to provide services within the established caseload standard.

Question:

Will awards be considered to conflict providers for more than 10% of the total petitions filed?

UCS Response:

Awards will not be made based on the number of petitions filed.

Question:

Is the expectation that current providers will maintain existing caseloads that will remain pending beyond January 1st?

UCS Response:

If the current provider is awarded a new contract, they will continue representation of existing clients. If not, a transition plan will be developed.

Questions:

- 1) Under 14, the contractor is expected to provide services for “after hours arraignments”. What are the expectations for institutional conflict providers to be present at night/weekend arraignments?
- 2) Alternate providers do not currently provide services at after-hour arraignments. Will proposals that do not include providing services at after-hour arraignments be considered?

UCS Response:

To clarify, the requirement to staff after hours arraignments was stated in error. Conflict providers will not be required to be present at night/weekend arraignments.

Question:

What is the significance of cost per attorney within the experience bands listed on page 14?

UCS Response:

The question is intended to provide insight into the organization's staffing structure.

Question:

In accordance with best practices for juvenile defense on the early assignment of counsel, does UCS agree that pre-filing representation on non-removal cases (such as representation during adjustment services) is essential and that this representation should be included in any cost-per-case analysis?

UCS Response:

Applicants may include pre-petition representation as part of the proposed practice model, but it is not considered "essential". Proposals will not be evaluated on a cost-per-case basis.

Questions:

- 1) The RFP states that UCS anticipates making one or more contract awards per county. If a proposal is being submitted for only a portion of the alternative provider work in a county, should submissions include an estimated case capacity? For a case capacity provided as a percentage, what total number of anticipated cases should be used?

- 2) RFP #072 for AFC Juvenile Defense included Projected Annual Caseloads by county. Does UCS have Projected Annual Caseloads by county for this RFP?

How many cases does UCS predict will need to be handled with the aggregate funding available for each county?

UCS Response:

Proposals are not being evaluated based on case capacity.

Question:

RFP 072 in 2020 asked for an estimated cost per case. This RFP does not request a cost per case. Will UCS be determining a proposed cost per case based on the budget provided? If so, how will the number of cases be determined to assess the cost per case? Will UCS be using the current 150 children caseload standard in Section 127.5 of the Rules of the Chief Administrative Judge?

UCS Response:

Proposals are not being evaluated based on case capacity.

Question:

What was the total number of petitions filed in AO and JO removal cases in New York County for each year of the preceding contract?

UCS Response:

Public information regarding Juvenile Offender and Adolescent Offender arrests, court case outcomes, and youth part activity is available on the [New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services' website](https://www.criminaljustice.ny.gov/crimnet/ojsa/juv_off/index.htm):
https://www.criminaljustice.ny.gov/crimnet/ojsa/juv_off/index.htm

Question:

How does the aggregate funding available by county compare to the aggregate funding available for alternate providers by county in RFP #072 in 2020 or to the total amount of money awarded to alternate providers pursuant to RFP #072?

UCS Response:

UCS awarded \$2,963,645 for alternative AFC juvenile defense representation for the period April 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021. The total amount UCS anticipates awarding for the initial 12-month period pursuant to this RFP is \$5,650,000 (subject to available appropriations).