

OCA-DGCP-063:

Community Dispute Resolution Centers Program-Outside NYC

Request for Proposals Questions and Responses

The New York State Unified Court System (UCS) thanks the vendors that submitted the questions below concerning OCA-DGCP-063 Community Dispute Resolution Centers Programs-Outside New York City issued on Wednesday December 17, 2025.

Question#1:

With regard to narrative question 2: our agency has an overall strategic plan and then develops individual business plans for each program, including our CDRC, that are monitored by our board and updated as needed, at least every 3 years. Would this meet the requirements of this question, or would we still need to provide additional explanation as to why we do not have a specific strategic plan for our CDRC?

UCS Response:

Please submit both your agency's overall strategic plan and the individual business plan for the CDRC.

Question #2:

The RFP lists contrasting dates in the header and the important dates chart. Specifically, incorrect days of the week are listed in each. Can you confirm the actual issue date and due date for the RFP? Additionally, can you clarify if this error could invalidate the RFP and require it to need to be re-issued?

UCS Response:

The correct issue date is Wednesday, December 17, 2025, and the correct due date is Wednesday, January 28, 2026. UCS has issued Amendment #1 to address this. Vendors are encouraged to monitor the UCS Current Solicitations webpage <https://ww2.nycourts.gov/admin/bids/currentsolicitations.shtml> in case further clarifications are made to the RFP document.

Question #3:

Funding under the RFP includes both CDRC funding and Court Project Services funding. Will this distinction require changes to fiscal reporting? Additionally, will separate fiscal reports now be required for each County?

UCS Response:

The funding distinction will not require changes to fiscal reporting. For vendors who are awarded more than one county, separate fiscal reports will not be required for each individual county.

Question #4:

Is it a requirement that the CDRC funding be used only for community work, or can these funds also support court-based work if needed?

UCS Response:

CDRC Funding is intended to support dispute resolution programs and services that will be delivered in the community, as outlined on Page 6-7 of the RFP document.

Question #5:

Services/Deliverables outlined include requirements to provide in-person mediation at court locations on specific days. For some courts listed, we are aware of space issues and that there is currently not dedicated space for mediation at these locations. Should we write our responses assuming the courts will be resolving these issues to allow for mediations to occur at the court locations as specified?

UCS Response:

Space will be provided at court locations that are requesting in-person mediation.

Question #6:

Is the RFP to be submitted in the order as published? The Cover Sheet of the application is in the middle of the document as an Exhibit.

UCS Response:

Please refer to the Document Enclosure Checklist on (RFP page 46 and 47) to ensure all documents are submitted in the correct order.

Question #7:

Exhibit 11 asks for Calendar year—we are funded through April 1 - March 31—do you mean UCS Fiscal Year? Otherwise, we are missing funding part of the year 2025. Is the Calendar Year a typo? The body of the document references the fiscal year as above, but the chart references the calendar year.

UCS Response:

Exhibit 11 is correct. Please use calendar year funding.

Question #8:

The date needs clarification—is it due Friday, 1/30 or Wednesday, 1/28?

UCS Response:

The correct due date is Wednesday, January 28, 2026. Amendment # 1 is issued to clarify the due day, date, and time.

Question #9:

Since we conduct much of our services on Zoom, and our mediators travel to courts in neighboring counties, we do not currently consider mediators to be county-specific. All mediators on our panel serve in all counties. Considering this, how should Exhibit 11, section VII 16-19 be completed?

UCS Response:

Please provide mediator information for the mediators available to mediate in each county for which you are applying.

Question #10:

Are all the appendices relevant, referring to "sub-contractors," specifically Attachment 1 - Bidders certificate of work (printing), recycled products, recycled content? If not applicable, are they excluded from the bidder's submission?

UCS Response:

Per the Document Enclosure Checklist "a complete set of RFP documents must be submitted. Failure to provide all documents in the manner required may result in disqualification of an applicant's proposal." If not applicable, please indicate not applicable on the appendices.

Question #11:

The RFP indicates that bidders must submit a separate budget line-item sheet and budget narrative for each county included in their proposal. If a bidder is awarded funding for multiple counties, is it anticipated that these budgets will remain distinct and county-specific throughout the contract period, or would they be consolidated into a single combined budget upon award?

UCS Response:

The contract budget will consolidate **county** budgets into a single contractual budget.

Question #12:

The budget line-item sheet distinguishes between Court-provided services and non-Court-provided services. If awarded, is it anticipated that these two budget categories will remain separate and individually tracked within the executed contract?

UCS Response:

UCS will communicate this information with the Awarded Contractor once an award is made.

Question #13:

We have noticed that when writing some of our responses, we are going over the suggested amount of pages for the question. Are those a minimum amount of pages required, or the maximum?

UCS Response

The suggested length has been provided to help proposers dedicate adequate information to rate the question. UCS strongly encourages proposers to adhere to the suggested length for responses.

Question #14:

Mediators. For mediators who can serve (in-person) in multiple counties, should we list/count them under each county's mediator panel (even if that results in duplication across county applications), or should each mediator be listed under only one county with a note that they are available region-wide? For mediators who are able and willing to conduct mediations virtually (as **not** all mediators can or choose to do virtual work), should they be counted **separately** from in-person mediators, or included within the same mediator panel totals?

UCS Response:

All mediators who are able to serve in-person or virtually should be listed under each county's mediator panel.

Question #15:

Page 40, Financial Stability. The RFP references "audited financial statements." Based on our revenue level, the NYS Charities Bureau requires reviewed (not audited) financials. For this procurement, should we continue to follow the NYS Charities Bureau standard, or is UCS requiring audited financial statements regardless of revenue? Also, the RFP references "annual reports." Can you clarify what is meant by "annual reports," whether they are required as part of this submission/contract, and what UCS expects them to include?

UCS Response:

Reviewed financial statements that are prepared in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) are sufficient. "Annual reports" refer to the summary of the reviewed financial statements.

Question #16:

Page 46, Checklist. What is required for "proof of Attorney General charities registration? Would a PDF/screenshot from the NYS Charities Bureau Registry Search showing our organization and Registration ID suffice? Or are you looking for evidence of current compliance for latest Char500 filing?

UCS Response:

Yes, a PDF/screenshot from the NYS Attorney General's Charities Bureau Registry is sufficient.

Question #17:

Page 86, Chart A1 & A2. Just want to confirm that Calendar Years refer to the actual calendar and not the Court Fiscal Years 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

UCS Response:

Please use calendar years for Chart A1 & A2.

Question #18:

We are coming into an issue trying to extract pages from the PDF of the grant application. For questions 19, 22 & 23: Would you like us to include Exhibit 11 within the body of the questions as an attachment, or filled out within the body of the grant PDF itself?

UCS Response:

Please submit the charts required in Exhibit 11 with your proposal. UCS holds no opinion on the placement of Exhibit 11.

Question #19

Since Lewis (and Washington) counties do not want Court Project Services , should we skip/enter “N/A” for Court Project Services-related questions and only answer CDRC-related questions for those counties?

UCS Response:

Please answer the questions fully as appropriate to the scope of services of the counties that you are submitting the proposal. **Bidders may enter “N/A” where relevant.**

Question #20

Even though each county will have its own submission for CDRC Services, can match be shared among counties awarded to the same vendor? Example: if we are awarded Jefferson and St. Lawrence and have excess match in Jefferson at fiscal year-end, may it be applied toward St. Lawrence match requirements?

UCS Response:

Yes, if the awarded vendor is serving multiple counties, the matching fund can be applied towards the multiple counties for which the vendor has been awarded.

Question #21

If a county’s Court Project Services only requires mediation and we opt to do Conflict Coaching (ex. if screened out for DV) in the best interest of the litigants, is that considered a CDRC Service (“CDRCS”) rather than a Court Project Service? If yes, would it be counted as a CDRC case instead of Court Project Service – and could a fee be charged since it is no longer a Court Project Service matter?

UCS Response:

It would be considered a court project service and no fee may be charged.

Question #22

If a court requests onsite mediation but does not mention scheduling, what if a matter cannot occur onsite and must be scheduled for a different time/date? Is that viewed as noncompliance or “counted against” the vendor?

UCS Response:

This can be discussed with the specific court after a contract has been awarded to the provider.

Question #23:

If a Court Project Service for a county states a paid staff member “must” provide the service and no staff are available on a particular day (illness, conflict with another court, vacation), but we can offer a qualified volunteer to cover, is that considered a deviation that must be reported or could affect scoring/compliance?

UCS Response:

The vendor will have to plan for staff or consultant coverage accordingly to meet the specific court request of in-person coverage from a paid staff member or consultant. Volunteer coverage would not be appropriate.

Question #24

If a court changes the day(s) it requested in the RFP for services (or eliminates a requested day), are we expected to report that change to OCA? Over a five-year term, court operations and staffing/judges may shift—what is the protocol for changes to the RFP’s requested coverage days?

UCS Response:

Any changes to days/times requested in the RFP services will be coordinated between the court, the ADR Coordinator, and the provider.

Question #25

In the Services/Deliverables section, the first sentence references “intake, case management and mediation services,” but later language says “screen, schedule cases, and mediate onsite” (e.g., Jefferson Family Court). In this instance beside mediating, is the vendor expected to provide intake/case management, screening/scheduling, or all 4 processes?

UCS Response:

The request for provider to conduct “intake, case management and mediation services,” should also include activities such as screening, scheduling cases and mediating onsite.

Question #26

Multiple counties/courts list “onsite” coverage, but for one court we currently provide Teams coverage (at their request) because appearances are virtual. Should we contact the court or the ADR Coordinator to verify whether “onsite” expectations have changed? Or does “onsite” include being present at the courthouse in a separate room while appearing via Teams?

UCS Response:

In-person coverage has been requested by the court. Provider should plan to provide in-person coverage as detailed in Article V Project Services.

Question #27

St. Lawrence County / Ogdensburg City Court states “coverage for Mondays and alternating Wednesday.” Should we contact the court or ADR Coordinator to clarify what “alternating Wednesday” means operationally?

UCS Response:

Provider should plan an in-person coverage every other Wednesday in addition to the weekly Monday coverage as specified in the project service request.

Question #28

St. Lawrence County timing conflict: Ogdensburg City Court requests 9:00–1:00 and Family Court requests 10:00–5:00; both specify staff only. Should we contact City Court or the ADR

Coordinator first to confirm the Monday coverage request? The answer to the question impacts creating a plan for coverage with a neutral.

UCS Response:

These are the times the court has requested for in-person coverage, as stated in Article V Project Services.

Question #29

If we receive a Family Court referral for a non-mandated service (e.g., child support), does that count toward Court Project Services referral/case goals (e.g., 120 C/V cases) or as a CDRC case (and thus potentially fee-for-service)?

UCS Response:

Yes, this will count toward the court service project referral.

Question #30

Of 7 court days across our two Court Project Service counties, volunteers can only be utilized on 2 days (the other 5 require staff). Given that, can you clarify the emphasis/expectation around increasing the volunteer panel for Court Project Services coverage?

UCS Response:

Successful CDRCs have volunteer capacity to support both the court and community cases. Each CDRC shall determine the number of their volunteer panel mediators to meet and serve the program needs of both community and courts.

Question #31

Does Paid Staff include AmeriCorps members and/or volunteers who receive a stipend from the CDRC?

UCS Response:

For the purposes of court coverage, paid staff includes consultants that are hired and compensated by the CDRC for that purpose, including Minimum Time AmeriCorp volunteers whose sole role is providing mediation services.

Question #32:

Since there is 1 contract per county, are we required to maintain separate financial accounting (ex. QuickBooks classes/accounts) for each county?

UCS Response:

For vendors who are awarded more than one county, separate fiscal reports will not be required for each individual county.

Question #33:

Should we submit three separate proposals—one per county—with the same Organizational Narrative copied into each as applicable? Or is there one Organizational Narrative submission with three separate County Narrative sections (one for each county we're bidding on)?

UCS Response:

One Organizational Narrative section should be submitted with separate County Narrative sections.

Question #34:

Past Funding Chart (p. 32, #3): Instructions say to complete based on an April–March basis, but the columns are labeled “2024 Calendar Year” and “2025 Calendar Year.” Should “2024 Calendar Year” be interpreted as April 2024–March 2025 and “2025 Calendar Year” as April 2025–March 2026? Or does it mean April 2023–March 2024 and April 2024–March 2025?

UCS Response:

The past funding chart is accurate. Amendment # 1 was issued to reflect this change.

Question #35:

Peer Mediation (pp. 34–35, #16): We operate a restorative-based Youth Court program, but not a peer mediation program. Are we still expected to complete a “separate summary of the demographic characteristics of those mediators”. They have not been trained in mediation either.

UCS Response:

No. You are not expected to complete the grid for practitioners that are not trained in mediation.

Question #36:

(p. 35, #17): When it says, “discuss how the panel in your response to Question 16 differs from your organization’s current panel,” does “organization” refer ONLY to the CDRC panel specifically (not the broader multi-purpose agency’s boards, CASA volunteers, etc.)?

UCS Response:

Yes, this is in reference to the CDRC panel only.

Question #37:

Non-Staff Volunteer Percentage Chart (p. 85): Are AmeriCorps members considered Paid Consultants or Volunteers for this chart?

UCS Response:

Minimum Time AmeriCorps members whose sole responsibility is to mediate are considered volunteers, not consultants, for the purposes of this chart. For purposes of court coverage, they are considered staff. All other AmeriCorps members are considered as staff for the purposes of this chart.

Question #38:

In the RFP for UCS it lists child support cases in the Court Project Services table in Article V Project Services for Schuyler and Tompkins counties. We currently don't offer Child Support Mediation. Do you know if it is something they would want us to add in the start of the new 5-year grant cycle?

UCS Response:

UCS expects that child support services would be implemented in the 5-year contract, however, the court would not expect that child support services would be offered immediately at the beginning of a new contract. The number of cases and the start date of child support case referral will be determined by the court, CDRC contractor and the Sixth Judicial District. The Division of ADR will be providing some child support mediation trainings in fiscal year 2026 and some CDRC staff or volunteers may receive training.

Question #39:

In the Court Project Services table in Article V Project Services, Chemung County does not list child support cases. Does part of my proposal need to involve the additional training, and staff preparation to be able to service Child Support Cases?

UCS Response:

Child support cases are not identified for Chemung County in the Court Project Services table in Article V, and therefore the Awarded Contractor for that county is not expected to provide those services. It should also be noted that the Division of ADR will be providing some child support mediation trainings in fiscal year 2026 and some CDRC staff or volunteers may receive training.

Question #40:

For question 15: We are applying for two counties in which we already have a designated office, but it asks for up to three spaces per county to be discussed. For the counties we already occupy, can we only discuss our current facilities or do we need to come up with two other hypothetical spaces for these counties?

UCS Response:

You need only discuss your current facility. If a proposer would like to, they may propose up to three locations, especially if a proposer does not have an office in the proposed county.

Question #41:

For question 16: Regarding the list of volunteers, we use the same group of volunteers for both of our current counties, are we allowed to duplicate this list for both counties we are applying for?

UCS Response:

Yes.

Question #42:

RFP p. 34 Section VII (a) #15

We are currently a CDRC with an office space. The question states, "...list up to three specific locations and specify why each location is under consideration for use as a CDRC or is currently a CDRC office location". We are prepared to answer the questions about our current space, but do we have to list 2 more specific locations to consider as office space?

UCS Response:

You need only discuss your current facility. If a proposer would like to, they may propose up to three locations, especially if a proposer does not have an office in the proposed county.

Question #43:

RFP p. 35 Section VII (a) #22

We are currently providing mediation services, including onsite coverage, for several town and village courts in our service area. The Court Project Services only lists City Courts and Family Court for our county, but do services for town and village courts fall under Court Project Services or CDRC Services? On page 86, Chart A.1: Case Projection, do we include town and village courts data in the court-referred category? These cases are referred to mediation by the Judges in the town and village courts. Additionally, should any expenses in support of town and village courts services be reflected in the budget as CDRC Services or Court Project Services?

UCS Response:

The scope of work/deliverables identified for the Court Project Services are limited to requests from City Courts, Family Courts and Supreme Courts. Any proposed services to support civic groups, social services agencies and criminal justice agencies, including town and village CDRC services, should be reflected in the proposal and budget. The local ADR Coordinator, the Division of ADR, and local Judicial Districts may approve certain town and village CDRC services for certain contracts.

Question #44:

RFP p. 35 Section VII (a) #22

We used to have a Matrimonial program, but ceased operations of that particular program at the end of 2024. Should we include the Matrimonial numbers from 2024 in the Chart A.1 Case Projection even though we will not be providing these services in the new contract term? These

were all Community Referred cases, not court-referred. Would it be allowable to provide a brief explanation?

UCS Response:

Yes. Please include all past caseload numbers for all ADR services in the chart, even if you are not projecting to offer them in the future. You may use the narratives in questions 21 and 24 to explain the change in programming.

Question #45:

RFP p. 36 Section VII (b) Line-Item Budget Proposal

Please confirm that the budget form submission is based on the maximum allowable amount of the 12-month budget as indicated in Exhibit 10, and should not be based on 75% of this amount due to the constraint in the initial budget period 7/1/26-3/31/27.

UCS Response:

Yes, confirming that the budget form submission will be based on the maximum allowable amount of the 12-month budget as outlined in Exhibit 10.

Question #46:

Page 6 of the RFP states that the Awarded Contractor must provide “appropriate, accessible facilities for each county it intends to serve.” Could OCA clarify whether these facilities must be leased directly by the Awarded Contractor, or whether it is acceptable to utilize appropriate court or community spaces that are made available for the purpose of scheduling/holding of dispute resolution sessions?

UCS Response:

Awarded contractor must provide appropriate and accessible facilities for each county it serves by either directly leasing a facility or directly arranging for in-kind donation of space to conduct dispute resolution services. Article 21A of the Judiciary Law, § 849-e (c), states that “Centers shall, whenever reasonably possible, make use of public facilities at free or nominal cost.”

Question #47:

For the services and deliverables listed under “Court Project Services,” will the courts be prepared to provide the required referrals for each service area? Alternatively, is the Awarded Contractor expected to develop new initiatives for service areas where courts are not currently generating referrals to the CDRC?

UCS Response:

The courts anticipate providing the specified volume of referrals during the five-year contract. In some instances, this volume will begin at the start of the contract period, and in other cases it may emerge later in the contract. For services requested by a court in the RFP, but that have not previously provided referrals or the same number of referrals, CDRC will be an included stakeholder in the program development process facilitated by the court, the local ADR Coordinator, and/or the judicial district.

Question #48:

Page 4 of the RFP states that one contract will be awarded per county and that Awarded Contractors will enter into “one (1) Contract for each county.” Could OCA confirm whether an organization awarded multiple counties will be required to execute separate CDRC contracts for each county?

If so, would each contract require separate fiscal and programmatic reporting? For example, if CDRC were to be awarded 4 counties with 4 contracts, would they be responsible for submitting 4 separate quarterly fiscal reconciliation reports? This would represent a significant change from current contracting practices and would substantially increase administrative workload, indirect costs, and administrative salary requirements. This may also affect our ability to apply for or continue services in counties where the administrative burden would outweigh available funding.

UCS Response:

No, organizations awarded multiple counties will be consolidated into a single contract. The contract budget will consolidate county budgets into a single contractual budget, and there will be one programmatic narrative report expected for each county.

Question #49:

The RFP includes projected numbers for certain services and deliverables. Could OCA clarify how these projections were developed, particularly for services for which there are currently no

referrals and where discussions with our ADR Coordinators have not indicated that these areas are district priorities?

UCS Response:

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, judicial districts conducted a needs assessment process and prioritized court services requested for this RFP.

Question #50:

How will Awarded Contractors be evaluated against these projected numbers if courts do not generate referrals at the levels indicated? We want to ensure that performance expectations are aligned with actual court practices and referral patterns.

UCS Response:

Local ADR Coordinators, judicial districts, and the Division of ADR will monitor referrals and contractual case referrals and will regularly interact with CDRCs and courts to provide technical assistance.

Question #51:

Are bidders to send a complete proposal for each county they are applying for, or just attach county-specific questions, together with separate budgets, amendments and attachments for each proposal? That is one set containing one cover sheet and answers to questions 1-14, with two separately completed sections appended to one application?

UCS Response:

Please follow the Document Enclosure Checklist. A complete proposal should include answers to questions 1-14 and separate responses for the Narrative Description - Proposed County-Specific Program Services section for each county for which you are applying.

Question #52:

Does number 23 of the Narrative Description - Proposed County-Specific Program Services need to be answered in both a narrative format or only in the chart form?

UCS Response:

Please respond only in the chart. A narrative about these projections may be provided in questions 21 and 24.

Question #53:

The RFP does not explicitly reference Town or Village Courts, including those located on the East End of Long Island.

Please clarify:

- a) Are services to Town and Village Courts considered Court Project Services under this RFP?
- b) If yes, are there specific deliverables, service expectations, or reporting requirements?
- c) If no, should services to Town and Village Courts be budgeted and reported under CDRCF funds rather than Court Project funds?

UCS Response:

Services to Town and Village Courts are not considered Court Project Services. The scope of work/deliverable identified for the Court Project Services are limited to requests from City Courts, Family Courts and Supreme Courts. Any proposed services to support civic groups, social services agencies and criminal justice agencies, including town and village CDRC services, should be reflected in the proposal and budget. The local ADR Coordinator, the Division of ADR, and local Judicial Districts may approve certain town and village CDRC services for certain contracts.

Question #54:

The RFP requires two or more staff and/or mediators to be present on-site in court locations. Please clarify space availability at the following courts:

- Nassau County District Court (Hempstead)
- Suffolk County District Courts (Districts 1–6)
- Suffolk County Family Court
- Suffolk County Matrimonial Court

For each location:

- a) What office or workspace (if any) will be available for staff, paid mediators, and volunteer mediators?
- b) How many private or semi-private rooms are available for screenings, mediations, and intakes?

c) Will sufficient space be provided to allow services to be delivered in a manner consistent with confidentiality and best practices, where two or more staff/mediators are required?

UCS Response:

Sufficient space will be provided to allow mediation services to be delivered in a manner consistent with confidentiality. In some locations a dedicated office will be also provided.

Question #55:

For Suffolk County Matrimonial Court, please clarify: where will Intimate Partner Violence Screenings be conducted? (*Reference: pp. 26–27*)

UCS Response:

Intimate Partner Violence Screenings will be conducted at the court facility.

Questions #56:

For Suffolk County Matrimonial Court, please clarify: Will contractors be provided private, confidential space for Intimate Partner Violence Screenings consistent with safety protocols? (*Reference: pp. 26–27*)

UCS Response:

Yes.

Questions #57:

For Suffolk County Matrimonial Court, please clarify: If space is limited, are alternative arrangements (e.g., scheduled room use or virtual screening options) permitted?

UCS Response:

Not applicable because there is adequate space provided.

Question #58:

When I review the current funding that we have from UCS for fiscal year 2025-2026 at our center and then add up the maximum available funding by county on the charts on 80-82, I come up with a lower amount of funding. Are we going to experience a decrease in funding for July 1, 2026?

UCS Response:

Funding listed by county is the expected level of funding for the first twelve (12) months of the new contract period.

Question #59:

My question is regarding #18 in Narrative Description - Proposed County-Specific Program Services, specifically, regarding percentages of cases mediated by volunteers vs. staff.

- a. are you looking for total number of cases referred to us or
- b. total number of just court cases referred to us or
- c. just the total number of cases that went to mediation.

UCS Response:

Please provide the total number of cases that went to a dispute resolution process (e.g., mediation, arbitration, conflict coaching, etc.) and where services were provided by the group in each role. To calculate the percentage, add the total cases provided by volunteers and the total cases provided by staff and consultant neutrals, and use that as your denominator. The percentage of cases serviced by volunteers and the percentage of cases services by staff/consultants should total 100%.

Question #60:

Fees for Court Project Services Cases. In the unlikely circumstance that a court referred case requires more than 3 total ADR hours (could be >1 session), excluding intake, screening, and case management, can we charge a sliding scale fee?

UCS Response:

No. Court-referred cases to CDRCs for dispute resolution processes are free to litigants.

Question #61:

Header/Footer. Can we add a Header with the agency name and RFP #/title, and a Footer with the page number to any or all of the CDRC prepared narrative pages and attachments for their application?

UCS Response:

As indicated in Article VII Required Documents, all documentation must be submitted on prescribed forms, without alteration. Where no form is included or specified, submissions must be single-spaced with one inch page margins (not including attachments or financial forms) using a 12-point font. In those instances where no form is included or specified, a header and footer may be added.

Question #62:

Page 83-83, Past Funding Chart. Other than the first box with “UCS Funding”, for all other boxes in Section 1 and 2, if they do not say “dispute resolution”, do we fill them in with CDRC non-ADR revenue (ex. fundraising event for general operating purposes)?

UCS Response:

Amendment #1 was issued to provide definitions for each of the categories on the Past Funding Chart.

Question #63:

Exhibit 4 (Insurance Requirements), page 53, #2, “The commercial general insurance of Applicants awarded funding shall be primary insurance with respect to UCS.” What does that mean? An email has also been submitted to our insurance agent.

UCS Response:

The clause ensures that the Applicant’s insurance pays first for applicable claims involving the resulting contract or services provided thereunder..

Question #64:

What happens in terms of funding for current grantees between April 1 and June 30, 2026 who are awarded for funding under this RFP beginning July 1, 2026?

UCS Response:

The current contracts end June 30, 2026. Bidders awarded contracts as a result of this RFP will have a new five-year contract beginning July 1, 2026, which will reflect the allocations indicated in this RFP. Funding does not carry over from one five-year contract to a new five-year contract.

Question #65:

Are there any requirements related to the spend-down of match funds? Or are the requirements around securing match funding only?

UCS Response:

As it pertains to Narrative Description - Organizational Capacity question 3 and Exhibit 11 Past Funding Chart (Section VII (a) # 3), please report secured funds, even if they were not expended.

Question #66:

How were the projected outcomes for Court Project Services determined? What happens if a CDRC falls short of specific targets in one or more courts?

UCS Response:

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, judicial districts conducted a needs assessment process and prioritized court services requested for this RFP. The scope of work/deliverable identified for the Court Project Services were specific requests from City Courts, Family Courts, and Supreme Courts in consultation with local the ADR Coordinator and local Judicial Districts. The awarded contractor will be expected to work with their local ADR Coordinator, courts, and/or judicial district in meeting the deliverables outlined in Article V Project Services.

Question #67:

Since court project services do not require match funds to be secured, does this mean that in-kind contributions of volunteers' time (on-site court services, professional development/in-services) are now considered part of the required match as a whole?

UCS Response:

Yes.

Question #68:

Are there any requirements related to the Statewide Financial System (SFS) for applicants?

UCS Response:

Applicants submitting a proposal in response to this RFP do not have any requirements related to the Statewide Financial System (SFS). There are SFS requirements once an award has been made.

Question #69:

Can a CDRC and court establish an arrangement post-RFP? If so, would the CDRC get additional funding for that work?

UCS Response:

This RFP includes all of the anticipated available funding for ADR services. If new programming were to be developed by a CDRC contractor, in collaboration with the local court, ADR Coordinator, judicial district, and Division of ADR, and there was a state appropriation allocated to support new programming, we anticipate that a separate procurement would be conducted.

Question #70:

Exhibit 11 requesting past funding information asks for calendar year data, but our fiscal year runs from April through March. Are applicants expected to convert their fiscal year data to fit with a calendar year format?

UCS Response:

Yes, please use calendar year funding as it's prescribed in Exhibit 11.

Question #71:

For the CDRC Services required under this RFP, are there any requirements around who does the work/how they are trained?

UCS Response:

Yes. All paid staff, volunteers, and consultants, regardless of whether they are providing court or CDRC services, are required to meeting training and apprenticeship requirements and all other policies outlines in the CDRC Program Manual and Article 21-A of the Judiciary Law.

Question #72:

Should a CDRC serve multiple counties, will multiple proposals be required, or is one proposal that addresses all counties sufficient?

UCS Response:

Please follow the Document Enclosure Checklist. A complete proposal should include one set of answers to questions 1-14 and separate responses for the Narrative Description - Proposed County-Specific Program Services section for each county for which you are applying.

Question #73:

Surrogates support is not mentioned under Court Services in Rockland but is included in the projected numbers and support for Westchester. Where should we address the proposed Rockland Surrogates needs?

UCS Response:

Based on the needs assessment conducted by the Ninth Judicial District and their state priorities, Rockland Surrogate's Court does not anticipate referring cases to the awarded contractor.

Question #74:

RFP p. 32; Section VII (a) #3; and RFP p. 83 Exhibit 11 Past Funding Chart

In Question #3 in the narrative, it instructs us to complete Exhibit 11, Past Funding Chart, answering on a state fiscal basis (April through March). But on the Exhibit 11 (p. 83), Past Funding Chart, the columns say 2024 Calendar Year and 2025 Calendar Year. Does this mean we complete this information in Exhibit 11 for the periods of 1/1/24-12/31/24 and 1/1/25 and 12/31/25?

UCS Response:

The past funding chart is accurate. Please use calendar year funding. Amendment # 1 was issued to reflect the change in Narrative Description - Organizational Capacity question #3 to address any confusion.