



**Office of the Administrative Director – Financial Services Division**

THE JUDICIARY • STATE OF HAWAII • 1111 ALAKEA STREET, 6TH FLOOR • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-2807  
TELEPHONE (808) 538-5805 • FAX (808) 538-5802

**Rodney A. Maile**  
ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR

**Iris T. Murayama**  
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR

January 24, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

FROM: Janell Kim, Financial Services Administrator

SUBJECT: ADDENDUM NO. 1, REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS NO, J12229,  
TO PROVIDE A CONSULTANT TO ASSIST THE JUDICIARY, STATE OF  
HAWAII, TO DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A STATEWIDE STRATEGIC  
PLANNING PROCESS AND TO PRODUCE A FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT

Transmitted herewith is one copy of Addendum No. 1 for your review.

Should you have any questions this regarding this addendum, please contact Newton Sakamoto in the Contracts and Purchasing Office at (808) 538-5805, Fax (808) 538-5802, or e-mail [newton.t.sakamoto@courts.state.hi.us](mailto:newton.t.sakamoto@courts.state.hi.us).

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Janell Kim".

Janell Kim  
Financial Services Administrator

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS NO, J12229**

**TO PROVIDE A CONSULTANT TO ASSIST THE JUDICIARY, STATE OF HAWAII,  
TO DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A STATEWIDE STRATEGIC PLANNING  
PROCESS AND TO PRODUCE A FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT**

**ADDENDUM NO. 1**

**January 24, 2012**

**The following questions were submitted in writing and/or discussed at the pre-proposal conference and are being answered in accordance with this RFP:**

Q.1. Will the Judiciary provide a copy of the last comprehensive strategic planning document?

A.1. Yes, the Policy and Planning Department will share its strategic planning materials upon request.

Q.2. Does the Judiciary currently have consultants assisting with any of the statewide strategic planning efforts? If so, please provide the name of the company and the value of the current contract. If available, please provide a copy of the current contract and pricing.

A.2. No, the Judiciary does not have other consultants assisting with the strategic planning effort.

Q.3. Can you provide the major areas within the Judiciary that will be covered under the assessment and recommendations?

A.3. There are no areas within the Judiciary that are excluded from consideration.

Q.4. Can you provide the Judiciary's current mission statement and any documents that discuss current gaps, deficiencies, and goals of the Judiciary?

A.4. The Judiciary's mission statement is as follows: "The mission of the Judiciary as an independent branch of government is to administer justice in an impartial, efficient, and accessible manner in accordance with the law." The 2011 Annual Report, Supplemental Budget and Variance Report submitted to the 26<sup>th</sup> State Legislature is a source for information related to "current gaps, deficiencies, and goals of the Judiciary".

Q.5. Is it possible to attend the pre-proposal conference on January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2012 via telephone?

A.5. N/A

Q.6. Is the contractor expected to provide interpreters, as described in the RFP, page 5, #9?

A.6. No, the Judiciary has a list of interpreters available (including American Sign Language interpreters) which the contractor may access.

Q.7. What is meant by “culturally appropriate practices” (RFP, page 5, #8)?

A.7. The Judiciary requires that the contractor meet face-to-face with stakeholders in each of the judicial circuits.

Q.8. How did the Judiciary arrive at the number of interviews with internal/external stakeholders, as described in the RFP, page 4, #4(a)?

A.8. The contractor is expected to meet with stakeholders in each of the four judicial circuits as follows: two on Kaua’I (one in the morning, one in the afternoon); two on Maui (one in the morning, one in the afternoon); three on Hawaii Island (one in Kona, two in Hilo); and the remainder on O’ahu, including the rural courts, Kapolei, and Honolulu.

Q.9. Has the Judiciary identified those court employees and external stakeholders whom the contractor is expected to interview?

A.9. No, the selection of those individuals is at the discretion of the contractor.

Q.10. Who are the chairs of the Strategic Planning Committee?

A.10. The co-chairs are Associate Justice James E. Duffy, Jr. and Associate Judge Lawrence M. Reifurth. The committee members are as follows: Aileen T. Chikasuye Port, Esq.; The Honorable Harry P. Freitas; Anona L. Gabriel; Terri L. Gearon; Velma K. Kam; Jay A. Kawakami; The Honorable Rhonda I. Loo; Kathy K. Moriyama; Loriann M. Okita; Cheryl A. Salmo; The Honorable Trudy K. Senda; Kevin K. Takahashi; Lillian K. Takaki, Esq.; Eric A. Tanigawa; Beth Tarter; Gary T. Teramae; The Honorable Rom A. Trader; Denise K. Villanova; The Honorable Matthew J. Viola; Susan A. Weber; Dawn G. West; Janice G. Yamada; and Kari L. Yamashiro.

Q.11. Was the web-based employee survey developed by an outside consultant?

A.11. No, the survey instrument was developed in-house by Planning Division staff assisting committee members.

Q.12. Are the findings and recommendations in the final report to be limited to the data gathered from the surveys, stakeholder meetings, and interviews?

A.12. No, it is anticipated that the contractor will inform the findings and recommendations with insights from previous contract work with court systems.

Q.13. Will the contractor be able to access the Judiciary's computer files and documents?

A.13. The Judiciary has established a web presence on Basecamp for the exclusive use of the Strategic Planning Committee. Materials are uploaded to this site regularly by committee members and staff; access to this site will be made available to the contractor.

Q.14. Is the current strategic planning initiative a continuation of the previous court re-engineering effort entitled, "Achieving Court Excellence" (ACE)?

A.14. No, the current strategic planning effort aims to invite critical thinking and direction from a broad base of stakeholders on the preferred vision of the Judiciary over the next ten years.

Q.15. If the potential offeror is unable to fully accomplish all of the work described in the statement of work for the amount of the estimated budget, is it permissible to (a) submit a plan which is out-of-budget, or (b) submit an amended plan of work within the amount of the estimated budget?

A.15. Yes, the Judiciary is willing to consider proposed plans which either exceed the Judiciary's estimated budget or amend the number and kinds of tasks listed in the statement of work.