



**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
MARYLAND JUDICIAL CENTER
2003 C COMMERCE PARK DRIVE
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401**

**Summary of Site Visit/Walk-Through
Small Procurement
Request for Proposal (RFP)
Consultant for Webcasting Assessment
June 13, 2012**

FRANK BROCCOLINA
STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR
(410) 260-1295 Fax: (410) 974-2066
frank.broccolina@mdcourts.gov

FAYE D. MATTHEWS
DEPUTY STATE COURT
ADMINISTRATOR
(410) 260-1257 Fax: (410) 974-2066
faye.matthews@mdcourts.gov

SHARON SAMPSON BALL, Director
Human Resources
(410) 260-1283 Fax: (410) 974-2849
sharon.ball@mdcourts.gov

GRAY BARTON, Director
Office of Problem-Solving Courts
(410) 260-3617 Fax: (410) 260-3620
gray.barton@mdcourts.gov

MARK BITTNER, Director
Judicial Information Systems
(410) 260-1001 Fax: (410) 974-7170
mark.bittner@mdcourts.gov

ALLEN C. CLARK, III, Director
Budget & Finance
(410) 260-1579 Fax: (410) 260-1290
allen.clark@mdcourts.gov

DAVID R. DURFEE JR., Director
Legal Affairs
(410) 260-1405 Fax: (410) 974-2066
david.durfee@mdcourts.gov

SUSAN HOWELLS, Director
Procurement & Contract Admin.
(410) 260-1410 Fax: (410) 260-2520
susan.howells@mdcourts.gov

CONNIE KRATOVIL-LAVELLE, Director
Family Administration
(410) 260-1296 Fax: (410) 974-5577
connie.kratovil-lavelle@mdcourts.gov

PAMELA C. ORTIZ, Director
Access to Justice Commission
(410) 260-1258 Fax: (410) 260-2504
pamela.ortiz@mdcourts.gov

DIANE S. PAWLOWICZ, Director
Court Operations Department
(410) 260-1725 Fax: (410) 260-2503
diane.pawlowicz@mdcourts.gov

JESSICA PITTS, Director
Emergency Preparedness & Court Security
(410) 260-3515 Fax: (410) 260-2505
jessica.pitts@mdcourts.gov

ROXANNE P. MCKAGAN
Director, Administrative Services
(410) 260-1407 Fax: (410) 974-2066
rocky.mckagan@mdcourts.gov

DEBORAH A. UNITUS
Director, Program Services
(410) 260-1291 Fax: (410) 260-3570
deborah.unitus@mdcourts.gov

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The following is a summary of questions or information shared at the site visit/walk-through of the Court of Appeals and Court of Special Appeals that took place on June 11, 2012 at 2 pm, as indicated in Questions and Responses No. 2.

Court of Appeals (4th Floor)

The current system was installed by Jefferson Audio Video Systems (JAVS), with some wiring done by Judicial Information Systems (JIS), Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC).

An ultimate solution must be long-term, reasonable, but flexible and capable of add-ons to ensure as much flexibility as possible.

There are four cameras in the courtroom; 2 in the back and 2 in the front. 1 camera in the back is focused on 4 of the 7 judges on the bench and the other camera in the back is focused on the other 3 of the 7 judges. 1 camera in the front is focused on the podium and the other camera in the front is only used during special occasions (i.e. bar admissions). Please see the following link for an example of a bar admissions webcast:

<http://www.mdcourts.gov/coappeals/baradmissionwebcast.html>

The cameras are preset, however the presets are different than the presets when first installed because the paneling on the walls shakes the cameras. The presets are not typically used because each camera must be dialed into separately. With or without using the presets, it is hard to get a full shot of all individuals in the frame because of placement limitations. Some objectives are to obtain the capability for a right-angle shot, the ability to zoom, pan, etc., operate the cameras remotely, place the cameras in auto mode when the production allows, and upgrade the quality of the cameras. Perhaps an additional camera could be added in the back, which could isolate the Chief Judge in the middle of the bench, at eye level on the side, or on a tripod, for example. Aesthetics do matter in the courtroom and one must be conscious of the colors, the placement, the existing décor of the courtroom, etc.

The webmaster controls the cameras remotely. The webmaster is not a videographer in a production studio. Currently, once the files are created they cannot be deleted or renamed remotely. This does not provide flexibility.

Cameras and the audio microphones (that trigger the cameras) are used to tape each court case, which last about 45 minutes on average. Each case is then uploaded to mdcourts.gov and remains there indefinitely. Each case is uploaded with its own file name. Cameras and the audio microphones are also used for live video

streaming of events. Some preferences are to be able to have the option to add captioning to our live-stream productions in the future, and to enhance the quality of the video stream (if the frame were bigger it would allow the option to use a split screen when necessary), and to have the capability to modify the order of preset graphics on the fly.

Wireless microphones are used sometimes, so there must be quick access to add additional audio sources. Additional video inputs for in-house use would be a preference.

Lobby/Rotunda (4th Floor)

One idea is to have a live feed on display monitors, but again, space and aesthetics are both something to consider.

Lawyer's Waiting Room (4th Floor)

One idea is to place a mult box for the media/press here. Or, a live feed on display monitors instead of in the lobby. Again, space and aesthetics are both something to consider.

Copier Room/Utility Room (3rd Floor)

This is where the mult box is currently located, which has been used by in-house personnel maybe one or twice.

Court of Special Appeals Courtroom # 1 and # 2 (2nd Floor)

Neither courtroom in the Court of Special Appeals has a video system nor the infrastructure to support one. There is an audio system in both courtrooms (JAVS supplied).

Lobby/Rotunda (2nd Floor)

One idea is to have a live feed on display monitors, but again, space and aesthetics are both something to consider.

Clarification

A response to this RFP must provide a work plan that solves the business problem, and demonstrates the offeror's capabilities and experience in providing the required assessment services. The AOC is not requesting the delivery of the draft report or final draft report at this time. These deliverables (the draft and final report) will be the work product that the consultant, upon award of the contract, shall produce. A response to this RFP must provide a work plan that explains how the offeror would go about offering consulting services, ultimately providing a final report that offers a resolution and suggestions on how to proceed with expanding and improving our existing webcasting services.

Date Issued: June 13, 2012
Anna Pfeifer, Procurement Officer

TTY Users: 1-800-735-2258

www.mdcourts.gov