

## QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES RE: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – Family Code Section 3150

1. *Does the contract include cases that are already assigned to attorneys?*

1. The contract certainly could include the already assigned cases. The Court's intent was to make the RFP as open as possible. Court records (as of 12/17/09) show the following distribution of active cases: Dennis Brimer – 11; Cherie D'Arcy 13; Kori Tearpak – 8. Appointments in 2009: Brimer – 9; D'Arcy – 4; Tearpak – 8.

2. *Do you prefer one or two attorneys?*

The Court does not have a preference. More than one attorney would certainly have its benefits. It does not need to be limited to two either.

3. *[Another attorney] told me she was getting about \$5500 per month when she had the entire contract. Is about the amount we should be looking at?*

The previous contract included both FC 3150 and W&I Code Section 300 cases. The methodology used to determine the allocation of the contract payment between the two case types is unknown. The Court does not have a target amount other than we want to make sure we are providing quality services in the most cost effective manner possible.

4. *Does it include guardianship as well as family law cases?*

No, this would not include court appointed counsel in guardianship cases. The county pays for attorneys in those cases.

5. *Is there any preference regarding flat monthly payment or hourly? If hourly, does the court anticipate the \$65.00 per hour that has been used in criminal cases.*

The Court will consider any fee/compensation proposal submitted. The goal of the RFP is to provide quality legal services to children in the most efficient and cost effective manner possible. The Court, like all public entities, is facing some very challenging budget issues in the upcoming years. We are attempting to cut costs in all areas including court appointed counsel. The Court also believes the RFP will result in a more uniform and transparent appointment process.

The court currently pays FC 3150 counsel \$70.00/hour.\* Again, the Court will consider all proposals. However, since cost containment is one of the goals of the RFP, a proposal that mirrored current practice, without some cap or limitation on fees charged, may not result in costs savings to the Court.

\*\$65.00 is the rate paid to attorneys the Court appoints to represent parties in cases in which the County is responsible for payment of fees.

