

RFP Title: **Plumas County Dependency Representation**
RFP Number: **CFCC-032514-PCDR-CF**

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Plumas County Dependency Representation
RFP# CFCC-032514-PCDR-CF

April 16, 2014

1) The RFP for Plumas County indicates that there are 70 children and 140 parents currently in the juvenile dependency system in Plumas County. Under the current representation model, one attorney is appointed to represent a single parent, but may represent multiple children in a single family.

a) How many *families* are currently involved in juvenile dependency proceedings in Plumas County?

Answer: Based on information from the Court's case management system, there are an estimated 40 families involved in juvenile dependency proceedings in Plumas County.

b) If a provider is proposing to serve a single party (or sibling group) in each action that is filed in Plumas County, how should that number be quantified?

Answer: Each party represented should be counted as one client. Each child in a sibling group represents one client. For example, if an attorney represents three siblings in a family, that should be quantified as three clients. Parent clients should be quantified as one client, regardless of how many children they have.

2) What is the Plumas County caseload range over the past 5 years (children and parents, as well as families)?

Answer: In Plumas County, each child is designated a case number. For counting purposes, the number of cases is equal to the number of child clients, regardless of their family association. Because of case management system limitations, historical information regarding the number of families in juvenile dependency cases is unavailable. However, proposers may consider the answer to question 1a, that there are an estimated 40 families currently involved in juvenile dependency proceedings in Plumas County. Over the past 5 years, there is an average of 44 new cases per year, which equals 44 new children entering the dependency system each year. Using a ratio of 2 parent clients for each child client identified in *Attachment 4, section 8* results in an estimated 44 children and 88 parents entering the juvenile dependency system each year.

3) Is the current caseload in Plumas County 210 cases or 280 (both numbers are reflected in the RFP)?

Answer: The intended caseload number to be used in this RFP is **210**, which is the total of the estimated 70 child clients plus 140 parent clients cited in *Attachment 4, Section 8, Caseload*.

RFP Title: **Plumas County Dependency Representation**

RFP Number: **CFCC-032514-PCDR-CF**

The number “280” in section 10, paragraph 10.2 on RFP Page 14 is an error. See *Addendum No. 2*, posted on the *Plumas County Dependency Representation* RFP webpage located at: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/25547.htm>, for clarification of this correction, as needed.

The salary range given in this RFP is \$ 49,049 to \$85,237. This range can be found in the Judicial Counsel’s Dependency Counsel Caseload Standards (2008). In the current RFP for Plumas County, will the range for an attorney position receive a cost of living adjustment (COLA) from the 2008 figure?

Answer: The Caseload Funding Model identified in the 2008 report, and used to measure funding available for new contracts pursuant to this RFP, does not provide for cost of living adjustments (COLAs). However, proposers may propose to adjust their own costs over time in their cost proposal. See *RFP section 7.2* for more information about the cost proposal.

- 4) *In Attachment 2 – Contract Terms and Conditions, Exhibit A, section 14.A*, is the “11.5 percent of the total annual contract amount” that is required to be held as an operating reserve an expense that can be claimed in the “transition” and “start-up” costs for this RFP?

Answer: Proposers may claim this cost as a transition and start up cost. See *RFP section 7.2.11* for more information regarding start up and transition budgets.

- 5) Given the *optimal practice standard* maximum caseload of 77 cases or clients per full-time dependency attorney, and a *basic practice standard* of 141, does the AOC consider a Plumas County attorney to be working full-time at the 77 case level, or at the 141 case level (or somewhere in between)?

Answer: It is up to the proposer to propose the full-time equivalent (FTE) for attorney staffing based on the number of clients the proposer plans to represent, as described in the *RFP section 7.1.2.c(i)*. However, the maximum available funding listed in *RFP section 7.2.3* is measured against the standard of 188 clients per FTE attorney, and is also determined by available funding. 188 clients per FTE attorney is the modified basic practice caseload standard that was adopted by the Judicial Council in October 2007.

See the October 2007 report to the Judicial Council for more information:
<http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/102607itemF.pdf>.

- 6) The Content Page indicates that Attachment 4 is for the scope of services for Lake not Plumas County.

Answer: See *Addendum No. 1*, posted on the *Plumas County Dependency Representation* RFP webpage located at: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/25547.htm>, for correction of this error.

- 7) On Attachment 4, paragraph 2, should state the juvenile dependency cases are heard in the Plumas County Courthouse, Department 1, Third floor.

RFP Title: **Plumas County Dependency Representation**

RFP Number: **CFCC-032514-PCDR-CF**

Answer: This information is correct. Juvenile dependency cases are heard at the Plumas Superior Court, Department 1, third floor. The courthouse is located at 520 Main Street, Quincy, CA, 95971.

- 8) Paragraph 3 in Exhibit B to Attachment 2 refers to appointment of conflict attorneys for this Contract. The standing Court policy by Judge Kaufman is that conflict attorneys are appointed by the Court. It is my understanding that those conflict attorneys may be required to be under a contract with the AOC, however I am not responsible for contracting with any other attorney in a conflict case nor am I responsible for payment of that attorney. If this provision is in the RFP in violation of current Plumas County Court policy regarding appointment of conflict attorneys in my cases, I will not be able to enter into this contract with the State. Please inform me if the AOC is aware of this Court policy and if the Court will not be responsible for the appointment of conflict counsel based upon this contract.

Answer: Currently, juvenile dependency representation is provided by a panel of five solo-practitioners who handle varying caseloads. The current practice in the Plumas County Court for handling conflicts in juvenile dependency cases is that conflict attorneys are appointed by the court. *Attachment 2, Exhibit B, section 3* is typically a provision that applies to vendors who provide attorney services to cover multiple levels of conflict. As indicated in *Attachment 4, section 4*, proposers should describe how they will provide representation to all parties for whom they are responsible. *Section 4* provides three guidelines for addressing conflicts. It includes options to handle multiple levels of conflict, or a “Solo Practitioner Approach”, under which the proposer is only required to establish procedures to determine whether actual conflicts of interest arise among current clients. See *Attachment 4, section 4* for more information.

In addition, as indicated in *RFP section 7.1.5*, proposers must either indicate acceptance of the Terms and Conditions in *Attachment 2*, or clearly identify exceptions to the Terms and Conditions. See *RFP section 7.1.5* for more information.

- 9) In these cases, the Court appoints an attorney to represent either of the parents or the child, which can be one child or multiple children. In *Attachment 4, paragraph 8* the RFP states there are approximately 70 children and 140 parents currently receiving representation. From this RFP, I have no way of calculating how many cases those 70 children represent. The RFP is based upon representation by case and there needs to be some specification as to that number for bidding purposes.

Answer: Please see the answer to question 1 a regarding how to quantify the number of clients represented. For counting purposes, proposers may presume one case as equaling one client.

[END OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS]