

Marla McCowan

From: oscdistrictct@osceolacountymi.com
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:18 AM
To: Comments
Subject: comments on proposed standards 6 and 8

As a tax payer in the State of Michigan, I speak in opposition to MIDC proposed standards 6 and 8. I raise the proverbial question: "Why fix what isn't broken?" I work with the courts in the central Michigan area, and I can attest to fact the Court Appointed Attorney (CAA) system is not broken. Stand 6 would limit the number of cases an attorney can handle. This could financially harm the attorneys who perform solely CAA services. Most misdemeanor cases are relatively cut and dried, and a CAA attorney should not be limited to 400 cases per year.

Standard number 8 involving economic incentives must have come right out of the Criminal Defense Attorneys of Michigan (CDAM) play book. Again, why fix what isn't broken? It is ridiculous to think a fixed dollar amount should be applicable across the state. In my opinion that is the worst form of price fixing there is. Current CAA attorneys have negotiated and agreed to the current financial compensation levels, and those are way below what is proposed in this standard. Is the State of Michigan so flushed with money that it can afford to indiscriminately throw out tax payer money? Does paying more money automatically mean better or improved CAA services? I think not! Attorneys who choose to practice law in more rural areas, where the cost of living is considerably lower, should not be compensated the same as an attorney living where the cost of living is considerable higher. It is more economically practical to have the compensation negotiated at the local level.

I oppose MIDC proposed standard 6 and 8.
A concerned tax payer.
Dan Clise