



**LSN PARTNERS**  
Local \* State \* National

September 6, 2017

Ms. Brenda J. Billingsley, Director  
Broward County Purchasing Division  
Broward County Governmental Center  
115 South Andrews Avenue, Room 212  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

Re: RFP No. R2114349P1, Group Prepaid Legal Services; Response of The Legal Plan, Inc. (d/b/a Preferred Legal Plan) to the Objection Letter filed by U.S. Legal Services, Inc.

Dear Ms. Billingsley:

Our firm represents The Legal Plan, Inc. d/b/a Preferred Legal Plan ("Preferred Legal") with regard to RFP No. R2114349P1, Group Prepaid Legal Insurance Service ("RFP"). Preferred Legal is the top-ranked firm in the RFP process. This letter is written in response to the Three-Day Objection Letter submitted by U.S. Legal Services, Inc. (referred to herein as "Objector").

### **Introduction**

The original RFP was issued by Broward County on May 30, 2017. Preferred Legal was among several firms who responded to the RFP and customarily compete in the prepaid legal services arena in the State of Florida.

A combined Initial and Final Evaluation Committee ("EC") meeting was properly convened on August 10, 2017 where the three (3) firms still in the RFP process were deemed responsible and responsive by the unanimous vote of the three (3) person EC. Each of the firms made presentations to the EC followed by extensive questions and answers ("Q & A") from the EC members.

No final scoring was done at the August 10th EC meeting. At the request of the EC, the August 10th EC meeting was recessed until August 14, 2017 to provide added time for EC members "to review the Vendors Submittals, Vendor Questionnaire Matrix, Vendor Evaluation Criteria Response Matrix, Performance Guarantee Matrix, Plan Design Matrix, and the Specific Verification Matrix (County Minutes of Meeting)." The August 14 EC Minutes reflect that, "After review of the submittals and the various matrices prepared by Staff, the Committee completed scoring of the firms."

The Scoring Sheet of the EC reflects that each of the three (3) members of the EC ranked Preferred Legal first, Objector second and Hyatt Legal Plans third. The total scores are: Preferred Legal: 264; Objector (U.S. Legal): 249.71; Hyatt Legal Plan: 215.96.

Objector's letter seeks to raise three issues under Sec. 21.84 (f) of the Broward County Procurement Code ("Code"). Preferred Legal's response will address the issues in the same order as presented by Objector.

At the outset, we note that Objector's 3-Day Letter fails to acknowledge the extremely thorough work done by staff in this RFP process. The issues raised by Objector were, in fact, raised through the presentations and Q & A between EC members and the proposers.

The three (3) evaluated firms are all acknowledged responsible providers of prepaid legal services who customarily compete against each other in the Florida marketplace where each of their plan models are well-known to these competitors and the Groups to whom they provide services. Historically, this competition is conducted in a business-like and professional way. Thus, we are dismayed at Objector counsel's use of pejorative and bombastic language in an unprofessional effort to compensate for the weakness of Objector's points. The use of terms like "tainted, misleading, illusory, bait and switch and misrepresentations" appears to be a futile substitute for the substance demanded by a letter under Sec. 21.84 (f) of the Code.

Objector's 3-Day Letter argumentatively questions application of certain scoring provisions of the RFP including the allocation of points for "Price." Objector has waived its right to challenge the contents of the RFP. Sec. 21.118 (a) (1) requires that protests as to "solicitation specifications or requirements must be made and received by the County within seven (7) business days from the posting of the solicitation or addendum on the Purchasing Division's website. Failure to timely protest bid specifications or requirements is a waiver of the ability to protest the specifications or requirements." Objector did not timely file a protest on the "price" aspect of the RFP specifications.

**A. Objector Complains That Preferred Legal Is Not a Responsible Proposer Because Preferred Legal's Proposal Did Not Meet the RFP Specifications That the Selected Proposer "Duplicate the Current Prepaid Legal Plan Benefits."**

**Preferred Legal's Response:**

The RFP section (Pp 6-7) entitled "SCOPE OF SERVICES: Group Prepaid Legal Insurance Services" states as follows:

Services:

Proposers must be capable of providing the services listed in the enclosed Group Legal Insurance Benefits Project Specific Vendor Questionnaire and are asked to specify their ability to provide these services. If Proposer cannot provide any of these services, the Proposer must indicate in their response.

Thus, the RFP's detail focuses on specific kinds of services, i.e., benefits available to covered Broward employees and their families. Clearly, the intent of the County was not that each submittal would be identical. Neither the plan model nor how a particular proposer would provide the services requested were mandated in the RFP, but instead left to the individual plan design.

The RFP also requested that, "any enhancements be identified in the enclosed Current Plan and Proposed Plan Design" (p. 6), thus emphasizing that the County was open to different model designs and enhanced services.

Preferred Legal offers a superior plan design with its unique structure that combines the professional services of a law firm with a prepaid legal insurance program.

### **Attorney Owned and Operated Home Office**

The EC understood from Preferred Legal's submittal, its presentation and extensive discussion the unique nature of the Preferred Legal plan vs. Objector's insurance Plan.

Preferred Legal, in fact, provides a more comprehensive plan, with more coverages than the current prepaid legal plan benefits and also provides a significantly easier interface for employees to utilize the services as well as faster responsiveness and turnaround of employees' issues. Further, the EC considered and reviewed this point at length during the initial August 10th meeting and again during extensive question and answer session at the August 14th meeting before proceeding to scoring.

As **the only attorney-owned and operated prepaid legal insurance plan in Florida**, Preferred Legal's service to its member clients is always the highest priority. Through the unique "home office" structure, Preferred Legal is able to insure excellent customer service for all County employees. Whenever an Employee needs assistance, the first point of contact is always Preferred Legal's Broward County-based home office (located in Hollywood), where the Employee speaks directly with an attorney to begin the process of dealing with their particular legal situation.

At the home office, each Employee has a personalized hard file and computerized record in the home office database, which includes all personal information on the Employee as well as a complete history of prior issues, questions and contacts made with Preferred Legal. The Employee is typically able to speak with an attorney immediately upon calling into the home office, or if the attorney is unavailable, the Employee will receive a call back by the end of the same business day.

Conversely, with the Objector's plan, the employee is required to obtain an authorization code from the Objector office, contact the independent network attorney's office, provide the code, leave a message and wait 24 hours for a return phone call. Since Employees are dealing directly with Preferred Legal itself and the Preferred Legal in-house Attorneys when they need assistance (instead of initiating service with an outside, independent attorney for any and all issues under the program), Employees receive a higher level and more personalized level of customer service with Preferred Legal.

### **All Services Unlimited Without Limitation or Exclusion**

Additionally, all services administered by the Preferred Legal's "home office" and in-house attorneys are always free and unlimited, including advice, document review and letters and phone calls to resolve disputes. Employees are also able to meet in person with in-house attorneys at the Broward County-based home office on an unlimited basis. Preferred Legal also provides more coverages without limitations or exclusions, including all family law matters (1st most popular use of service), credit repair (2nd most popular use of service), identity theft protection, all landlord tenant matters, all real estate matters, all IRS matters, all bankruptcy matters, all planning for elderly parents, and all HOA/Condo association matters.

Preferred Legal is able to help Employees with all pre-existing issues and situations they might be facing and does not restrict Employee usage with limitations or exclusions. Divorce and family law related issues are by far the most heavily used aspect of any legal plan. In many cases, these issues relate to pre-existing situations and must be dealt with immediately. Preferred Legal covers all such situations with no waiting period for usage, and no limit on the amount of "covered" hours applicable to such representations.

### **Coverage Extended to Entire Household**

Additionally, Preferred Legal's unique family coverage extends protection to an Employee's spouse or domestic partner, minor children as well as his or her entire household. Preferred Legal will also cover all dependents up to age 26. This means that ANYONE living at home with the Employee (i.e. significant other, parent, sibling, older child, etc.) is covered and is entitled to the same uses of the plan, without restriction or limitation.

### **Representation in Court**

Preferred Legal's approach in dealing with formal attorney representation for Employees is highly effective. When an Employee is facing a problem or issue that may require appearance in court, the Employee has the best of both worlds options available. The Employee can deal directly with Preferred Legal's home office and in-house attorneys to guide them through the entire legal process and assist with all forms, filings, reviews, and advice on appearing in court. This is included in coverage.

Preferred Legal maintains an extensive panel of qualified attorneys – over 100 – in Broward County and over 300 in the tri-county area. This panel includes a number of attorneys fluent in Spanish and Creole.

Thus, if needed, Preferred Legal can refer the Employee to a Panel Attorney, located near the Employee's home or office and who is a specialist in the applicable area of law, for discounted legal representation. Employees are always given 3-4 different Panel Attorneys to choose from and are always entitled to a free initial face-to-face consultation with each. Preferred Legal uses a comprehensive, detailed Fee Schedule to coordinate the pre-determined discounted fees for formal representation by a panel attorney. This gives an Employee absolute certainty in knowing and understanding what would be required to undertake a particular representation. Most discounted fees are set at a "flat" fee, which means one price for the entire representation from A to Z. Hourly fee arrangements are discounted to \$125 per hour. Employees know a precise rate under Preferred Legal in deciding whether to undertake a representation.

Most importantly, the need for an Employee to formally retain a Panel Attorney is not a regular occurrence. **On average, 85% of member client calls to Preferred Legal are for a FREE service covered under the membership** through our home office attorney representations.

Thus, the Objector's argument regarding not duplicating the current prepaid legal plan benefits is invalid, since Preferred Legal provides more extended coverages without limitations or exclusions and does NOT shift significant costs to Broward County's employees.

### **No Claims Processing**

Also, there is absolutely no claims processing involved under Preferred Legal. Unlike the Objector's plan, where the network attorney must file an insurance claim for the Employee to receive benefits, with Preferred Legal no Employee nor panel attorney is required to file any type of claim for representation. Thus, Preferred Legal's member clients never receive any type of "balance bill" for service and Preferred Legal itself is not bogged down with reviewing claims, leaving more time to focus on monitoring past referrals made and providing ongoing future service to Employees.

It should also be noted that in the County draft Agreement attached to the RFP, Exhibit A to the Agreement labeled Certificate of Coverage relates to a certification of the services to be provided. That

Exhibit A expressly states: "[To be determined; subject to negotiations]." This is a reflection that there may be different plan designs, structures and enhancements that will be incorporated into the Agreement after negotiations. The County reserves the right during negotiations to add other services. Our experience is that Preferred Legal's plan design is geared to address employee needs for specific services.

The crux of Objector's claim that Preferred Legal is not a "responsible offeror" is that Preferred Legal "fails to match the current plan" with regard to specific benefits/services. This claim is baseless and demonstrates the Objector's lack of understanding of the plan design submitted by Preferred Legal.

As described above, Preferred Legal's home office approach with its in-house local attorneys and staff provides them with a unique ability to handle more than 85% of all matters without referral to the outside panel of attorneys. This approach was described in depth in the matrix with Preferred Legal's submittal as well as in the staff-prepared matrix, all of which was provided to EC members. In addition, this issue was thoroughly discussed during the presentation and Q & A at the EC meeting on August 10th and as continued on August 14th.

In the next point of Objection relating to price, Objector attempts to convert its first objection regarding plan services into an attack on pricing. In our response, we compare and contrast the two plans relative to specific kinds of services referenced by Objector.

**B. Objector's Second Point of Attack Relates to Preferred Legal Plan's Pricing. Objector Claims That the Pricing Evaluation Was Unfair and Incorrect Because the County Did Not Conduct an Apples to Apples Comparison.**

**Preferred Legal's Response:**

Preferred Legal has maintained the lowest premium price in the industry since its existence in 1998 and is proud to be the lowest priced plan in this RFP at \$9.95 per month. Moreover, given the overall low average usage of legal plans, combined with the significant amount of time that member clients' issues are resolved through free and unlimited services, Preferred Legal allows Employees to keep more of their hard earned paycheck each pay period. In fact, **Preferred Legal will save County Employees \$122,070 per year and \$366,210 over the 3 year initial contract period (\$7.73 - \$4.60 x 26 pay periods x 1,500 covered employees x 3 years).**

Thus, Preferred Legal's 20 points earned on the RFP for being the lowest priced plan (by far – over 40% less expensive than the Objector's plan) are well earned and are not any "fruit of a poisonous tree". Further, the Objector's concocted Exhibit "A" purporting to show that Broward employees would spend \$776,000 is preposterous, baseless and without any basis of fact or merit. The same goes for their argument that 96% of Broward employees would have to pay out of pocket attorney fees. Again, **85% of Employees' issues under Preferred Legal would be resolved in-house as a free and included service under the plan.**

We specifically question the legal propriety of Objector submitting a concocted "chart" as constituting "new information" within the permissible definition of that term in Sec. 21.84 (f) of the Broward County Procurement Code. The "chart" is Objector's made-up effort to provide an incomplete and biased second bite at the apple. We respectfully request that the County strike Objector's "chart" from consideration.

Preferred Legal's principals, Mr. Jason Rudolph, Esq. and Mr. Brian Samuels, Esq. have been operating Preferred Legal's home office and administering this successful business for almost 20 years. Being on

the front lines and “in the trenches” dealing with member client’s issues all these years, Mr. Rudolph and Mr. Samuels have seen firsthand the types of problems that Employees need assistance with. Typically, an Employee’s issue does not rise to the level of needing to go to court. Most of the time, the Employee needs advice, documents reviewed, phone calls and correspondences to third parties or guidance in some fashion. Preferred Legal in-house attorneys handle these matters on a free and unlimited basis under the plan with prompt turn-around and with maximum effectiveness. **Preferred Legal runs its “home office” like a law office creating a huge benefit to its member clients, especially for the County Employees who can also visit the local home office in person anytime.**

### **The Objector's Plan Limitations and Exclusions**

It is actually the Objector’s plan which could conceivably shift more cost to the Employees, since their assertion that they “cover in full” many services is misleading.

For example, family law issues are far and away the most popular use of legal plans, but the Objector only “covers” up to 20 hours maximum (only up to 15 hours in some cases). Most divorce cases would take more than 20 hours to complete representation. Additionally, family law matters present ongoing issues that continue to rear their head post-divorce and as time goes on. After the 20 hour limit is extinguished, Employees would pay out of pocket for additional services with the Objector. Preferred Legal has no limitations on hours. Member clients’ uncontested divorces are easily handled by the in-house attorneys as a free and included service. Likewise, most ongoing issues post-divorce are easily resolved in an identical fashion. Member clients dealing with a contested divorce have the option of working with the in-house attorneys at no cost on an unlimited and included basis or obtaining discounted representation with a Panel Attorney.

More examples of the Objector’s misleading assertion that services are “covered in full” by Objector include examples in Objector's plan design:

- **Landlord/Tenant law**, BUT only if the Employee is the tenant and listed as a defendant in a legal dispute (i.e. eviction defense). (Section II, Paragraph J of Objector’s Certificate of Insurance)

This is not the typical issue that arises under landlord/tenant law. Preferred Legal provides full included coverage for the most common issues here – return of security deposit, landlord not making timely repairs, landlord facing foreclosure, landlord unreasonably entering premises. Additionally, Preferred Legal provides full included coverage for the Employee as the landlord.

- **Real Estate Transactions**, BUT only for the sale or purchase of the Employee’s family dwelling. (Section II, Paragraph H of Objector’s Certificate of Insurance)

Preferred Legal provides full included coverage for more common real estate issues – refinancing, mortgage paperwork, title work, title changes, adding/removing someone from deed, loan modifications, foreclosure defense, liens.

- **IRS Matters**, BUT only to provide payment to an accountant when the Employee is required to appear for an audit at an IRS office. (Section II, Paragraph Z of Objector’s Certificate of Insurance).

IRS issues are a very popular usage of legal plans, but very rarely is the individual being called in for an audit into the IRS office. Preferred Legal provides full included coverage with attorneys for the most common IRS issues – including responding to a deficiency notice, blocking garnishments, unfreezing attached accounts, removing liens, resolving IRS identity theft, arranging payment plans, preparation of

past due returns and/or amended returns, settling outstanding IRS debts. The Objector does not provide any coverage for these more typical “real world” problems.

- **Bankruptcy**, BUT only for Chapter 7 filings. (Section II, Paragraph Z of Objector’s Certificate of Insurance).

If an Employee earns too much income or doesn’t otherwise meet the legal standards for Chapter 7, they must file a Chapter 13. Preferred Legal provides coverage for all Bankruptcy matters, including 7s and 13s.

- **Elder Law coverages**, BUT only for consultation on estate planning documents and financial planning. (Endorsement E7 of Objector’s Certificate of Insurance).

Preferred Legal provides coverage for the most common issues concerning an Employee’s elderly parents – planning for Medicaid, dealing with unscrupulous loved ones who may be taking advantage of the elderly parent, actual preparation of estate planning documents.

There are more examples, but these present some of the more popular uses of legal plans.

### **Traditional “Insurance” Plan vs. Home Office Law Firm Structure**

As demonstrated above, the Objector’s structure and plan administration is that of a traditional “insurance” company – certain things are “covered” but with many restrictions, limitations and exclusions. Attorneys need to file “claims” directly with the Objector to be paid and may balance bill member clients for services that are deemed to be “not covered.”

Preferred Legal is fully licensed, bonded and regulated by the Florida Department of Insurance, but does not operate like a traditional insurance company, since all services administered through the attorney-owned and operated home office are always free and unlimited. Coverages are without restriction, limitation or exclusion and there is no “claims” processing of any kind.

### **Preferred Legal Has Replaced the Objector’s Plan at Other Client Groups**

Preferred Legal has been competing with the Objector and a handful of other firms every year for business in the prepaid legal plan industry. There are not many firms licensed to do such business in Florida. This is not Preferred Legal’s first time competing with Objector or vice versa. **The Objector has no right to call into question the impeccable character and credibility that Preferred Legal has demonstrated over their almost 20 year track record of business in South Florida,** including long-term working relationships with a number of governmental entities.

Preferred Legal has a respected track record and has replaced Objector in many client groups over the years, including the City of Miami Beach, UF Health/Shands Jacksonville and University of Florida Jacksonville Physicians, Inc. Preferred Legal is very proud of its client reference list, which includes many extensive, 10-plus year relationships with client groups. See Preferred Legal’s current client reference list attached as Exhibit A.

### **C. Objector's Third Claim is That the Evaluation Process Was Unfair Due to the Committee Members' failure to Receive or Review Proposals Prior to the Initial Evaluation Meeting**

#### **Preferred Legal's Response:**

Objector's claim is simply not supported by fact. Evaluation Committee members were well prepared and had all pertinent materials and had engaged in extensive discussion prior to the final EC vote to rank.

Objector has alleged a procedural error by the EC claiming that the EC made findings of Responsibility even though it appears the Evaluation Committee had not yet "received the proposals submitted" by the proposers.

It is puzzling that Objector assumed that EC members had not reviewed the submittals prior to the August 10, 2017 initial meeting of the EC. The submittals had been posted to the document repository of the Purchasing Division's website shortly after their submittal. Moreover, each EC member has a set of the proposals provided to them presumably either in hard copy or, if preferred, electronically well in advance of the first meeting of the EC. Members of the EC also receive copies of all Staff Matrices in advance of the initial EC meeting. It is expected that members of the EC review all of these materials prior to the initial meeting of the EC.

At the time of the August 10, 2017 initial meeting of the EC, the Purchasing Division's website was "down" and this point was mentioned by staff at the August 10, 2017 EC meeting. The EC discussion had, among other things, focused on the structure and breadth of Preferred Legal's plan and Preferred Legal addressed those issues in response to EC questions. The recess of the August 10th EC meeting gave EC members additional time to further review all aspects of the RFP and the submittals prior to the final vote on August 14, 2017 - as all of this is documented in the Minutes of the EC meeting.

**D. Objector's Fourth Claim is That Based on New and Significant Information Preferred Legal Made Material Misrepresentations to the Evaluation Committee Which Must Now Be Reconsidered.**

**Preferred Legal's Response:**

Mr. Samuels, Esq. and Mr. Rudolph, Esq. represented Preferred Legal at both meetings before the Evaluation Committee, where they delivered a comprehensive presentation with handouts and engaged in a significant amount of question and answer with the Committee members and Purchasing Division members. They explained the aspects of Preferred Legal the same way they have been expressed above, answered pertinent questions and laid out the clear differences with the other plans. Based on the questions and statements from the Committee members at both meetings, it was abundantly clear that they understood all aspects of Preferred Legal and the uniqueness of its plan in the industry.

**No "New" Information**

The Objector's contention that they have "new information about multiple misrepresentations" made by Preferred Legal is simply not supported by the facts and appears to be nothing more than an attempt to mislead the Committee and/or the Purchasing Director into reconvening the EC. Every issue raised in this section by Objector are points that Objector could have raised in their presentation, but did not do so because the points are without merit.

Objector quotes language from Preferred Legal's website. The particular language is part of Preferred Legal's effort to recruit added attorneys to its outside panel. It does not in any way contravene the fact that over 85% of all employee matters are resolved in-house without referral to panel attorneys.



The Objector's cherry-picked information from Preferred Legal's website and the corresponding argument is misleading and not supported. The text is from the Panel Attorney's section of Preferred Legal's website intended to attract Panel Attorneys to join the network. Preferred Legal uses recruitment tools like this to constantly augment the existing panel and expand the number of attorneys available. The Objector is misconstruing this information in a desperate effort to confuse the EC and/or Purchasing Director.

**Preferred Legal's statement that 85% of member client issues are resolved in-house as a free service is accurate and based on decades of tracking every single call coming in to the Plan.**

**Preferred Legal Does NOT Have Any Claims Processing**

The Objector's review of Preferred Legal's annual report to see that no claims or attorney's fees have been paid out is accurate, since there is absolutely no claims processing involved under Preferred Legal's plan design (as previously explained above). The "fully covered" matters are handled by Preferred Legal in-house attorneys. Again, the Objector demonstrates a failure to understand the unique structure of coverage and service that Preferred Legal provides.

**Changes in Plan Memberships During the Year**

The number of individual client member plans (employees) terminated or cancelled during the year 2016 pertains to turnover of employees (terminations, leaves of absence, etc.) across all 200+ client groups that Preferred Legal serviced throughout the year. This number represents a typical average in the industry in terms of employee turnover. The Objector fails to point out that Preferred Legal gained significantly more covered employees than it lost from those same client groups during the year (new hires, additions, rehires, etc.), which is an indication of the positive word of mouth generated by Preferred Legal across all employee environments.

Preferred Legal's biggest measure of success over all these years has always been the retention rate of its membership. Through its service track record, constant availability and consistent responsiveness, Preferred Legal has always had a net increase in Employee participation at annual re-enrollments across all client groups. As the public record reflects through a review of Preferred Legal's Insurance Report filings over the years, EVERY YEAR Preferred Legal has increased its membership since its existence. The Objector's speculative opinion here is not based on any insight or analysis and amounts to a meritless claim in another attempt to mislead the EC and/or the Purchasing Director.

**Preferred Legal maintains relationships with over 200+ client groups and services a membership of over 25,000 covered client members throughout the State of Florida.**

**Preferred Legal Meets the Minimum and Mandatory Qualifications**

Preferred Legal's proposal more than meets the minimum and mandatory qualifications of the RFP and Preferred Legal submitted a proper pricing proposal. County employees will enjoy the extended coverages, more personalized service, quicker turnaround times and locally based home office that Preferred Legal provides, all the while saving more money in their paychecks.

### **Preferred Legal is a Certified Local Vendor**

Objector calls into question Preferred Legal's certification as a local vendor. Preferred Legal purchased a property and relocated its home office headquarters from Miami to Hollywood in 2014. Objector's desperate claims are baseless. Preferred Legal, a licensed and regulated insurance company in Florida since 1998, is currently headquartered in the City of Hollywood, Broward County, at 2535 N. 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Jason S. Rudolph, Esq. and Brian J. Samuels, Esq., the owners of Preferred Legal, grew up in Broward County and continue to reside there. They are now raising their own families in Broward County, and are proud to have grown this highly successful local business.

### **Conflicts of Interest**

Preferred Legal takes all conflicts of interest very seriously. Regarding the scenario illustrated by the Objector, Preferred Legal only covers the plan member spouse (same coverage as the Objector). The Objector must not have clearly understood this point. Further, since every call for service initiates to Preferred Legal itself, Preferred Legal guarantees that any conflicts of interest will be resolved immediately and handled properly and accordingly.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the Objector's unprofessional efforts to discredit Preferred Legal, calling into question repeatedly the integrity and reputation of Preferred Legal, and making misleading claims and statements should be rejected on their face. The Objector's apparent intense review of Preferred Legal's website, report filings and related information only after the recommendation of rankings demonstrates their desperation to do anything they can to discredit the RFP process and diligent review and evaluation undertaken by the County staff and the Evaluation Committee. Preferred Legal fully and fairly responded to the RFP and met all required aspects of the RFP. Preferred Legal provided a comprehensive presentation to the EC and thoroughly answered all relevant questions and were properly awarded the most points by the EC. The Evaluation Committee's efforts and final decision as well as the efforts of all parties involved with this extensive RFP process should be respected. Objector's 3-day letter should be rejected.

Respectfully Submitted,



George I. Platt

Cc: Daphne Jones, Assistant County Attorney  
Jacqueline Chapman, Purchasing Agent, Broward County  
Brian Samuels, Esq., CPA, Vice President & CEO, Preferred Legal Plan  
Jason Rudolph, Esq., President, Preferred Legal Plan

EXHIBIT A

# PREFERRED LEGAL PLAN™



*A New Wave of Legal Representation™*

SOME OF THE GROUPS AND COMPANIES PLP IS  
CURRENTLY ASSOCIATED WITH INCLUDE . . .

- University of Florida
  - Florida Atlantic University
  - Broward College
  - St. Thomas University
  - Florida International University
  - Florida Memorial University
  - Lynn University
  - Miami Dolphins
  - Burger King Corp
  - Joe's Stone Crab
  - Vizcaya Museum & Gardens
  - Borden Dairy of Florida
  - Loews Miami Beach Hotel
  - Mandarin Oriental Hotel
  - Don Shula's Hotel & Golf Club
  - The Club at Admiral's Cove
  - Saddlebrook Resort
  - Craig Zinn Automotive Group
  - Warren Henry Automotive
  - Gunther Motor Company
  - Harley Davidson
  - Piper Aircraft
  - Kaufman Rossin & Co.
  - GA Telesis
  - Moss & Associates
  - Miller Construction Company
  - City of West Palm Beach
  - City of Miami Beach
  - City of Boca Raton
  - City of Oakland Park
  - City of Homestead
  - City of North Miami Beach
  - City of Miramar
  - City of Plantation
  - City of Vero Beach
  - City of Coral Springs
  - City of Dania Beach
  - City of Parkland
  - City of Venice
  - Palm Beach Sheriff's Office
  - Naples Airport Authority
  - Broward Clerk of the Court
  - Tropical Fin Credit Union
  - Dade Cty Fed Credit Union
  - Mercantil Commercebank
  - Banco Itau International
  - United Way of Palm Beach
  - United Way of Broward
  - United Way of M-Dade
  - Sage Dental Group
  - Miami Science Museum
  - CareerSource PB County
  - UF Health/Shands HealthCare
  - UF Health/Shands Jacksonville
  - Miami Children's Hospital
  - NCH Healthcare System
  - Bethesda Healthcare Systems
  - Boca Raton Regional Hospital
  - Larkin Community Hospital
  - Moffitt Cancer Center
  - Martin Health Systems
  - Miami Jewish Health Systems
  - TrustBridge
  - SantaFe HealthCare
  - Ultimate Software
  - Girl Scouts of SE Florida
  - Wellnext/Nature's Products
  - 1-800-PetMeds
  - City Furniture
  - His House Children's Home
  - ChildNet Youth & Family Services
  - Gulliver Schools
  - Carrollton School of the Sacred Heart
  - MasTec
  - Turnberry Ocean Colony
  - Easter Seals of South Florida
- ... specific contact names and numbers  
available upon request ...