Date: March 16, 2017

To: The Honorable Chair and Members
   Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
   County Administrator

Re: March 7, 2017 Board of Supervisors Meeting Questions Regarding AMS Financial System Coding

Supervisor Ally Miller raised questions regarding the correct Procurement methodology and whether it was reflected accurately in Board of Supervisors Agenda materials.

Please see the attached March 15, 2017 memorandum from the Procurement Director regarding this subject. The memorandum cites the different data fields in reporting documents. There was nothing emergent about the procurement discussed by Supervisor Miller.

If you have any questions regarding the attached memorandum, please contact me.

CHH/anc

Attachment

c: Tom Burke, Deputy County Administrator for Administration
   Mary Jo Furphy, Director, Procurement
Date: March 15, 2017
To: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator
Through: Tom Burke, Deputy County Administrator
From: Mary Jo Furphy, Procurement Director
Re: AMS System Coding Question
Item 9 on March 7, 2016 Board of Supervisors Agenda

In response to the question posed by Supervisor Miller, “Why did the procurement method change from a Direct Select to a Direct Select Emergency?” The procurement method cannot change once it has been defined. There is no procurement method called Direct Select Emergency. This contract was originally established as a Direct Select and it continues as a Direct Select. The Procurement Department fully understands the distinction between different procurement methods and acts to ensure the processes are in full compliance.

The AMS system is a complicated system with many classifications and coded information, much of which is for statistical purposes. Without knowing exactly what system information Supervisor Miller was referring to, it seems that she was looking at the “Procurement Type” field. If the goal was to determine if the Procurement Department properly coded the procurement method in the AMS system, the “Award Class” field, which is what Procurement uses to define the procurement method, should have been viewed. An Award Class code of EM stands for emergency procurement and an Award Class code of DS stands for Direct Select.

The Procurement Type codes are used for our internal metrics for processing time. Procurement methods are bundled together based on processing complexity or authority. There is not a one to one relationship for each procurement process to Procurement Type code. Procurement Type 11 is used for Title 34 Direct Select, Emergency and Limited Competition, as these are all processes that have a quicker processing time as opposed to a Title 34 bid or qualifications process. Complexity factors from 1 to 5 are applied to each Procurement Type by the AMS system.
CT-FC-16-170 is properly coded with “Procurement Type” T34 Direct Select/Emerg/LC (referencing the timelines for the award) and “Award Class” of DS (referencing the procurement method that was used) as displayed by the attached system screen shots. There was no change of codes between the original contract and the amendment, just as there was no change in the procurement method. There is no need to update any information in the system, so no action will be taken.

Additionally, the Board of Supervisors Agenda Item Report, including the attached materials, and the language of the contract would rule over a system entry for statistical purposes. The Board of Supervisors Agenda Item Report clearly states that the original contract was put in place as a Direct Select under the authority of A.R.S. §34-103 and Pima County Board of Supervisor Policy D 29.1 (C) (1). The original contract also clearly states the contract was entered into under the direct select provisions of A.R.S. § 34-103 and Pima County Board of Supervisors Policy D 29.1 (C) (1).

The Procurement Department properly recorded the method of procurement in the AMS system and accurately reported it to the Board of Supervisors in the Agenda Item Report.

Attachment