DECONCINI MCDONALD YETWIN & LACY
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
2525 EAST BROADWAY BOULEVARD • SUITE 200 • TUCSON, ARIZONA 85716-5300
(520) 322-5000 • (520) 322-5585 (FAX)
DMYL.COM

ADDENDUM MATERIAL
DATE 12-13-16 ITEM NO. ADD 27

DENISE M. BAINTON
ALICE W. CALLISON
BARRY M. COREY
JODY A. CORRALES
PETER B. GOLDMAN
NATHAN B. HANNAH
STEVEN J. ITKIN
JAMES A. JUTRY
JOHN C. LACY
ZELMA LETARTE
KATHRYN B. NELSON
RYAN D. O'NEAL
ALEXIA J. PETERSON
JOHN C. RICHARDSON
LISA ANNE SMITH
SPENCER A. SMITH
SESALY O. STAMPS
JAMES M. SUSA
PAUL M. TILLEY
MEGAN J. TROG
GARY F. URMAN
MICHAEL R. URMAN

OF COUNSEL:
RICHARD M. YETWIN
BARRON & ASSOCIATES, P.C. - JOHN H. BARRON, III

FIRM FOUNDERS:
EVO A. DECONCINI (1901-1986)
JOHN R. MCDONALD (1933-2012)
DENNIS W. DECONCINI

PHOENIX OFFICE:
7310 NORTH 16TH STREET, SUITE 205
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85020
(602) 282-0500
FAX: (602) 282-0520

PLEASE REPLY TO TUCSON
BCOREY@DMYL.COM

December 12, 2016

DEC 13 '16 AM08:07 PC CLK OF BD

Via Facsimile to Clerk of the Board at (520) 222-0448
Pima County Board of Supervisors
130 West Congress
Tucson, AZ 85701

RE: APPEAL OF PROTEST DECISION IN SOLICITATION NO. 228614

Dear Members of the Pima County Board of Supervisors:

Donna Aversa's letter to the Board of Supervisors should be disregarded for at least the following reasons, none of which were addressed in her letter:

1. There is no provision in Pima County's Procurement Code for such a response; and

2. The response does not in any way address the inherent impropriety of allowing the County to appoint the legal counsel for a potential adversary in court or an independent agency before which the County appears in an adversary status; and

3. None of the people listed as references in the proposals were contacted, with the result that - for the first time in at least the last 36 years - the proposed contract recommendation was made with absolutely no input from the Commission; Council; and

4. The manner of allocating the 40 points referred to in the solicitation was never described in the solicitation, so there was nothing to object to before the proposed recommendation was+ issued; and

5. The Felker proposal was not responsive in that it was required to submit three public agency references, but two of the three such references submitted in that proposal were the same agency, the Pinal County HR department, which was never a client of the Felker firm.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

Barry M. Corey

BMC/tag

I:\FILES\DOCS\PIMA14\270411\LTR\10U2466.DOCX