



City of Apache Junction

Development Services Department



MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and City Council

THRU: Larry Kirch, Development Services Director

FROM: Dave Zellner, Building and Safety Manager

SUBJECT/ISSUE: RFP PROJECT NO: DSD2018-01 FOR IN-OFFICE RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL PLAN REVIEW, COUNTER PLAN REVIEW, AND INSPECTOR/PLAN REVIEWER TRAINING

DATE: March 19, 2018

Mayor and City Council,

In an effort to improve customer service to permit applicants, the Development Services Department, Building Division, issued a Request for Proposals ("RFP"), DSD2018-01, for in-office residential and commercial plan review, counter plan review and inspector/plan reviewer training. The goals of the RFP were to:

- Improve the quality and accuracy of permit application plan reviews.
- Improve the communication of code requirements to owners, contractors and developers at the counter, by phone, by email and in plan review comments.
- Improve building inspections through one-on-one training of the city's building inspector, and through communication of code requirements and special conditions for building projects to the building inspector.
- Improve review of documents submitted during construction for code compliance and design agreement.
- Establish an effective, service-oriented, "over-the-counter" ("OTC") plan review program.

It was expected that the City would be able to secure the specific services noted in the RFP for about \$60.00 per hour, and we were seeking someone for 20 hours a week. For a fifteen-month contract term, we projected a cost of \$75-80,000.00. Three months would fall under Fiscal Year ("FY") 2017-2018 and the remaining 12 under FY 2018-2019.

We chose the RFP route, as opposed to adding staff, due to the still unknown disposition of the State land and the potential lack of need for added staff in the future. The RFP also included some specific products such as creating submittal and review checklists, "typical" plan details so

applicants can simply attach “pre-approved” plan details to applications, and other long-term benefits we are seeking.

We received only two proposals in response to our RFP.

One of the proposals provided no clear cost for the requested services. It only included a general rate sheet with multiple categories that may or may not be relevant to our request. The proposal, also, did not specifically address all of the requested services.

The second proposal proposes it will take 40 hours a week of staffing to fulfill the requested services. The proposer listed two hourly fee amounts based on their understanding of the service requested. These two rates, figured for 20 hours each per week (for a total of 40 hours per week) result in a 15-month contract total of \$250,900.00. If we were to reduce the hours to 20 a week but maintain 50% mix of the services the cost would still be \$40,000.00, more than we planned to budget.

At this time, we do not believe either proposal was responsive to the intent of the RFP. We respectfully request the mayor and council reject both proposals.

Staff is reviewing other options, such as part-time staff to meet our customer service improvement goals.