



State of Wisconsin
Department of Health Services

Scott Walker, Governor
Dennis G. Smith, Secretary

October 29, 2012

Arlene Meyer, Board Chair and CEO
Nino Amato, President
Coalition of Wisconsin Aging Groups
2850 Dairy Drive, Suite 100
Madison, WI 53718-6742

Re: Guardianship Support Center

Dear Ms. Meyer and Mr. Amato:

I am responding to your appeal of the decision to award the DHS Guardianship Support Center grant to the Greater Wisconsin Agency on Aging Resources. While I will explain the reason for the Department's decision I need to correct your misunderstanding that there is a formal appeal process within this Department or the Department of Administration that applies to the award of this grant. That protest and appeal process pertains to purchases under Chapter 16 of Wisconsin Statutes, not to grants.

Your application failed to meet the mandatory requirements of the RFP. The grant RFP stated at sec. 4.0 that a failure to comply with mandatory requirements "will result in exclusion from further consideration." One of the mandatory requirements was to demonstrate an ability to meet a 10% match requirement. Elsewhere in the document the proposers were instructed to include the match in the budget that was to be part of the scored proposal. (RFP section 6.6) CWAG's budget had no mention of how it was going to meet the match. While your transmittal letter noted that CWAG could meet the match, the mandatory requirement was to provide budget detail for the Department as to how the commitment would be met, not just to simply state that a match would occur. The other three proposers followed the RFP directions and submitted budgets that itemized the sources and amounts that would be used as match. CWAG's proposal should have been excluded and not forwarded to the evaluation team for scoring. That was corrected by awarding the grant to GWAAR as the highest scoring proposer that met all mandatory requirements.

This is the reason that CWAG is not eligible to receive the grant award -- it did not follow the criteria that were clearly set for all proposers to follow.

Because of the grounds for the Department's decision I see no need to respond to your criticism of the scoring by the evaluation committee except to note that neither Ms. Spear, Ms. McDowell or Ms. Schwersenska were members of that committee. In addition, even in a Chapter 16 appeal process the scoring judgments made by evaluators are not subject to protest. (DOA Procurement Manual, PRO-I-13). I also believe that your complaints about your access to the records are mischaracterizations and that you had adequate and timely access to the records. I also find your other assertions regarding irregularities and unethical and biased behavior groundless and without merit.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Dennis G. Smith".

Dennis G. Smith
Secretary