DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Milwaukee County

Hector Colon, Director

May 8, 2014

Mr. Gerard Randall, Board Chairman
Mr. George Hinton, Chief Executive Officer
Social Development Commission
4041 N Richards Street
Milwaukee WI 53212

Delivered via email to George P. Hinton at: ghinton@cr-sdc.org
Original to follow in U.S. Mail

Re: Notice of Intent to Award Energy Assistance Contract

Dear Mr. Randall and Mr. Hinton,

This is in response to your Notice of appeal under Milwaukee County Ordinances section 110.05 regarding Notice of Intent of Award issued for ENERGY ASSISTANCE RFP # 82110001 issued by Management Service Division. Your protest was received by the Department of Health and Human Services on May 6, 2015. Pursuant to Section 110.06 of the Milwaukee County Ordinances, in preparing this response, I read your letter carefully and examined the RFP and reviewed the process and procedures used to evaluate the submitted proposals. The findings are to deny the appeal for the reasons set out below.

Issue: No specific issue was raised in your notice of appeal. However, you asked me to consider six factors mentioned in your letter. (Letter attached for ready reference).

References: All proposals were evaluated based on the Proposal Selection and Award Process (RFP Section 3) using the "Proposal Review Process, Review and Scoring Criteria" set forth in RFP Section 4 part 4(Page 4-62 to Page 4-67).

The evaluation and selection of contractors will be based on the information submitted in the proposal plus references (refer Section 2 Page 2-4). DHHS reserves the right to make a final selection based solely upon review and scoring of the written Proposals should it find it to be in its best interest to do so (refer RFP Page 3-2).

Basis for the Decision: My role as reviewer of your appeal is to ensure the determination of the Intent to Award is based on the Selection and Awards process set forth in RFP Section 3. Here is my response to the six factors you requested to be considered in connection with this appeal:

Your first 4 points indicate your long-standing involvement with the program as the sole or major contractor. I am very aware of your service as a contractor to Milwaukee County, the sites you currently operate and the volume of applications processed in Milwaukee County each year. Prior experience makes up 13% in the overall score. Inclusion of these points in your submission would not only be compelling information in this category, but would show in your administrative ability and outcomes and quality assurance.

Although this experience is invaluable in executing the service, our best practices require us to solicit bids for these programs on a regular basis.

In point 5 you indicate that you have met all contract requirements. As an incumbent, your administrative ability would be demonstrated by the timeliness and accuracy of submission of fiscal information and state-mandated information. All incumbents throughout DHHS were scored on the same criteria.

In point 6 you reference one of the technical requirements of the submission. All proposals are initially evaluated for completeness and do not proceed to evaluation if they are late or incomplete. Therefore, your submission was deemed sufficient by MSD. Any clarifications or resubmissions would be at the discretion of that department.

The quality and methodology of your proposed service, both on its own merits and in comparison with the other proposals is the heart of the RFP evaluation process. I'm sure your years of experience allowed you to propose new and innovative practices in line with our DHHS mission, our goals for the program and the state requirements.

The above listed factors, if mentioned and elaborated in the RFP proposal submitted by SDC, would have been evaluated and included in the final score. If these factors were not identified or written in the proposal, then they cannot be considered now. As "The evaluation and selection of contractors will be based on the information submitted in the proposal" (RFP Page 2-4).

Based on these criteria, Social Development Commission was not the highest scoring bidder in any zone.

Conclusion: After a review of your appeal and my review of the Proposal Selection and Award Process used for evaluation of Energy Assistance RFP, I find that all processes have been unilaterally applied and that the evidence and arguments submitted do not change the outcome of the award. Therefore the appeal is denied.

Thank you for bringing your concerns to my attention. Please contact me if you have any questions.

If you disagree with my review of the evidence you presented, you may notify me within five (5) working days of mailing of the decision, pursuant to section 110.07, of your desire to appeal this decision to the Health and Human Needs Committee of the Milwaukee County Board.

Sincerely,

Héctor Colón
Director
Milwaukee County Department of Health and Human Services

cc: Jeanne Dorff, Milwaukee County
Dennis Buesing, Milwaukee County
Diane Gallegos, Milwaukee County