



THE STATE
of **ALASKA**
GOVERNOR MIKE DUNLEAVY

Department of Health

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

Anchorage

3601 C Street, Suite 902
Anchorage, Alaska 99503-5923
Main: 907.269.7800
Fax: 907.269.0060

Juneau

P.O. Box 110601
350 Main Street, Suite 404
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0601
Main: 907.465.3030
Fax: 907.465.3068

#2

October 6, 2022

Loretta Knudson-Spaulding, Executive Director
Soldotna Area Senior Citizens, Inc.
197 West Park Avenue
Soldotna, Alaska 99669

Dear Ms. Knudson-Spaulding:

Thank you for your letter dated September 27, 2022, on behalf of Soldotna Area Senior Citizens, Inc. (SASCI). Your letter indicates you are appealing a denial of an award for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 Nutrition, Transportation and Support Services (NTS) grant program. The SASCI proposal and proposal evaluation committee notes have been carefully reviewed in light of your concerns in your appeal letter and are addressed below.

As your letter indicated, SASCI was not awarded for FY23-25, and you were just made aware of this decision but with that being said we are honoring your appeal rights in light of your agency staffing issues.

The SASCI proposal for the competitive solicitation was received on time, thank you. The Department of Health held a proposal evaluation committee (PEC) per 7 AAC 78.092. The PEC concluded that the application submitted by SASCI lacked sufficient detail to justify funding. The evaluation and scoring process noted multiple areas that did not meet application standards, including:

- Submitted project narrative was general to all agency operations and did not include sufficient detail relevant to the proposed project of Nutrition, Transportation, and Support services
- Submitted responses for certain application questions were copied/pasted responses from prior questions in the application, and did not address the specific evaluation criteria being asked for
- Submitted responses for multiple questions did not answer the question being asked
- Submitted response for project's goals, outputs, and outcomes for the project were underdeveloped and lacked sufficient detail and did not include metrics as required.
- Submitted response describing target population and service area of the project did not provide sufficient detail or description
- Submitted project budget was incomplete and did not adhere to provided instructions. Deficiencies included incorrect methodology for allocating required matching funds; incorrect and incomplete narrative justifications and budget allocations for personal services costs; insufficient detail in narrative justification for facility costs; insufficient detail in narrative justification for supply costs;

insufficient detail in narrative justification for equipment costs; in sufficient detail in narrative justification for other costs.

- Submitted response describing applicant's previous experience was copied and pasted from a previous answer and did not provide sufficient detail or description in response to the question asked.
- Submitted Planned Services and Expenditures (PSE) document was incomplete and did not adhere to provided instructions. Deficiencies include missing information related to proposed services and errors in the budgetary information included on the PSE. Total formulae on the summary page were overwritten with hard numbers to match the budget.
- Submitted application package was missing resumes of project staff, as required. Due to the missing information, the evaluation committee had difficulty assessing administrative capacity of applicant to fulfill the demands of this project.
- Submitted response describing agency's procedures to protect client confidentiality were inadequate; submitted information included a notice of privacy practices, but no other supporting details or policies addressing how client confidentiality is protected.
- Submitted application reflected an overall deficiency of detail, responses appeared to be general agency information copied and pasted from other agency sources and were not tailored to the information required by the Request for Proposals (RFP).

While your appeal letter indicates the dire hardship this places your agency in, we only have a set amount of funding allocated to this program each solicitation period. I am upholding the decision that your proposal does not get awarded for FY23-25 considering it did not score high enough in this highly competitive NTS solicitation period based on the information provided above. This constitutes a final agency action. If you are dissatisfied with this decision, you may appeal the decision within 30 days of the date of the letter to the Alaska Superior Court.

Sincerely,



Adam Crum
Commissioner

Cc: Al Wall, Health, Deputy Commissioner
Tony Newman, Division of Senior Services & Disabilities, Acting Director
Kristin Cox, Division of Senior Services & Disabilities, Program Manager
Sylvan Robb, Health, Assistant Commissioner