From: Don Hartman
To: Zeigler, Jack E. (DES); DHartman@cbm-wa.com
Subject: FW: Comments
Date: Friday, January 09, 2015 11:02:35 AM
Attachments: WSCA MPS Rebid Recommendation WA State 4-30-2014.doc

---

COMMENTS ON THE APRIL 30, 2014 LETTER TO THE WSCA-NASPO MANAGEMENT BOARD

There will be some assumptions made concerning this letter but only because the discussions and decisions discussed in this letter were conducted miles away from Olympia. We were told that DES would make a request to have the WSCA MPS contract rebid to address vendor and customer concerns. This came about because of the lawsuit that was going on between DES and CBM. CBM was at odds with DES because DES wanted to implement MPS contracts without first establishing rules and guidelines. The statute creating MPS required savings and there were no tools in place for agencies to verify those savings.

In the following section from the attached letter Christine Warnock states the following;

We understand the sourcing team will be recommending that the contract be left to expire without rebid due to complexities, and the fact that several states may not have the need for MPS at this time. The state of Washington does not disagree with this recommendation.

WSCA decided that MPS was not being used by the majority of states and was willing to let the contract end, but DES still used it. Perhaps vendor and customer concerns are the same as complexities. Even WSCA knew that the existing MPS contract had problems but DES continued to push state agencies into MPS.

Agencies here in Washington were threatened by DES to have their delegated purchasing authority revoked if they did not move forward with MPS. What is very hard to understand is why DES would agree with WSCA (The state of Washington does not disagree with this recommendation.) that WSCA MPS needed to die, and still force Washington State Agencies to use a flawed contract.

The State of Washington has a statue mandating MPS that was pushed through

the legislature as a way to bring money into the State Printer because they were losing $100,000.00 per month. The Printer became part of DES so DES inherited MPS.

As a taxpayer I cannot understand why if a majority of 17 states cannot make MPS work in their state how the staff at DES feels it is still workable in Washington. Why is DES not looking out for the agencies they supposedly serve? Why not take the time to fix a problem instead of running forward with a flawed product.

At the least DES should stop all agencies from moving ahead with MPS until they can bid their own MPS contract. It makes one wonder, whose interests is DES concerned about, their customers or their own?

Don Hartman