

Monroe A. Miller Jr.
19 Big Spruce Lane
Waynesville, NC 28786
October 1, 2014

Subject: Haywood County Schools Fatally Flawed Chemical RFP Award, Investigation & Final Report.

This report summarizes the Administering and Awarding of a Chemical RFP by Alison Francis, the CN (Child Nutrition) Director for Haywood County Schools for Haywood - Buncombe and Henderson County's -

[re: <http://haywoodtp.net/pubII/140829ChemicalBidRPF.pdf>].

The bid was awarded to Ecolab over Champion, based on *The "price per unit" of the chemicals* [re: per Alison Francis, Haywood County CN Director, and attested to by Pat Bryant, Buncombe County School Board Designated Pit-Bull member] submitted in response to a twenty three (23) Line Item list of Chemicals, and the tabulation of six (6) "Award Criteria" forms filled out by CN directors of Haywood, Buncombe and Henderson Counties, one each for Ecolab and Champion.

This bid process was a Coop between Haywood - Buncombe - Henderson, with Haywood taking the lead. Which ever bid Haywood went with, the others would follow. CN directors gathered and based their award criterial on a summary spread sheet of the first ten (10) lines items, listing again, "price per unit" as the primary analysis indicator.

I contend that all three (3) School Systems wound up paying nearly 2.5 times more for Chemicals from Ecolab than they had been paying, and would have paid, for this bid for chemicals from Champion. The administering and awarding of this bid is so far off norm from any form of reality, that I have to conclude that there has been either fraud/corruption or astronomical incompetence. Under any circumstances, Alison Francis should either resign immediately or be fired. The same goes for the other two CN directors, Lisa Payne, CN Director for Buncombe County, and Christina Dodd for Henderson County. This is the same path I demanded for Julie Davis, Haywood County Finance Director, when she Cooked the Books and Falsified Per Pupil Allocation values for the Funding Formula (yet she remains!).

Both Haywood and Buncombe County School Boards (haven't gotten into Henderson County yet), pencil whipped approval of Alison Francis' recommendation without hardly a whimper.

[**Editors Note:** Bob Morris of the Haywood County School Board raised some initial objections, and Lisa Baldwin of the Buncombe County School Board voted against. All other board members fell in line and voted for this recommendation.]

What triggered this Investigation?

Credit is to be given to Becky Johnson of the Smoky Mountain news for two articles she wrote -

<http://smokymountainnews.com/news/item/13980-outbid-or-passed-over-haywood-businessman-questions-school-contract-for-cleaning-supplies>

<http://www.smokymountainnews.com/news/item/14047-haywood-s-detergent-war-schools-opt-for-ecolab-over-local-supplier>

A special thanks to Lisa Baldwin, who actually supplied as much or more information on this fiasco than I received from Bill Nolte, Haywood County Assistant Superintendent, when I initiated a formal Request for Public Information. As a whole, I would rate Bill Nolte as more of an obstructionist than not.

Requirements.

Let's start with the requirements. These can be found within the Public Information I received from the Haywood County School System package I received, specifically from Bill Nolte.

See again, <http://haywoodtp.net/pubII/140829ChemicalBidRPF.pdf>, pages 16 - 18. These pages specify the 23 line items bidders are to respond.

Notice the last two (2) columns labeled:

- DILUTION RATIO 1 GALLON WATER
- USE COST PER 1 GALLON WATER

Line items 1-5 have blank spaces for each of these columns, all other remaining items have N/A (in bid parlance, this means Not Applicable). This seemed to make sense, because some items contained within these line items are RTU (Ready To Use), like Glass Cleaner, Item 8, and a majority of items after Item 10.

However, in the various Bid Responses (re: pages 26 - 32), I noticed that values were filled in for these last two columns past item Line Item 5. Why?

Bursting with questions, Dr. Anne Garrett, Haywood County School Superintendent graciously set up a meeting with her, Alison Francis, and me to answer some questions I had developed. The meeting was conducted on 9/11 from 11:00 am to 11:30 am (and not one second more). The meeting was recorded. I would rate the meeting as Hostile.

Prior to that meeting, I discovered from a website in Buncombe County, via Buncombe County School Board Member, Lisa Baldwin, that there had been an addendum to the Chemical Bid, revising the items to remove N/A from the table.

<http://www.buncombe.k12.nc.us/Page/44096>

<http://www.buncombe.k12.nc.us/site/handlers/filedownload.ashx?moduleinstanceid=52821&dataid=81142&FileName=Chemical%20Bid%20Addendum%201.pdf>

This addendum was issued June 10, 2014 and the bid was dated June 4, 2014. Why make this change? We will get to that.

I asked Alison Francis during the meeting if I was bidding on this RFP, why would I have to go to a website in a different county to find this addendum? Alison Francis replied during the meeting [re: recorded] that it was initially on the Haywood County website, but had since been removed. [Why scrub it? Running out of server space as David Francis and Mark Swanger are regarding eliminating some vital tax information are on the County's server?]

[Editors Note: The complete list of questions I walked into the meeting with between Alison Francis, Dr. Anne Garrett and myself, appear at the end of this report. Time permitted only about a third of the questions being asked, others remain unanswered. The (my) recording of this meeting is likely to appear on my website, www.haywoodtp.net shortly. Alison Francis also made a recording.]

Vendor supplied responses.

There were two (2) vendor supplied responses provided by Bill Nolte, and appear on pages 26 through 32, and these are from Champion and Ecolab. However, Lisa Baldwin was able to provide a third set of responses from Green Bamboo, although that vendor only responded to about half the items. Green Bamboo shows up on Alison Francis' summary sheet, which we will get to.

The first 20 line items can be broken up into three (3) groupings.

- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-20

Items 1-5 contain Dish Machine Detergent, Rinse, stuff like that. However, these turn out to be the items representing the bulk of the expenditure for chemicals.

Items 6-10 contain cleaners, laundry detergent, stuff like that. However, some of these items were not responded to with the following parameters -

- DILUTION RATIO 1 GALLON WATER
- USE COST PER 1 GALLON WATER

Items 11-20, both Ecolab and Champion had to respond to a lot of items with RTU (Ready to Use). Definitely not the parameters of

- DILUTION RATIO 1 GALLON WATER
- USE COST PER 1 GALLON WATER

So why in the world did Alison Francis come up with an addendum to specify line items 11 - 20 in terms of

- DILUTION RATIO 1 GALLON WATER
- USE COST PER 1 GALLON WATER

if vendors were not able to respond in those terms?

The Alison Francis Summary Spread Sheet.

Alison Francis must have realized this conundrum, as she created a summary spread sheet containing only Line Items 1-10. It is on page 34 of <http://haywoodtp.net/pubII/140829ChemicalBidRPF.pdf>. This spread sheet does show Green Bamboo, but only a summary. Some of the writing at the bottom of this spread sheet is mine, as I was making some notes before I took the whole mess to the UPS Store to get it converted to a single pdf file.

Alison Francis has used only the first 10 Line Items in this summary sheet for three vendors. Alison Francis has thoughtfully highlighted winning numbers in yellow blocks, although there seem to be two winners for Line Item 7, Floor Cleaner.

Notice below the chart under the columns for Champion and Ecolab, there are two numbers, presumably representing the totals of each column.

- Champion 2.2544
- Ecolab 1.763

These numbers were referenced by Alison Francis in her Award Criteria Sheets [re: pages 36-42 of <http://haywoodtp.net/pubII/140829ChemicalBidRPF.pdf>]. Check out pages 41-42 of the Award Criteria Sheets, Alison Francis' pages. These were the two sheets Alison Francis filled out for Ecolab and Champion, respectively. They both reference the two numbers above in a category entitled "Pricing". It appeared that Alison Francis awarded the bid to Ecolab based on these two numbers. Alison Francis awarded 20 out of 20 points to Ecolab for Pricing, and only 15 out of 20 points to Champion. The other two CN Directors followed suit. They are, by the way,

- Lisa Payne, Buncombe County, [re: page 19],
- Christine Dodd, Henderson County, [re: page 23].

None of these Award Criteria Sheets have any place for a signature, nor a date. This is handy for limiting accountability.

Note that there is nothing what-so-ever in Alison Francis cleverly designed spread sheet about actual usage (quantity) of products, nor what the overall cost of the all the products are going to cost each school system per year. The entire awarding of this bid was evidently awarded on the following numbers (plus the other less meaningful criterial in these Award Criteria Sheets):

- Champion 2.2544
- Ecolab 1.763

I had asked Alison Francis in our 9/11 meeting where these Award Criterial Sheets originated, and she gave a sketchy rambling answer [re: recording] that they were here before she got here.

Analysis - Reverse Engineering.

This is the fun and challenging part of any investigation, the part where you have to actually use your brain (as I had to really use my brain in reversed engineering Julie Davis' work in the Funding Formula). Fortunately, this fiasco was not as difficult, perhaps because Alison Francis is not as clever as Julie Davis.

As I have been fortunate to have been part of both sides of several large bids [re: Electronic Flight Instrument Systems, Flight Control Systems, etc., for Boeing's 7X7 aircraft, etc.], I can spot area's that produce red flags, and this Chemical RFP Award had it's share. In summarizing these problems, I will concentrate on three area's -

- The Price Per Unit aspect, i.e., Alison Francis' summary Spread Sheet, the basis for the Award, and
- Overall usage cost, an analysis prepared by Bruce Johnson, Champion [re: pages 52-71 of <http://haywoodtp.net/pubII/140829ChemicalBidRPF.pdf>].
- The Award Criteria Sheets

These three aspects have to be combined to form the overall perspective and conclusion. So we begin by looking at each one separately, and then combining aspects of all three.

Price Per Unit.

Line Items 1-2. The first two line items were actually a duplication of each other. That's right, this is like double counting in Alison Francis' summary spread sheet. This (these) single item, by the way, accounted for between 28% - 55% of the entire usage of Line Items for the three school counties last year. Note the values to be entered into the spread sheet - \$.002 and \$.005.

Line Item 3. This is where you have to use a little common sense. Ecolab indicated the dilution ratio was .05 oz per gallon. That means if you multiply by 20, you get 1 oz of Manual Pot Detergent per 20 gallons of water. Think about it. For those that drink, imagine taking a jigger of this super highly concentrated chemical and mixing it with four 5 gallon water cooler jugs of water. Would you expect this to clean your pots? Somehow, that does not pass the sanity check with me. Again, note the values to be entered into the spread sheet - \$.015 and \$.013.

Line Items 4-5. Rinse. Ecolab used ml (milliliters) per gallon (why cross contaminate metric and English units), while Champion used oz (ounces) per gallon. There are .034 oz per milliliter, but that didn't phase Alison Francis. She blindly figured they were equivalent and used the Cost / Gallon based on this unit discrepancy as though it did not matter. The rinse, by the way, is **the major cost** item for all schools, dollar wise. Ecolab was \$.017 per ml, and Champion was \$.003 for Item 4 and \$.069 per ml for Ecolab and again, \$.003 for Champion for Item 5. So, in Alison Francis' little world, Champion won this line item, .003 to .017. These line items were treated as Apples and Oranges, and with no regard to actual usage.

Lets jump directly to **Line Item 8.** Glass Cleaner. It is listed as \$1.65 per quart under Champion and \$.78 (for presumably the same units) for Ecolab. Wait a minute! Per quart? What happened to the Dilution Ratio per gallon? This appears to be one of those RTU (Ready to Use) chemicals that you cannot get to cost per gallon, because it is already premixed, like Windex.

The glass cleaner amounted to less than 1% of all chemical usage dollar cost wise for any school, yet Alison Francis lumped in right into her spread sheet and added it up with the rest of the dilution ratios. The \$1.65 used in this spread sheet dominates over all other numbers, like \$.002, and is the single largest factor in this spread sheet analysis. That Champion used a higher cost Glass Cleaner than Ecolab did, and placing these numbers in the spread sheet without regard to if it matched other products Dilution Ratio per Gallon is a clear indication that this process is fatally flawed.

Let's check Addition.

Arithmetic does not seem to be one of Alison Francis' strong points. If you take a look at my handwriting on page 34 on Alison Francis' summarized spread sheet, she added wrong!

Instead of 2.2544 for Champion, it should have been 2.3784.

Instead of 1.763 for Ecolab, it should have been 2.3139.

This discrepancy was brought up in the famous 9/11 meeting with Alison Francis. She must have seen my handwriting notes on the RFP I put on my website, and she came prepared to the meeting with a new spread sheet with the corrected numbers above, and proudly announced, "**See - Ecolab still wins!**" [re: recording].

That, my friends, as far as I am concerned, is evidence that she used that spread sheet as the ultimate criteria for awarding the bid to Ecolab.

I contend that it was -

- fatally flawed /fraudulent (whatever f-word you want to use), or
- Astronomically Incompetent

to commingle Dilution Ratios per Gallon and Cost per Gallon with Cost per Quart. If you disqualify Item 8 from Alison Francis' astronomically stupid summary spread sheet, you get new results.

- Champion $(2.3784 - 1.65) = 1.4415$
- Ecolab $(2.3139 - .78) = 2.9665$

and Champion wins in a landslide!

Overall usage cost, an analysis prepared by Bruce Johnson, Champion.

Bruce Johnson has an engineering degree from Duke and an MBA from UCLA, and has been supplying Haywood, Buncombe and Henderson Counties for the past ten years with Chemicals (until Alison Francis decided to pull the plug with her summary spread sheet). Consequently, he took the time to provide Haywood County Schools with a Bid Cost Analysis for the three (3) school systems. Furthermore, knowing what Ecolab was bidding for chemicals, he was able to extrapolate what each schools cost would be for the first year that Ecolab was awarded this contract. This analysis included last year's cost, Ecolab's cost for the current year, and what Champion's cost would have been, if Champion won the bid.

These analysis' appear on pages 52-71 of <http://haywoodtp.net/pubII/140829ChemicalBidRPF.pdf> and were contained in the information provided to me by Bill Nolte.

Are you ready to have your mind blown? I hope you are sitting down... Here we go.

The following analysis is disturbing to me. For Haywood County, Bruce Johnson lists only three (3) chemicals out of the total twenty-three (23) chemicals listed as line items in the RFP. Further, the Data Used is for 2013-2014 School year - about half the schools for about half the year. That means to extrapolated to the full usage for all schools for the entire year, one would multiply by a factor of four (4) to get to the total amount. Recall, this is for only 3 of the 23 chemicals. Further, Mr. Johnson applied the cost numbers that Ecolab used, who won the bid by the way, and presented what Ecolab's cost would be. Let's look at what we find of the raw data for Haywood County.

Last years cost	\$ 7,211
Ecolab	\$16,187
Champion Bid	\$ 6,743

My first question was "Why was Champions Bid less than last years cost?" So I asked Bruce Johnson, and he indicated he went to his suppliers, letting them know he was in a tight bit, and was able to negotiation better pricing from his suppliers.

Now, let's take those numbers, and extrapolate what the total yearly cost would be, again, simply by multiplying each of those numbers by 4.

Last years cost	\$ 7,211 x 4 = \$ 28,844
Ecolab	\$16,187 x 4 = \$ 64,748
Champion Bid	\$ 6,743 x 4 = \$ 26,972

We can see immediately that Ecolab came in 2.24 times last years cost, and 2.4 times Champions bid price. Why did Alison Francis award the bid to Ecolab? Ecolab won the incredibly inane Alison Francis summary spread sheet analysis.

In the historical data of how much Haywood County has paid for Chemicals over the past several years, Alison Francis responded to my Request for Public Information during the 9/11 meeting, and I have summarized it in the following table.

School Yr.	Amount
2007-2008	\$26,291
2008-2009	\$39,174
2009-2010	\$27,409
2010-2011	\$30,588
2011-2012	\$25,001
2012-2013	\$25,934
2013-2014	\$ 7,702

The average of the first six (6) years of supplied data (2007-2013) is \$29,732, about \$30K per year. If you take the last year's data, which Bruce Johnson indicated he had supplied half the schools for about have the year, and multiply by 4, you get \$30,808, which is about \$30K, and matches data provided by Alison Francis (a sanity check).

Now, let's take a look at Buncombe County, where Bruce Johnson compiled the exact amounts for all chemicals.

Last years cost	\$ 101,773
Ecolab	\$ 232,239
Champion Bid	\$ 89,552

What the [expletive deleted]!

Here again, Ecolab won the bid with a cost that was 2.28 times higher than last year's cost, and 2.59 times Champions bid. As you can see, this compares pretty close to Haywood County, and you can look at the Henderson County numbers, which are again similar. Buncombe County took the biggest hit - \$142,687.

I made a similar Request for Public Information to Lisa Payne to verify, as I have done with Haywood County, past historical expenditure history for Buncombe County for the past ten years. Do you know what she said?

“ ... Buncombe County Schools School Nutrition currently has three years plus the current year records on file. Today I will provide you with each years totals, however, these figures do include trash can liners, brushes and all other items purchased for operations from Champion Supply. I acknowledge that you prefer the totals without trash cans, however, in reviewing our usage report from Champion Supply these additional items were not included. I can contact Mr. Johnson and request that Champion Supply provide me with a usage and sales report that will break each item down by line item and product category if you like. ...”

The years totals are as follows:
Champion Supply total invoice amount:

2011/2012 School Year	\$143,423.51
2012/2013 School Year	\$136,182.11
2013/2014 School Year	\$134,570.22

Well knock me over with a feather. She doesn't know! 2013-2014 should be \$ 101,773 according to Bruce Johnson, not \$ 134,570. The level of incompetence with these CN directors is astounding.

[**Editors Note:** It was like removing four impacted wisdom teeth extracting this information out of Lisa Payne at the Buncombe County School System. The primary obstructionist there was Tony Baldwin, Superintendent, who threw me under the bus when he passed me along to a "gatekeeper". After busting a few doors down, the path was finally cleared to received this information directly from the custodian of this Public Information, Lisa Payne.]

The Award Criteria Sheets.

[9_5_13_cn_procure_plan-2 Buncombe County .pdf](#) This is the Buncombe County Procurement Plan for Child Nutrition by Lisa Payne, provided to me by Lisa Baldwin.

Let me direct your attention to Section B, COMPETITIVE SEALED BID (IFB) or COMPETITIVE NEGOTIATION (RFP), Item 9, which states:

9. The following criteria will be used in awarding bids.
 - a. **Price**
 - b. Quality
 - c. Delivery
 - d. Service

[Note the order in which the preceding items were listed, Price being first.]

10. In awarding a competitive negotiation (RFP), a set of award criterion in the form of a weighted evaluation sheet will be provided to each bidder in the initial bid document materials. **Price alone is not the sole basis for award, but remains the primary consideration when awarding a contract.** Following evaluation and negotiations a firm fixed price or cost reimbursable contract is awarded.

This was my primary objection with how Allison Francis ran this award. Price was relegated to the bottom of the pile, and I have some serious questions about comments on the Award sheets.

The raw Award Criteria Sheets are in <http://haywoodtp.net/pubII/140829ChemicalBidRPF.pdf>, pages 36-42. A cursory examination is that they are all filled out extraordinarily similar in nature, Ecolab winning every sheet. Unfortunately, mathematics does not appear to be one of Lisa Payne's best skills either, as she incorrectly added the points for Champion on her (unsigned and undated) sheet. It should have been 81, not 91. All three CN experts rated the price categories for Ecolab and Champion identically; 15 points for Champion and 20 points for Ecolab. The only way this could have happened is with the guiding hand of Alison Francis and her astronomically insane summary spread sheet, which she herself, put the incorrectly added numbers as a notation on her two Award Criteria Sheets.

Obviously, these people were in their own little world when they filled this out, and did not pay any attention to the Buncombe County Procurement Plan for Child Nutrition which stated:

9. The following criteria will be used in awarding bids.
 - a. **Price**
 - b. Quality
 - c. Delivery
 - d. Service

10. In awarding a competitive negotiation (RFP), a set of award criterion in the form of a weighted evaluation sheet will be provided to each bidder in the initial bid document materials. **Price alone is not the sole basis for award, but remains the primary consideration when awarding a contract.** Following evaluation and negotiations a firm fixed price or cost reimbursable contract is awarded.

Cabarrus County Comparison.

Lisa Baldwin did some comparison shopping to see what neighboring counties were paying for Chemicals. This is an exchange Lisa had with Tony Baldwin, Buncombe County Superintendent.

See the email below per my conversation today with the Cabarrus County Child Nutrition Director. Cabarrus has over 30,000 students and 37 schools with cafeterias. Cabarrus is paying \$60,044.44 per year (10 months) for chemicals. Last year Buncombe paid \$134,241.18 for chemicals, more than double the price Cabarrus is paying this year. Is this an apples to apples comparison? Please let me know if the Cabarrus service contract model is something Buncombe could emulate next year to save money.

Chemical Contract Comparison: Buncombe: \$134,241.18 or 2013-14 (no total available for 2014-15)
Cabarrus: \$ 60,044.44 for 2014-15

Dairy Contract Comparison: Buncombe Roll-over of Pet Dairy: \$1,035,523.54 for 26,000 students
Cabarrus Dairy Bid: \$ 821,986.00 for 30,000

Keep in mind Cabarrus has more students than Buncombe but fewer schools. What would account for the discrepancies in prices? See attachments.

It is my understanding that Cabarrus County was able to get a “service contract” due to the proximity of the county with the supplier, and the mountain region would be more difficult, but provides a point of comparison.

[**Editor’s Note:** The number Lisa Baldwin referenced for chemical expenditures for Buncombe County - \$134,241, was information that had been provided by Lisa Payne at the Buncombe County School Board meeting on 9/4/2014, who apparently did not then, nor still does not have a clue as to what Buncombe County spends on chemical expenditures, as of this date.]

Testimonials.

On more than one occasion, I had requested additional information from Bill Nolte regarding questions I had relating to this Chemical Bid. The second and last bunch of material I received were not the answers to the questions I asked, rather an abundant plethora of testimonials from a variety of Haywood County School employees, circling the wagons around Alison Francis after she was first criticized for awarding this bid. Check out the cluster of dates these testimonials were written.

They are on <http://haywoodtp.net/pubII/140829ChemicalBidRPF.pdf>, starting at page 73, ending hilariously with a final letter from a Wayne Worley, which generated question #20 in my list of questions to Alison Francis during our meeting on 9/11. It was never answered.

Conclusion and Summary.

- Champion got screwed.
- Children of Haywood, Buncombe and Henderson County's got screwed.
- Teachers of Haywood, Buncombe and Henderson County's got screwed.

The combined **extra amount of money** these school systems will have to pay for this fiasco is nearly a quarter of a million dollars (\$234K)! This basically comes right out of taxpayers pocket-books and away from Children and Teachers.

How was this all able to get past school administrators, and County School Boards? Especially Buncombe County School Board, where flags were raised before they rammed the vote through (Lisa Baldwin voting against).

This is a lesson for taxpayers in each of these county's. We have already seen how the Haywood County School Board bows down (turning around, bending over and grabbing the ankles) in front of Haywood County School Board Chairman Chuck Francis and Haywood County Commission Chairman Mark Swanger with the Funding Formula Fiasco. It appears Buncombe County has a similar situation even though all the red flags were raised. Pat Bryant, the Designated Pit-Bull, is the most vociferous. It will be up to voters to determine if you all want these same people to continue to run the show.

I cannot determine if it was fraud/corruption or astronomical incompetence. Under any circumstances, as for the three (3) CN directors, they should all stand up and resign, and if they do not resign, they should be fired, just as Julie Davis, Haywood County Finance Director should resign or be fired. Julie Davis, however, is still kicking around.

[Editors Note: It has just been brought to my attention that Christina Dodd, CN Director of Henderson County, has resigned and moved to Colorado. One down, two to go.]

Monroe A. Miller Jr.
19 Big Spruce Lane
Waynesville, NC 28786
~~September 4, 2014~~
September 11, 2014

Questions for Allison Francis
September 11, 2014
11:00am - 11:30am

1. Buncombe Child Nutrition Procurement Plan (page 2)
Dish Machine Supplies, vendor listed as Champion
Buncombe, Caldwell, Haywood, Wilkes, Henderson. Were is Caldwell and Wilkes in your RFP?
2. Buncombe Child Nutrition Procurement Plan (page 5)
PRICE - primary consideration.
3. Where did APPENDIX F come from? Did you create it? Why is Price at the bottom of the list? Why is Price set at a maximum of 20 points?
4. Were the same Award Sheets used for Buncombe, Henderson, Wilkes and Caldwell counties?
5. Was standard government criteria used or made up by Allison Francis on these Award Criterial Sheets? Nolte refused to respond.
6. Who signed off on the Award Sheets from Buncombe and Henderson Counties? Why aren't their dated signatures on the Award Sheets?
7. Spec Sheet (pages 1-3), everything after Item 5 -
Dilution ratio / 1 gal water, Use cost / 1 gal water, marked N/A. What does N/A Mean?
8. 3 sheets provided, only documentation who it was from was "For Comlovs".
Who is that, and why are Items 6 through 20 have values for dilution ratios?
9. On what appears to have been described as your (Allison Francis) summary table of Vendors Cost vs "something" -
Values at bottom of Ecolab and Champion columns appear on Award Criteria Sheets.
Explain addition.
Explain why values included past Item 5, which are marked N/A on RFP Spec Sheet.
10. Show basis for all dilution ratios
Detergent - how did Ecolab get .016?
Pot Soap -
11. Read e-mail concerns / analysis from Bruce Johnson. Have Allison Francis explain.
12. My abortive analysis with Cascade Dishwasher soap purchased from Costco.
13. Award Criteria Sheets - Quality has the highest consideration (at top of list and highest category in percentage point assignment). Why?
14. Award Criteria Sheets - Buncombe and Haywood use "Per gal Based" on heavy usage.

15. Award Criteria Sheets - Haywood, "Champ 2.2544, Eco 1.763" This comes from your summary sheet.
16. Award Criteria Sheets - Justification for all three counties having Champion get 15 points and Ecolab 20 points, even though Champion won price in all three instances.
17. Past Performance Award Criteria. Justify points for Champion vs. Ecolab.
18. Why didn't the RFP explicitly state the type of products desired?
19. Did Ecolab install their equipment prior to the Haywood School Board vote, and obviously the Buncombe County School Board vote, which is tonight?
20. Wayne Worley, in his "Testimonial" indicated savings in "Labor and Equipment Costs". What are those numbers? Nolte refused to provide those.
21. The testimonials are not documented. Where is the data on the improved cleaning ability? Besides how can the astronomical spending be justified - because it makes the job easier?
22. What is this about a pilot program for Ecolab? There was nothing about a pilot program in the information I received as a Request for Public Information from Nolte?
23. What were the parameters of the Pilot program? Did Ecolab give Haywood County free chemicals to try? Did Haywood purchase chemicals from Ecolab during this pilot program, if so, how can that be? Weren't you under contract to purchase chemicals from Champion?
24. Were the Ecolab products distributed for free? Did this influence cafeteria managers?
25. Are you related to either David Francis, Tax Collector or Chuck Francis, Chair of School Board?
26. Did Allison Francis ever receive anything from Ecolab such as gifts or been taken out to eat, and if so, how many times and when? [This is a common business practice but would like to know the extent].

LINE	ITEM NAME AND PRODUCT SPECIFICATIONS	APPROVED BRAND	Usage	USE COST PER 1 GALLON WATER	Changlin	ECOLAB	Green Bamboo	Coronet Enterprises
Districts will provide approximately two weeks notice of intent to order for all items in this section that are marked with an asterisk								
1	Detergent, Dish Machine - Non-corrosive, metal safe, with low surfactant levels. Designed for controlled dispensing. Preferred pack: 4 - 67.5 lb blocks	Apex Power Plus 17003 or Approved Equivalent	997		0.005	4.085	0.002	0.0078
2	Detergent, Dish Machine - Non-corrosive, metal safe, with low surfactant levels. For use with moderately hard water. Designed for controlled dispensing. Preferred pack: 4 - 47.5 lb blocks	Apex Power 15051 or Approved Equivalent			0.005	0	0.002	0.0078
3	Detergent, Manual Pot and Pan - Non-corrosive, metal safe, with low surfactant levels. Concentrated liquid detergent. Preferred pack: 2.5 gallon bags	Scud 10595 or Approved Equivalent	1347		0.035	20.205	0.013	0.011
4	Fast Drying Rinse Additive - Non-corrosive, metal safe, with low surfactant levels. Preferred pack: 2-5 qt.	Apex 610011R or Approved Equivalent	618		0.003	1.854	0.017	0.0039
5	Rinse Additive - non caustic. Preferred pack: 2-2.5 lb blocks	Apex 16911 or WNC Approved Equivalent			0.003	0	0.069	0.0039
6	Detergent, Laundry - not caustic. Safe for all machines as well. Preferred pack: 45 lb.	Puma Brite Plus 10598 or Approved Equivalent	230		0.2384	54.832	0.15	0.049
7	Cleaner, Floor - non caustic, No-Rinse. Preferred pack: 2.5 gallons	Walk 'n Walk 14774 or Approved Equivalent	625		0.155	96.875	0.41	0.1125
8	Cleaner, Glass - non caustic, Stain-Free, Fast Drying. Preferred pack: 2.5 gallons	Novus Labors/Manufacturer Label	89		3.65		0.78	2.75 gal
9	Cleaner, Porcelain, Multi-Purpose - Cleans Glass, Mirrors, countertops, and metal fixtures. Preferred pack: 1-2.5 gallons	Powder Glass R. Surface 6100609 or Approved Equivalent			0.18	0	0.32	1.42 qt.
10	Cleaner, Multi-Purpose - non caustic, Non-abrasive, Break-free. Preferred pack: 1-2.5 gallons	Quik 127 Orange Force 14589 or Approved Equivalent			0.124	0	0.56	0.156

Buncombe, Haywood, and Henderson County Schools Child Nutrition Programs

Proposal Form - Chemicals #14-15

USE COST PER 1 gallon

Company Name _____

Address _____ City, State, Zip Code _____

Phone Number _____