

CITY OF DETROIT

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

REQUEST TO CLOSE MEMORANDUM

DATE:

5/22/2023

TO: Ellen Ha
Inspector General

Approved



FROM: Beverly Murray, CFE, CIGA
File Manager

RE: OIG FILE #: 22-0011-INV
DDOT Sole Source Bids

COMPLAINANT INFORMATION: Osiris Zinjanthropus

I. Summary

On August 4, 2022, the City of Detroit Office of Inspector General (OIG) received a complaint from Osiris Zinjanthropus against Detroit Department of Transportation (DDOT) Director C. Mikel Oglesby. The complaint involved five DDOT contracts and alleged the contracts involved “suspicious procurement spending¹” and that Mr. Oglesby was not awarding contracts “...in a transparent, open and fair manner for all eligible contractors.²” The complainant alleged the contracts were awarded as sole source contracts in violation of the procurement ordinance. The contracts listed in the allegation are as follows:

- Contract #6003563 with Transportation & Management Design, Inc. (TMD)
- Contracts #6003711 and #6003712 with The Leflore Group (TLG)
- Contract #6003749 with Champion Services Group (CSG)
- Contract #6003751 with Jackson Lewis P.C. (JL)

The OIG’s investigation revealed the following findings:

- The OIG has substantiated the allegation contract #6003563 with TMD was improperly awarded as a sole source contract with no competitive bidding process.

¹ Memorandum to Ellen Ha, Inspector General from complainant Osiris Zinjanthropus Re: Request for Investigation of City of Detroit Public Servant and Executive Director of Transit, Mikel Oglesby, July 27, 2022.

² *Id*

- The OIG did not substantiate the allegation that the contracts with TLG, CSG, or JL were awarded as sole source, and found these contracts followed the standard procurement process, including competitive bidding.
- The OIG found there was communication between DDOT and TLG regarding work related to the contract, prior to the contract being approved.
- The OIG found the invoices from TLG lacked detail about the work performed by the vendor.
- The OIG found the use of inaccurate commodity codes hinders the responses to bid solicitations and reduces competition.
- The OIG found the purchase requisition for JL was created after the contract was awarded, which did not follow the established procurement process.

The complaint also alleged that Director Oglesby has a personal relationship with DDOT Deputy Director Maryanne Walsh. This allegation is based on the complainants' review of their work history and home address. This aspect of the complaint does not fall under the jurisdiction of the OIG. A prior working relationship or friendship does not prohibit Mr. Oglesby from hiring any qualified candidate, including Ms. Walsh, as his Deputy Director.

Finally, the complaint alleged that Deputy Director Walsh misrepresented her work history at the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority based on what he believes to be discrepancies between her age and work history located on her LinkedIn page. However, there is no evidence that Ms. Walsh does not meet the qualifications for the Deputy Director position. Therefore, the OIG did not investigate this aspect of the complaint because we did not find the basis for the allegation to be sufficient to warrant- further investigation.

Based on our findings, the OIG is recommending the following:

1. The Office of Contracting and procurement (OCP) should ensure all non-standard procurements are documented using the non-standard procurement form.
2. OCP should review the commodity codes to ensure they accurately reflect the goods or services, hopefully increasing the responses from bidders.
3. OCP should train all city employees involved in procurement on the process, including what actions and communications are prohibited during the bid process.
4. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) should require detailed invoices that reflect the work performed by the vendors.

II. Background

The OIG investigated this complaint as a possible abuse of authority by Mr. Oglesby in the procurement process. The first step of the investigation was to gain an understanding of the procurement process by reviewing the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for the Office of Contracting and Procurement (OCP) relevant to this investigation. The OIG also engaged with OCP staff throughout the investigation to request documents related to these contracts and gather additional information when necessary.

To determine if there was abuse of authority in the procurement process, the OIG first needed to determine if the contracts were awarded as sole-source contracts as alleged in the complaint. If the contracts were sole-sourced, we then needed to determine if the contracts followed the established non-standard procurement process.

The complaint also alleged these vendors were selected based on their prior relationship with Director Oglesby. To investigate this matter, the OIG reviewed Director Oglesby's emails to determine what communications, if any, he had with the vendors regarding the upcoming contracts.

Finally, the OIG conducted interviews with key figures in the award of these contracts, including Director Oglesby and Michael Anderson, a former Contracting and Procurement Specialist with OCP. The documents reviewed and the interviews allowed the OIG to conduct a thorough investigation to determine the veracity of the complaint.

III. Analysis and Findings

Contract #6003563-Transportation & Management Design

On July 6, 2021, the City of Detroit's City Council approved contract #6003563 with TMD. The services covered under the contract include on-call transportation planning services, including but not limited to, transit planning services and management planning services.³ The contract was awarded for \$3,035,200.00 and the agreement lasts through June 30, 2024.

The complainant alleges the contract was awarded as a sole-source based on the experience of the vendor, despite experience not being one of the requirements for a sole-source award.⁴ The OIG *has substantiated* the allegation the TMD contract was improperly awarded as a sole-source contract.

OCP's policy⁵ on non-competitive purchases lists the following criteria when determining if a sole-source purchase is appropriate:

- Goods or services that are unique or of a proprietary nature available from only one source.
- Patented items or copyrighted materials only available from the patent or copyright holder.
- Unique or specialized expertise in one source of goods or services unlikely to be obtainable from any other source.
- Compatibility of equipment accessories or replacement parts which permits on one reasonable source of supplier.

³ Contract No. 6003563 between the City of Detroit and Transportation & Management Design, Inc., Exhibit A- Scope of Services, Pgs. 34-41

⁴ Memorandum to Ellen Ha, Inspector General from complainant Osiris Zinjanthropus Re: Request for Investigation of City of Detroit Public Servant and Executive Director of Transit, Mikel Oglesby, July 27, 2022.

⁵ Office of Contracting and Procurement Standard Operating Procedure Manual, Chapter 3: Making a Purchase, Sec. 3.8: Non-Competitive Purchases, Policy, Page 39. (Effective August 2016)

- Goods or services from a single source are required for trial use or testing.
- Only one source supplies goods or services that meet the required salient specifications.
- Goods required must be identical to equipment already in use by the end user to ensure compatibility of equipment and goods only available from one source.
- Maintenance or repair service by the original equipment manufacturer (OEM) are required for equipment and the manufacturer does not have multiple agents to perform these services.
- Grant monies are involved that mandate whom the agency or department must contract with without allowance for exceptions.
- A public emergency exists where the urgency for the requested goods and services will not permit competitive bidding.

When utilizing a Non-Standard Procurement Process, the Contracting and Procurement Specialist (CPS) should complete a Contract Exception Form, as required by OCP Standard Operating Procedure (SOP). Under the SOP, this form would document the following:

- a. Description of the goods or services.
- b. Reasons or rationale that the goods or services can be procured only from a single supplier.
- c. Explanation of the efforts made to reach its conclusion that the goods or services can only be procured from a single source.⁶

In addition, the SOP requires OCP management to determine “whether there is only one source feasibly available to provide goods and services considering the following:

- a. Feasibility with regard for expense, time or inconvenience.
- b. Whether the specifications or work statement has been so narrowly defined that it precludes multiple bidders or sources from eligibility or was written to avoid competition.⁷”

The CPS should also ensure the price is reasonable by conducting a price analysis. The CPS then submits the Contract Exception Form and all supporting documentation to the Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) for approval.

The OIG reviewed this contract to determine if the OCP’s policies and procedures were followed to award this contract as a sole source. According to the OCP, DDOT provided in a memorandum a sole-source justification for TMD stating “Improving infrastructure for the City of Detroit is the primary reason [DDOT] is requesting a sole source justification for regional planning services.....TMD has expertise in logistics, engineering and planning as a part of their

⁶ Office of Contracting and Procurement Standard Operating Procedure Manual, Chapter 3: Making a Purchase, Sec. 3.8: Non-Competitive Purchases, Procedure, Page 40.

⁷ *Id.*

portfolio of services. The need is immediate to supplement staffing with the proven expertise they can provide.⁸

In this instance, the only document provided to the OIG by OCP to support the sole-source purchase was a memorandum with no names or signatures. It is unclear if all the steps outlined in the sole-source process were followed, who initiated the memorandum, and if it was approved by the Chief Procurement Officer (CPO). In addition, because the proper documentation was not completed it is unclear if “improving infrastructure and expertise” would meet the required criteria to justify a sole-source purchase in this instance.

Based on the information reviewed by the OIG, OCP’s procurement process for non-standard purchases was not followed for this contract, as the expertise required under the SOP would need to be unique and specialized to justify a non-competitive bid. However, the memorandum did not identify the services provided by TMD as unique or identify any other clear reason why this purchase would qualify as sole-source purchase.

Based on the OIG’s understanding of policies and procedures, this contract should have been subjected to a competitive process, as DDOT’s preference for a particular vendor is not a sufficient justification to circumvent the process. Not following the policies and procedures outlined for non-competitive purchases not only gives the appearance of impropriety but raises questions that can lead to future allegations like the one found in this complaint. OCP can minimize this risk by following the established policies and procedures that require documentation of the reasons for using a non-competitive purchase, as well as documenting who requested and approved the purchase.

Although the OIG is concerned the procurement process for a non-competitive purchase was not properly followed, we did not find that Mr. Oglesby abused his authority in the procurement process in this instance. Based on the OIG’s understanding of the policies and procedures, it falls on OCP to determine if a purchase meets the criteria for a sole-source contract, and ensure their procedures are followed for a non-competitive purchase. Therefore, the request from Mr. Oglesby for a sole-source contract is not an abuse of authority because the decision to move forward as a sole-source came from OCP.

Contracts #6003711 & #6003712-The Leflore Group

On July 27, 2021, the City Council approved contract #6003711 with TLG. The services covered under the contract included creating procurement boilerplate documents, management of procurement transactions and procurement training for DDOT staff.⁹ The contract award was for \$374,000.00 and the agreement lasted through July 31, 2022.

On July 27, 2021, contract #6003712 was awarded to TLG. The contract included services for data collection and analysis of routes schedules and blocks to determine the optimal zero emission technology to deploy; inventory analysis and vehicle fleet data; analysis of existing

⁸ Email from Kevin Nosotti, former OCP Auditor to Beverly Murray, OIG Forensic Auditor, RE: Sole Source Justification-Transportation Management & Design from DDOT to OCP, dated July 19, 2022.

⁹ Contract No. 6003711 between the City of Detroit and The Leflore Group, Exhibit A-Scope of Services, Pgs. 34-35

infrastructure; financial analysis; and implementation.¹⁰ The contract was awarded in the amount of \$203,500.00 and the agreement lasted through July 31, 2022.

In the review of contracts submitted to City Council, it was noted that OCP only received one proposal in response to the solicitations, which was from TLG.¹¹ The complainant alleged this was because Director Oglesby only sent the solicitation to TLG and no other vendors. The complainant also alleged a conflict of interest because Director Oglesby worked with TLG during his prior employment in California.

According to OCP policy, the City of Detroit “must competitively bid all new contracts to the greatest extent possible.¹²” In addition, the policy states “[w]ell-developed bid documents are the foundation of a competitive procurement. The information contained within the bid documents is the primary resource that potential bidders will use to craft their response. This means that the quality, clarity, and completeness of the bid documents is critical.¹³”

The OIG reviewed the procurement process used for these two contracts to determine if a competitive procurement process was used prior to the contracts being awarded. The OIG requested bid documents related to this solicitation from Renee Hollis, Auditor with OCP, including a list of suppliers notified of the solicitation. We found that Purchase Requestion #489730 listed category 918.96-Transporation Consulting as the commodity code for contract #6003711. OCP also provided a list of 15 suppliers registered under that commodity code who were notified of the solicitation. However, none of the vendors on the supplier list responded.

We also found that Purchase Requestion #489718 listed category 918.96-Transporation Consulting as the commodity code was used for contract #6003712. OCP also provided a list of 17 suppliers registered under that commodity code who were notified of the solicitation. Again, none of the vendors on the supplier list responded.

The OIG checked the websites of the vendors on the supplier list and found many of the vendors provide transportation consulting services. However, the scope of work for the two contracts was for procurement support services for #6003711 and clean energy solutions for #6003712. Therefore, the OIG does not believe this commodity code reflected an accurate description of the request and thereby limited competition.

While the same commodity code was used for both purchase requisitions, the supplier lists were different with only 5 vendors appearing on both lists. In addition, the Bid Negotiation Oracle Summary for this RFP shows the commodity code as 918.41-Energy Conservation. OCP stated that when there is limited response to the RFP, the OCP notifies the department and asks the department to recommend additional vendors to participate in the solicitation. The OIG found

¹⁰ Contract No. 6003712 between the City of Detroit and The Leflore Group, Exhibit A-Scope of Services, Pgs. 41-45

¹¹ Memorandum from David Whitaker, Director of the Legislative Policy Division to The Honorable City Council, RE: Review of Contracts and Purchasing Files, July 26, 2021.

¹² Office of Contracting and Procurement Standard Operating Procedure Manual, Chapter 3: Making a Purchase, Sec. 3.5: Creating, Advertising and Managing Solicitation, I-Managing the Solicitation, Policy, Page 26.

¹³ Office of Contracting and Procurement Standard Operating Procedure Manual, Chapter 3: Making a Purchase, Sec. 3.5: Creating, Advertising and Managing Solicitation, E-Creating Bid Documents, Policy, Page 22.

this response from OCP to be a sufficient explanation for why the vendor notification lists would differ when the same commodity code was used in the bid solicitations.

The complainant's allegation that only TLG was notified is inaccurate. Based on information gathered during the investigation, other vendors were made aware of the solicitation. However, the OIG is concerned that the notified vendors did not provide the services requested in the RFP. Again, the accuracy of the commodity code is imperative to ensuring fair competition.

As noted above, the complainant also alleged that Mr. Oglesby sent the bid solicitations to TLG based on Mr. Oglesby's prior working relationship at Sunline Transit in California. Mr. Oglesby acknowledged in his interview¹⁴ with the OIG that he previously worked with the company during his time working in transit. However, Mr. Oglesby denied any personal or financial interest in TLG, and the OIG did not find any evidence that Mr. Oglesby had an ownership interest in TLG.

While both contracts did go through OCP's competitive bid process, the OIG found some additional concerns regarding contract #6003711. It was discovered that TLG was actively communicating with DDOT and other City of Detroit employees regarding an RFP for new bus cameras as early as April 13, 2021.¹⁵ This was prior to the department request date of April 16, 2021, and contract approval date of June 27, 2021. In addition, the OIG discovered an email from DDOT Deputy Director Maryanne Walsh to Director Oglesby. The email was dated April 11, 2021, and discussed procurement needs for DDOT and included an attachment that outlined her preferred vendors. When discussing the need for procurement assistance, Ms. Walsh wrote the following:

The LeFlore Group specializes in assisting transit agencies that need procurement assistance. Currently, they are on board for writing the RFP for a new bus camera system. Their company support includes everything from drafting procurement policies that are compliant with state and federal laws, staff procurement training, drafting RFPs, reviewing procurement files for compliance and drafting SOPs for the transit agencies.

The true need is to have on call procurement services that specializes in public transportation (FTA) requirements on a larger scale. LeFlore Group preferred.¹⁶

Although a competitive bid process was used, the emails suggest that TLG was the intended vendor for the contract. In addition to Ms. Walsh highlighting their experience and listing them as "preferred," TLG was already working on the RFP for new bus cameras despite a contract not yet being approved. There are concerns the communications, and any work done prior to the contract being approved, would be a violation of procurement policies.

¹⁴ OIG Interview with Executive Director of Transit C. Mikel Oglesby, February 23, 2023.

¹⁵ Zoom meeting invitation from Shrone Perry to C. Mikel Oglesby, RE: Intro w/The Leflore Group to discuss the camera system needs for an RFP, dated April 13, 2021.

¹⁶ Email from Maryanne Walsh to C. Mikel Oglesby, RE: DDOT Procurement Needs, dated April 11, 2021.

The OIG reviewed the TLG invoices to determine if there was an invoice associated with the work performed on the RFP for the bus cameras. Unfortunately, TLG's invoices did not contain any detail regarding the actual work performed, with the invoice only reflecting a monthly labor rate. This monthly fee schedule was included in the contract but the lack of detail in the invoices creates a risk of fraud or abuse.

The fee schedule stated the hourly rate for the project manager is \$150.00 and the rate for the assistant project manager is \$140.00. The fee schedule then states it will be billed monthly in increments of \$28,333.00.¹⁷ The contract does not include a minimum number of hours the project manager or assistant project manager need to work, and the invoices do not detail what work was produced during the billing period. This creates the risk of the monthly billing fee being paid with no way to verify work was completed by the vendor. Since the monthly fee is billed for labor, the invoices should reflect how many hours were worked by the vendor during the billing period and identify what work was performed. The lack of detail on the invoices makes it impossible for the OIG to determine when TLG billed the City of Detroit for the work performed on the new bus cameras and creates a lack of transparency regarding how public funds are being spent.

Based on our review of records, the OIG cannot substantiate the allegation that these contracts were awarded as sole source to TLG. Only one response was received, but the bid solicitations followed OCP's competitive bidding process. The lack of responses to the RFPs appears to be a flaw in the procurement process and not based on the actions of Director Oglesby. Furthermore, a prior working relationship alone is not sufficient evidence that a conflict of interest exists.

However, the communications with TLG prior to the contract being awarded does raise concerns regarding the integrity of the competitive procurement process. These actions make it appear as if TLG was the intended vendor, regardless of the outcome of the procurement process. OCP can minimize this risk by training departments and agencies on the procurement process, including when it is appropriate/inappropriate to communicate with potential or active bidders, when work can begin on a contract, and not to prefer a vendor prior to evaluating the bid responses.

RFP # 181344

OCP issued a bid solicitation for RFP #181344 with a closing date of May 28, 2021. The RFP sought "qualified firms to help [the] Detroit Department of Transportation with personnel training needs."¹⁸ The scope of work detailed in the RFP included train the trainer, de-escalation training and labor/discipline and management training.

The RFP received two responses, one from CSG and one from JL. The complainant alleged that Director Oglesby only sent the bid solicitation to these vendors but that is not accurate. The bid solicitation was shared with 15 vendors according to the supplier list provided by OCP. However, none of the vendors responded to the RFP. CSG and JL were not on the supplier list.

¹⁷ Contract No. 6003711 between the City of Detroit and The Leflore Group, Exhibit B: Fee Schedule, Pg. 27

¹⁸ RFP No. 181344 for DDOT Personnel Training (due May 28, 2021)

The OIG found a similar concern with the commodity code and supplier list as with the other responses. While the vendors on the supplier list provide consulting services, none provide the human resources related services requested in the RFP.

According to the OCP policy, “[n]o solicitation is permitted to be issued without a requisition and available funding.¹⁹” The purchase requisition associated with this RFP only listed the de-escalation training with an amount of \$271,600. However, the final contracts exceeded that amount. Contract #6003749 was awarded to CSG totaling \$271,600.00 while contract #6003751 was awarded to JL totaling \$282,563.00. Therefore, the OIG questioned why two contracts were awarded, as well as why the contract amount was increased.

In response, OCP stated “both vendors had unique qualifications that DDOT needed at the time. One vendor was doing the de-escalation (enforcement) and the other was trying to teach the consequences [of] non-compliance (education).²⁰” In this instance, CSG was awarded the De-escalation training and JL was awarded the labor/discipline and management training.

The explanation from OCP does not address why the contract amount was increased. The initial RFP included all the services covered under both contracts. CSG’s response revealed they could provide the services requested for approximately \$246,600.00. JL’s response revealed they could provide the services requested for approximately \$2,500.00 per session, if done virtually.

Instead of splitting the initial requisition amount of approximately \$271,600 into two contracts, a second purchase requisition (#491430) was created for \$282,563. Purchase requisition #491430 was created in September 2021, after the contract was awarded in July 2021, which appears to go against OCP’s policy of creating the requisition before the bid solicitation process.²¹

The OIG questioned if this action raised concerns about wasteful spending because the services were separated into two contracts for nearly identical amounts, when all the services could have been provided under one contract for less money. In addition to concerns about the purchase requisition, the OIG was concerned with OCP’s explanation of why two vendors were selected, since both vendors responded to the RFP showing that they could provide all services requested. In an interview with Michael Anderson, former Contracting and Procurement Specialist for OCP, he stated the department decided to award a contract to both vendors based on their strengths and DDOT’s goals. CSG specialized in training the trainer, whereas JL is a law firm, and their experience would be instrumental in getting the DDOT staff trained to tackle grievances. The OIG accepted the explanation provided by Mr. Anderson as a sufficient reason to award two contracts.

¹⁹ Office of Contracting and Procurement Standard Operating Procedure Manual, Chapter 3: Making a Purchase, Sec. 3.5: Creating, Advertising and Managing Solicitation, I-Managing the Solicitation, Policy, Page 26.

²⁰ Email from Adam Kind, OCP to Beverly Murray, OIG Forensic Auditor, RE: Response to OIG Request to Michael Anderson, dated January 18, 2023, emailed March 17, 2023.

²¹ Office of Contracting and Procurement Standard Operating Procedure Manual, Chapter 3: Making a Purchase, Sec. 3.5: Creating, Advertising and Managing Solicitation, I-Managing the Solicitation, Policy, Page 26.

However, the OIG uncovered emails that DDOT preferred these two vendors prior to evaluating their responses to the bid solicitation. In an attachment regarding DDOT's procurement needs emailed to Director Oglesby, Deputy Director Walsh wrote the following:

Need training assistance for Operators, Mechanics and Administrative that includes but not limited to: Train the Trainer De-escalation Training and labor/management/discipline training. Accomplished one emergency training session via a nonstandard agreement due to Operator walk out. This program should be ongoing. In addition, there is an immediate need for Operator training (Back to Basics) and revised training materials.

Prefer the Champion Group [CSG] to have on-call transit training services and they provided de-escalation training. Prefer Jackson Lewis [JL] to provide just cause labor training.

What is the process and how long will it take to bring a company onboard?²²

This document appears to reveal an intent to award contracts to both CSG and JL, or at least a preference for these vendors, prior to RFP being created and open for bids, as the document was shared in April 2021 and the RFP was not open for bids until May 2021. This decision appears to be based not on the evaluation of the bids, but the preference of DDOT management. Similar to the prior stated concerns about the TLG contract, these actions make it appear as if CSG and JL were the intended vendors, regardless of the outcome of the procurement process. Since CSG and JL were the only vendors that responded to the RFP, the OIG cannot determine if these actions had any impact on the competitive bid process.

For the reasons stated above, the OIG cannot substantiate the complainant's allegation that these two contracts were not competitively bid. The RFP only received two responses, but it was posted in Oracle and shared with other vendors. Therefore, the OIG does not believe these contracts were awarded as sole source as alleged by the complainant.

IV. Conclusion

OCP should serve as an internal control against purchases that violate the spirit of the Procurement Ordinance. To do this, OCP should thoroughly review and document any purchases that do not follow the standard procurement process to ensure compliance with OCP's policies and procedures. This did not occur with the TMD contract, raising questions about how and why the vendor was awarded the contract without a competitive bidding process. When spending public dollars, it is important to be transparent about the process, including documenting any reasons for deviation from the policy. The OIG has substantiated the allegation the TMD contract was improperly awarded as a sole source contract.

²² Email from Maryanne Walsh to C. Mikel Oglesby, RE: DDOT Procurement Needs, dated April 11, 2021.

With respect to DDOT's contracts with TLG, CSG and JL, we cannot conclude the contractors were awarded as sole source contracts. While a competitive bid process was used for the contracts awarded to TLG, CSG, and JL, the OIG does have concerns about the integrity of the process. There was a lack of responses to the RFP based on the solicitation being shared with vendors who do not provide the services requested, communications between DDOT and one of the vendors about contract work prior to a contract being approved, and discussions among DDOT management about their preferred vendors for the upcoming RFP's, prior to bids being reviewed and evaluated.

V. Recommendation(s)

1. OCP should ensure all non-standard procurements are documented using the non-standard procurement form.
2. OCP should review the commodity codes to ensure they accurately reflect the goods or services, hopefully increasing the responses from bidders.
3. OCP should train all city employees involved in the procurement process, including what actions and communications are prohibited during the bid process. OCP should also advise all department and agency staff involved in the procurement process to familiarize themselves with the policies and procedures of OCP found on the City's intranet.
4. OCFO should require detailed invoices that reflect the work performed by the vendors.

VI. Evidence Reviewed

a. Interviews

- Executive Director C. Mikel Oglesby
- Former Contracting and Procurement Specialist Michael Anderson

b. Documents

- OCP Standard Operating Procedures Manual, August 2016 Edition (with revisions)
- Departmental Requisition Request Forms
- RFP 181313 and bid responses
- Purchase Requisition No. 489730
- Documents related to Contract #6003711
- RFP 181333 and bid responses
- Purchase Requisition No. 489718
- Documents related to Contract #6003712
- RFP 181344 and bid responses
- Purchase Requisition No. 490029
- Purchase Requisition No. 491430
- Documents related to Contract #6003749
- Documents related to Contract #6003751
- Emails for C. Mikel Oglesby from April 2021-September 2022

