

- With respect to question 7 and the layout of the pricing sheet, item 54 shows usage of 9,234 oz. I understand the Unit Cost column to be the price per oz. Therefore, the Total Cost column is the Unit Cost multiplied by the usage of 9,234 oz. For example, if our cost per oz. is \$0.50, then the Total Cost column in this example is \$4,617.00. I do not understand why your clarification describes converting the cost to a 19 oz. can price. In general, I understand that your preferred packaging is there to give an idea of package size, as described in Section XI – B, but it has no bearing on the calculations in the pricing sheet since  $\text{Total Cost} = \text{Unit Cost} * \text{Usage per Unit Specified}$ . Please confirm my understanding.

Since I changed the UNIT on the pricing sheet to ounces for item 7, Bidders can disregard the clarification to convert to 19 oz cans. Price the item by the ounce.

- With respect to question 8, the usage is still unclear. Following the same format as the rest of the spreadsheet, the usage shown, as indicated by the Unit column, is the number of boxes. I take this to mean, for example, that the usage on Line 59 – Small is 700 boxes over three years. Your clarification indicates we should now take the preferred packaging into consideration and divide the usage by 100. This is inconsistent with the other lines where the usage shown is the quantity per the Unit over the three year period. This also presents problems on line 62 – Small where you indicate we should divide by 1,000, but that results in a fractional usage of 8.9 boxes. The other thing I question with this approach is that those numbers seem very low for a three year usage across the school system. For example, on Line 62, that indicates that the schools only used 1,063 boxes of large, powder-free vinyl gloves. That works out to 354 boxes per year across the entire school system for what should be one of the most popular gloves and sizes. Given our experience with other customers, I would expect the school system's usage to be much higher than that per year.

Based on these concerns, I ask that you change the Unit to ea for lines 59-62 in order to display the usage as the total number of individual gloves used, which eliminates all confusion. This will result in the Unit Cost and Total Cost being calculated like all other lines in the sheet and will show you the total cost for comparison amongst all respondents, regardless of packaging, for the three year period. I also ask that you verify the usage and package quantity for lines 61-62. These gloves are typically packaged 100/BX, just like lines 59-60, with 10 boxes per carton. Were you really buying boxes of 100 and there is a typo in the package quantity or were you really buying cartons and the item is mislabeled as boxes? Without confirming that, your usage could be off by a factor of 10, or in the case of Line 61, the respondent's proposed price could be off by the same factor.

Item 59/Small is a very low usage item. Your instructions to divide by 100 which results in 7 BOXES usage is correct. In respect to item 61 & 62, dividing by 1,000 actually results in usage by the case and yes that would mean that item 62/small usage would result in 8.9 cases. Gloves are packed 10 boxes of 100 gloves in a case or 1,000 gloves per case. Just follow your instructions, divide by 1,000, and use the case price in the UNIT column.

- Lastly, I ask that you review and apply that same logic to anywhere else where the usage and units are unclear, for example:
  - Line 67. How many per box?
  - Line 87. Is this 2,330 boxes with 10/box, or is it 233 boxes if you divide by the package quantity?

Line 67 show the 3M 8511 Respirator Mask or approved equal. The 8511 is packed 10 masks per box and the bidder can go on line to find that information. If his don't come 10 box he should price his by the each multiplied by 10.

Line 87 is per box of 10 pads. Usage was 2,330 boxes of 10.