



Margaret Blank &lt;margaret.h.blank@gmail.com&gt;

---

## Fraud report Response

2 messages

---

**Christopher Weber** <cweber@keyssao.org>  
To: margaret.h.blank@gmail.com

Fri, Dec 1, 2017 at 9:00 AM

Ms.Blank:

Thank you for your recent report regarding the animal shelter and the bid process. I made inquiries into the process and according to received records, it appears that the RFP was initiated through the proper channels.

Over 700 vendors reviewed the request for bids and six downloaded and reviewed the RFP and responding to same.

Respectfully,

**Christopher Weber, Chief Investigator**

State Attorney 16th Judicial Circuit  
530 Whitehead St. Suite 201  
Office 305-292-3509

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This electronic message, including attachments, if any, is privileged and confidential, and is intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s) named above. If you are not a(n) intended recipient, or if you are responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, use, disclosure, distribution, or copying of the communication is not authorized, allowed, or intended by the sender. If you have received this communication in error, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of this e-mail and its attachments, if any. Additionally, please note: **The State of Florida has a very broad PUBLIC RECORDS LAW. Virtually all electronic mail sent or received is available to the PUBLIC upon request. PLEASE GOVERN YOURSELF ACCORDINGLY!**

Florida has a very broad public records law. Virtually all electronic mail sent or received by the Office of the State Attorney is available to the public upon request.

---

**Margaret Blank** <margaret.h.blank@gmail.com>  
To: Christopher Weber <cweber@keyssao.org>

Fri, Dec 1, 2017 at 7:31 PM

Lol. Okay. It sounds like you copied and pasted an email from Bob Shillinger so I'll copy and paste my response to him.

Ahhh...only one animal shelter operator downloaded the RFP and nobody rethought the advertising strategy? You got one bidder - the same shelter operator you have now only they're asking \$175,000 more for the same job they're already doing. Nobody thought to reject the bid and re-advertise? Did anyone check out similar bids to see who submitted? Did anyone call around to see who else might be interested? Did anyone research what other governments pay for similar sized operations? Was there any reality check whatsoever?

How about the fact that the Marathon shelter will receive twice as much per animal as the other two shelters? Why is that? Did anybody bother to ask? Or were the shady commissioners too anxious to rush this through?

What about HACC's abysmal performance? Why would you put an RFP out for services at a shelter that's running fine but not do so for a failing shelter? Are there any performance metrics at all?

You must realize this reeks of collusion/bid rigging. And so soon after all those egregious ethics violations.

I don't care how many subscribers Demandstar has, you failed the taxpayers again. Not that you care.

Btw, companies that use Demandstar to look for bid opportunities have to pay a subscription. Your typical animal shelter operator isn't going to be cruising Demandstar. The county knows this (unless they're even stupider than I think they are). Demandstar is mostly for contractors - as in construction contractors. Look at the companies on the plan holder list. With the exception of FKSPCA they're all construction-related.

So if the county truly wanted to reach as many qualified bidders as possible for this particular RFP, they can't count on Demandstar to get the word out. The only other places they advertised were the Citizen and Keynoter/Reporter. Again,

12/1/2017

Gmail - Fraud report Response

that's not enough reach to secure a competitive bid on this RFP. It shows in the end result. We pay 70% more for the same contractor to do the same job they're already doing. I suppose you could boil it down to simple incompetence, but nobody could really be this stupid.

It seems that your main concern is whether the county followed the letter of the law in advertising the bid - not the fact that there are enormous red flags waving all over the place. That being the case, perhaps you should look into the sale of the [Hickory House](#). The taxpayers took \$1 million loss on that one.

Best,

Margaret Blank

[Quoted text hidden]