DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Service Associates, Inc.
651 Solomon Jones Road
Post Office Box 329
Cedar Mountain, North Carolina 28718
800.396.99500 – 828.221.0602 FAX – ttraywick@serviceassoc.com

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 20 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

May 16, 2005

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary
445 12th Street, SW
Room TW-A325
Washington, DC 20554

CC Docket No. 02-06
CC Docket No. 96-45

Re: Request for Review of
USAC-SLD Appeal Denied
FCC Form 471 Application Number 415662 FRN 1142922

To whom it may concern:

This Request for Review is filed on behalf of the applicant. My contact information is as follows:

Tom Traywick, Compliance Analyst
Service Associates, Inc.
651 Solomon Jones Road
Post Office Box 329
Cedar Mountain, NC 28718-0329
ttraywick@serviceassoc.com
800.396.9950
828.221.0602 FAX

Applicant Contact:
Renee Sanders, Director of Finance
Allendale County School District
P. O. Box 458
Allendale, SC 29810
acs@serviceassociates.com
(803) 584-4603
(803) 584-5303 FAX

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

****
Service Associates, Inc. is an E-rate support services company providing services exclusively to E-rate applicants.
****

This Request for Review requests further consideration of the following USAC-SLD decision:

Administrator's Decision on Appeal – Funding Year 2004 - 2005	
Date of Letter	March 09, 2006
Applicant	Allendale County School District
Billed Entity Number	127248
Form 471 Application Number	415662
Funding Request Number	1142922

The "**Funding Commitment Decision Explanation**" given in the March 24, 2005 Funding Commitment Decision Letter is: **"Documentation provided demonstrates that price was not the primary factor in selecting this service provider's proposal."**

Grounds for Appeal

We appeal this decision on grounds that price was the primary factor in selecting the service provider and that the most cost effective (and lowest cost) solution was chosen.

Attachments

We have attached a copy of our May 16, 2005 Letter of Appeal (electronically submitted) to USAC-SLD which was lost at SLD and which we resubmitted by US Postal Service on 12/07/2005.

We have attached a copy of the USAC-SLD Administrator's Decision on Appeal – Funding Year 2004 – 2005 dated March 09, 2006.

History

Our attached Letter of Appeal and the USAC-SLD Selective Review and PIA Review files detail a long and torturous process. If any additional information is required from us in order to adequately review this Request for Review we will be happy to accommodate such a request

Discussion

The applicant committee conducted the bid evaluation process using their previously documented vendor selection criteria which used cost as the most heavily weighted of several selection criteria. Having used cost as the most heavily weighted of several selection criteria, at this point the bid evaluation sheets and the explanation of the applicant contact indicate that there was a tie between the two service providers, CSI and SSC.

It became necessary then to take service quality further into account in evaluation of cost effectiveness in more detail in order to break the tie.

Explanation of the use of the various service quality cost effectiveness issues in breaking the tie given by Renee Sanders, in the final SR2004 follow up information request response, is as follows:

> ***After lengthy discussions by the evaluators, the District determined that CSI Technology's previous knowledge of the District's network, facilities, and staff would be more beneficial to the District. System & Services would have had to have time to familiarize themselves with our network, facilities, and staff where CSI Technology could get started immediately after notification of funding approval. We took into consideration that CSI would be sending only Level 3 technicians to our District, whereas Systems & Services would be sending Level 1, 2, and 3. Previous Experience with both companies led us to choose CSI Technology over Systems & Services.***

Level 3 Network Engineers are the highest level of support that can be provided by a highly authorized network integration and support company for jobs that are most demanding technically, and of an urgent nature, or in escalation from jobs that could not be solved by Level 1 and Level 2 Technicians. Systems & Services proposed to staff the contract with Level 1 and Level 2 Technicians in addition to Level 3. This factor made the CSI proposal even more cost effective. Although Systems & Services had provided cabling services in some of the schools in the District, they were not familiar with the overall District network configuration and District staff. CSI had previously provided network configuration support to the District, and with satisfactory results. Their previous experience with Systems & Services was characterized by the District as unsatisfactory. Their previous experience with CSI was characterized by the District as satisfactory.

Conclusion

After following the vendor selection process described above, the District selected CSI as service provider. CSI was not only chosen as the best most cost effective option for the District, but having bid $54,800.00 as opposed to Systems & Services' bid of $67,000, CSI was also the low cost service provider. We believe that this procurement was in compliance all District procurement regulations, in compliance with FCC Regulations, and that the District had a strong dis-incentive for it to be otherwise.

We believe that the continued denial of funding for FRN 1142922 is a result of blameless miscommunications and we respectfully request that this condition be corrected. To do otherwise would cause unintended consequences of hardship and inequity for the students and teachers in this District.

We all thank you for your kind attention to this matter. Please contact me if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,
Service Associates, Inc.

Tom Traywick, Jr.
Compliance Analyst

Attachments as listed above

Universal Service Administrative Company
Schools & Libraries Division

Administrator's Decision on Appeal – Funding Year 2004-2005

March 09, 2006

Tom Traywick
Service Associates, Inc.
651 Solomon Jones Road
Post Office Box 329
Cedar Mountain, NC 28718-0329

Re:	Applicant Name:	ALLENDALE COUNTY SCHOOL DIST
	Billed Entity Number:	127248
	Form 471 Application Number:	415662
	Funding Request Number(s):	1142922
	Your Correspondence Dated:	May 16, 2005

After thorough review and investigation of all relevant facts, the Schools and Libraries Division (SLD) of the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) has made its decision in regard to your appeal of SLD's Funding Year 2004 Funding Commitment Decision Letter for the Application Number indicated above. This letter explains the basis of SLD's decision. The date of this letter begins the 60-day time period for appealing this decision to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). If your Letter of Appeal included more than one Application Number, please note that you will receive a separate letter for each application.

Funding Request Number(s): 1142922
Decision on Appeal: **Denied**
Explanation:

- On appeal, you contend that the SLD erroneously determined that price was not the primary factor in selecting the service provider. You affirm that the District provided complete information regarding the procurement including the bid evaluation sheets, the vendor selection criteria showing cost as the primary factor, and explanation of how the tie between two companies was broken in the Selective Review response and follow-up requests and responses. You further state that it is difficult to find evidence to support the FCDL decision for the following points. First of all, CSI bid was $54,800 and Systems & Services bid was $67,000. Secondly, CSI proposed to staff the contract entirely with the highest level Network Engineers which made the CSI proposal even more cost effective. Thirdly, CSI had previously provided network configuration support to

the District with satisfactory results. Lastly, your previous experience with Systems & Services was unsatisfactory, and your previous experience with CSI was satisfactory. In support of your appeal, copies of your letter of agency, FCDL Funding Commitment Report, a letter from Renee Sanders to Tom Traywick, and 21 pages of correspondence to and from Selective Reviewer are *included as attachments. In closing the appeal, you respectfully request the* funding decision be reversed.

- Upon thorough review of the appeal and all relevant documentation, it was determined that the information provided on appeal is consistent with the information provided during Selective Review. You did not mention cost as a factor when you were asked to explain how you broke the tie between CSI Technology and Systems & Services. Based on your documentation, SLD supports the PIA denial of the FRNs for price not being the primary factor. You have failed to provide evidence that SLD has erred in its decision.

- SLD's review of your Form 471 application determined that price was not the primary factor when you selected your service provider. Since you did not demonstrate in your appeal that price was the primary factor when you selected your service provider, SLD denies your appeal.

- FCC rules require that applicants select the most cost-effective services offering with price being the primary factor. 47 C.F.R. § 54.511(a). Applicants may take other factors into consideration, but in selecting the winning bid, price must be given more weight than any other single factor. 47 C.F.R. § 54.511(a); *Request for Review by Ysleta Independent School District, et. al., Federal State Joint Board on Universal Service, Changes to the Board of Directors of the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc.*, CC Docket Nos. 96-45, 97-21, Order, FCC 03-313 ¶ 50 (rel. Dec. 8, 2003). Ineligible products and services may not be factored into the cost-effective evaluation. *See* Common Carrier Bureau Reiterates Services Eligible for Discounts to Schools and Libraries, CC Docket No. 96-45, *Public Notice*, 13 FCC Rcd. 16,570, DA 98-1110 (rel. Jun. 11, 1998).

If your appeal has been approved, but funding has been reduced or denied, you may appeal these decisions to either the SLD or the FCC. For appeals that have been denied in full, partially approved, dismissed, or canceled, you may file an appeal with the FCC. You should refer to CC Docket No. 02-6 on the first page of your appeal to the FCC. Your appeal must be received or postmarked within 60 days of the date on this letter. Failure to meet this requirement will result in automatic dismissal of your appeal. If you are submitting your appeal via United States Postal Service, send to: FCC, Office of the Secretary, 445 12th Street SW, Washington, DC 20554. Further information and options for filing an appeal directly with the FCC can be found in the "Appeals Procedure" posted in the Reference Area of the SLD web site or by contacting the Client Service Bureau. We strongly recommend that you use the electronic filing options.

We thank you for your continued support, patience and cooperation during the appeal process.

Schools and Libraries Division

Universal Service Administrative Company

Box 125 – Correspondence Unit, 80 South Jefferson Road, Whippany, New Jersey 07981
Visit us online at: *www.sl.universalservice.org*

Renee Sanders
Allendale County School District
P. O. Box 458
Allendale, SC 29810

Billed Entity Number: 127248
Form 471 Application Number: 415662
Form 486 Application Number:

Service Associates, Inc.

651 Solomon Jones Road
Post Office Box 329
Cedar Mountain, North Carolina 28718
828.885.2830 – 828.885.8393 FAX - 828.553.9366 Mobile
ttraywick@serviceassoc.com

May 16, 2005

Letter of Appeal
Schools and Libraries Division
Box 125 – Correspondence Unit
80 South Jefferson Road
Whippany, NJ 07981

Re: Appeal of funding decision for Form 471 Application Number 415662 FRN 1142922

To whom it may concern:

This appeal is being filed on behalf of the applicant. My contact information is as follows:

Tom Traywick, Compliance Analyst
Service Associates, Inc.
651 Solomon Jones Road
Post Office Box 329
Cedar Mountain, NC 28718-0329
ttraywick@serviceassoc.com
828.885.2830
828.885.8393 FAX

Danielle - 21-340040
11/29/2005 4PM
Christy - TCSB
she will contact appeals dept. and let me know
12/6/05 - lm for Christy to cb
1/4/06 - lm for Christ. to cb
1/9/05 - Kristi acknowledged rcpt.

Applicant Contact:
Renee Sanders, Director of Finance
Allendale County School District
P. O. Box 458
Allendale, SC 29810
acs@serviceassociates.com
(803) 584-4603
(803) 584-5303 FAX

This appeal letter requests that the SLD reverse the denial of funding for the following FRN.

Regarding: Funding Commitment Decision Letter

Date of Letter	March 24, 2005
Applicant	Allendale County School District
Billed Entity Number	127248
Form 471 Application Number	415662
Funding Request Number	1142922

The "**Funding Commitment Decision Explanation**" given in the FCDL is: **"Documentation provided demonstrates that price was not the primary factor in selecting this service provider's proposal."**

Grounds for Appeal

We appeal this decision on the grounds that the USAC-SLD reviewer was provided the information to resolve this question, but either misplaced or misunderstood the information provided.

Attachments

We have attached a copy of:

1. My letter of agency.
2. 03/24/2005 FCDL Funding Commitment Report 415662
3. 04/05/2005 letter from Renee Sanders to Tom Traywick
4. 21 pages of correspondence to and from Robert Sniecinski, USAC-SLD Selective Reviewer. The pages are numbered and initialed.

History

PIA Review
The initial SLD PIA Information Request for Application Number 415662 was dated October 27, 2004. The PIA Reviewer was Bill Kanyuk, who conducted the review through January 10, 2005. As of a request received on January 28, 2005, Jennifer LeGates became the PIA reviewer and conducted the review through February 4, 2005 after which nothing more was heard until receipt of the 03/24/2005 FCDL.

At no time during this review was any information requested regarding procurement of the services requested in FRN 1142922.

Selective Review
The applicant responded in a timely manner to the USAC-SLD 2004 Selective Review information request. At about the end of October 2004, having heard nothing further, Renee Sanders followed up by telephone. Robert Sniecincki, the Selective Reviewer conducting the review, told Ms. Sanders on November 5, 2005 that no further information was needed.

On November 8, 2004 Robert Sniecincki emailed the attached information request regarding retrofitting and bids. I had recently been retained as E-rate advisor to the District, and to serve as the District's contact with USAC-SLD, and I responded to the request (attached) including my Letter of Agency. Robert Sniecincki did not acknowledge this response, did not respond to my subsequent e-mails, and did not return any of my follow-up telephone calls.

The District has no record of any further contact until the attached 1/20/2005 10:47:27 AM email from Robert Sniecincki to Renee Sanders. This request was responded to 1/20/2005 1:45:31 PM (attached) by Renee Sanders. By now it was clear that Robert Sniecincki was refusing to work with me.

On 1/28/2005 2:04:37 PM the District received a request (attached) that is a duplicate of the above request.

On 2/8/2005 8:47:27 AM the District received a request (attached) and responded that day at 8:56 AM.

On February 17, 2005 8:11 AM the District received a follow-up information request from Robert Sniecincki. As usual the document requested information previously provided by the District. By now it was clear that the reviewer had not carefully considered the information that had been provided previously by the applicant in both the original Selective Review Response and in the past 90 days of follow-up requests and responses. On 2/23/2005 2:14 PM Renee Sanders responded (attached) to this request. This was the final 2004 Selective Review follow-up information request and nothing more was heard until receipt of the 03/24/2005 FCDL.

Discussion

The "**Funding Commitment Decision Explanation**" given in the FCDL is: **"Documentation provided demonstrates that price was not the primary factor in selecting this service provider's proposal."**

In the Selective Review Response and in the 90 days of follow-up requests and responses, the District provided complete information regarding this procurement including the bid evaluation sheets, the vendor selection criteria showing cost as the most heavily weighted criteria, and explanation of how the tie between two companies was broken in order to select the winning bidder as the Service Provider for this FRN.

The explanation of breaking the tie given by Renee Sanders in the final SR2004 follow up information request response is as follows:

> ***After lengthy discussions by the evaluators, the District determined that CSI Technology's previous knowledge of the District's network, facilities, and staff would be more beneficial to the District. System & Services would have had to have time to familiarize themselves with our network, facilities, and staff where CSI Technology could get started immediately after notification of funding approval. We took into consideration that CSI would be sending only Level 3 technicians to our District, whereas Systems & Services would be sending Level 1, 2, and 3. Previous Experience with both companies led us to choose CSI Technology over Systems & Services.***

It is difficult to find evidence to support the FCDL decision explanation in light of the following points:

1. CSI bid $54,800.00 and Systems & Services bid $67,000.
2. CSI proposed to staff the contract entirely with Level 3 Network Engineers. Level 3 Network Engineers are the highest level of support that can be provided by a highly authorized network integration and support company for jobs that are most demanding technically, and of an urgent nature, or in escalation from jobs that could not be solved by Level 1 and Level 2 Technicians. Systems & Services proposed to staff the contract with Level 1 and Level 2 Technicians in addition to Level 3. This factor made the CSI proposal even more cost effective.
3. Although Systems & Services had provided cabling services in some of the schools in the District, they were not familiar with the overall District network configuration and District staff. CSI had previously provided network configuration support to the District, and with satisfactory results.

4. Their previous experience with Systems & Services was characterized by the District as unsatisfactory. Their previous experience with CSI was characterized by the District as satisfactory.

We respectfully request that this error be corrected and that FRN 1142922 be funded.

We all thank you for your kind attention to this matter. Please contact me if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Tom Traywick, Jr.
Compliance Analyst

Attachments as listed above

Allendale COUNTY SCHOOLS

P. O. BOX 458, ALLENDALE, SOUTH CAROLINA 29810

November 9, 2004

Schools and Libraries Division
Box 125 – Correspondence Unit
80 South Jefferson Road
Whippany, NJ 07981

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is to inform you that Allendale County Schools has retained Tom Traywick to advise and assist the District in all matters regarding E-Rate and associated matters, and we hereby authorize you to fully and openly speak and/or correspond with Tom Traywick regarding all District matters before USAC-SLD and/or the FCC.

Additionally, Tom Traywick will serve as the District's Form 471 Block 1 contact person, and as the District's E-rate contact on any other forms and correspondence requested by the District.

This Letter of Agency will be in effect through October 31, 2007, unless canceled or extended by the District, and covers all District applications for all types of services for any Funding Year.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Paula L. Harris

Paula Harris, Superintendent
Allendale County Schools
(803) 584-4603 x112
Billed Entity 127248

cc: Tom Traywick

TELEPHONE (803) 584-4603
FAX (803) 584-5303

Form 471 Application Number: 415662
Funding Request Number: 1142840 Funding Status: Funded
Services Ordered: Internal Connections
SPIN: 143017811 Service Provider Name: CSI Technology Resources, Inc.
Contract Number: ER7 ACS-1-29810
Billing Account Number: 803-584-4603
Service Start Date: 07/01/2004
Contract Expiration Date: 06/30/2005
Annual Pre-discount Amount for Eligible Recurring Charges: $.00
Annual Pre-discount Amount for Eligible Non-recurring Charges: $196,371.77
Pre-discount Amount: $196,371.77
Discount Percentage Approved by the SLD: 90%
Funding Commitment Decision: $176,734.59 - FRN approved as submitted

Funding Request Number: 1142877 Funding Status: Funded
Services Ordered: Internal Connections
SPIN: 143017811 Service Provider Name: CSI Technology Resources, Inc.
Contract Number: ER7 ACS-1-29810
Billing Account Number: 803-584-4603
Service Start Date: 07/01/2004
Contract Expiration Date: 06/30/2005
Annual Pre-discount Amount for Eligible Recurring Charges: $.00
Annual Pre-discount Amount for Eligible Non-recurring Charges: $28,666.76
Pre-discount Amount: $28,666.76
Discount Percentage Approved by the SLD: 90%
Funding Commitment Decision: $25,800.08 - FRN approved as submitted

Funding Request Number: 1142922 Funding Status: Not Funded
Services Ordered: Internal Connections
SPIN: 143017811 Service Provider Name: CSI Technology Resources, Inc.
Contract Number: ER7 ACS-1-29810
Billing Account Number: 803-584-4603
Service Start Date: 07/01/2004
Contract Expiration Date: 06/30/2005
Annual Pre-discount Amount for Eligible Recurring Charges: $.00
Annual Pre-discount Amount for Eligible Non-recurring Charges: $54,800.00
Pre-discount Amount: $54,800.00
Discount Percentage Approved by the SLD: N/A
Funding Commitment Decision: $0.00 - Bidding Violation
Funding Commitment Decision Explanation: Documentation provided demonstrates that price was not the primary factor in selecting this service provider's proposal.

Funding Request Number: 1143014 Funding Status: Funded
Services Ordered: Internal Connections
SPIN: 143017811 Service Provider Name: CSI Technology Resources, Inc.
Contract Number: 04-S6261-A10264
Billing Account Number: 803-584-4603
Service Start Date: 07/01/2004
Contract Expiration Date: 12/04/2008
Annual Pre-discount Amount for Eligible Recurring Charges: $.00
Annual Pre-discount Amount for Eligible Non-recurring Charges: $19,031.32
Pre-discount Amount: $19,031.32
Discount Percentage Approved by the SLD: 90%
Funding Commitment Decision: $17,128.19 - FRN approved as submitted

Allendale County Schools----------

Post Office Box 458, Allendale, SC 29810

April 5, 2005

Mr. Tom Traywick
Service Associates, Inc.
PO Box 329
Cedar Mountain, NC 28718-0329

Dear Mr. Traywick:

In reference to FRN 1142922 for Network Maintenance, I received an email from Robert Sniecinski dated February 17, 2005. In his email, one of the questions was in reference to Vendor Selection (see attachment 1). Robert wanted to know how the evaluators chose CSI Technology over Systems and Services.

Our vendor selection process was based on the following criteria:

Cost – 30%	Capabilities – 20%
Client References – 20%	Preparation – 15%
Previous Experience – 15%	

After the evaluations were completed, CSI Technology and Systems & Services were tied with each receiving a rating of 90%. The evaluators then went into lengthy discussions of the pros and cons of each company. CSI Technology was determined, by the evaluation team, to be the best company for the District for several reasons (see attachment 2).

Please file an appeal on behalf of the district.

Thank you,

Renee Sanders

Renee Sanders
Director of Finance
Attachments (2)

Universal Service Administrative Company
Schools & Libraries Division

CASE SR-2004-127248

Date: 11-8-04
To: Rene Sanders
Entity: 127248
Fax #: 803-584-5303
Sender: Robert Sniecinski
Phone: 973-560-4472
Fax: 973-599-6515
Subject: Funding year 2004 E-Rate

*** *** ***

This fax is a follow up to the information you provided in reference to the E-Rate Selective Review Information Request Funding Year 2004. (Optional- In addition, other questions relating to your Funding Year 2004 E-Rate applications are included in this fax.) Please provide the information requested by the close of business 11/152/04. If we do not receive the information by that date, your application will be reviewed based on the information we currently have, which may impact the approval of your application.

Retrofitting:

- Your investment in retrofitting appears low in relation to the level of network resources you are requesting. Have you already retrofitted your buildings for technology (prior to 2003)? If so, can you briefly document the dollar amount and/or the work done? Also please indicate if this is a relatively new school (past five years or so). If not, please provide a one-page summary of the resources and strategies you have available to retrofit you schools for technology.

Retrofitting refers to removing asbestos, adding air conditioning, upgrading wiring, building server closets, knocking down or drilling thorough walls, or anything else done in order to prepare buildings for new technology.

Bids: For FRNs 1142840, 1142877, 1142922 and 1143014 please let me know how many bids were received **for each FRN**. Also please provide the name of the service provider responding for each FRN.

For FRN 1142840 please provide the establishing 470.

Please call me if you have questions at 973-560-4472

1 of 21

Thank you.

Robert Sniecinski
Selective Reviewer

Tom Traywick

From: Tom Traywick [ttraywick@serviceassoc.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2004 10:34 AM
To: *Bob Sniecinski*
Cc: Renee Sanders
Subject: RE: Entity 127248 - Selective Review

SR2004-127248 followup respons... ATT00051.txt (63 B)

Mr. Sniecinski,

Please see the attached response document.

Thank you for your assistance.

Tom Traywick
Service Associates, Inc.
651 Solomon Jones Road
P.O. Box 329
Cedar Mountain, NC 28718-0329
828-885-2830
828-885-8393 FAX
828-553-9366 Cell
ttraywick@serviceassoc.com

DISCLAIMER: This e-mail message contains confidential, privileged information intended solely for the addressee. Please do not read, copy, or disseminate it unless you are the addressee. If you have received it in error, please notify us by forwarding the message back to us and deleting it from your system. Thank you.

-----Original Message-----
From: Renee Sanders [mailto:SandersR@acs.k12.sc.us]
Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2004 3:50 PM
To: ttraywick@serviceassoc.com
Subject: Fwd: Entity 127248 - Selective Review

This is the second request from SLD. These questions need to be answered.

Thought for the day!!
To be prepared is half the victory!

Renee Sanders
Director of Finance
PO Box 458
Allendale, SC 29810
Phone 803-584-4603
Fax 803-584-5303

>>> "Bob Sniecinski" <bsnieci@necaservices.com> 11/8/2004 12:33:47 PM
>>>
Renee,

We received your initial response to the Selective Review Information

3 of 21

Request , however, we need some additional information. Please see the attached. The response is due by 11/15/04.

Bob Sniecinski
PIA Selective Reviewer
Schools and Libraries Division
Fax: 973-599-6515
Phone: 973-560-4472
bsnieci@sl.universalservice.org

This email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipients and may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. Thank you.

<<<<gwavasig>>>>

4 of 21

Service Associates, Inc.
P.O. Box 329
651 Solomon Jones Road
Cedar Mountain, North Carolina 28718
828.885.2830 Phone – 828.885.8393 FAX – 828.553.9366 Mobile
ttraywick@serviceassoc.com

November 11, 2004

Bob Sniecinski
PIA Selective Reviewer
Schools and Libraries Division
Fax: 973-599-6515
Phone: 973-560-4472
bsnieci@sl.universalservice.org

VIA Email:

Re: SR2004-127248 Follow-up Information Request
Dated November 8, 2004

Mr. Sniecinski,

I am assisting Allendale County Schools with E-rate matters. My letter of agency from the District is attached.

You have requested additional information regarding retrofitting, in light of what you consider to be a low investment in retrofitting indicated in the initial response to this Item 25 Selective Review.

For FY2003 and later years, almost all retrofitting necessary has been carried out by the District's own maintenance staff (electricians, carpenters, etc.). Much of the retrofitting necessary to support modern network technology was accomplished prior to 2003. In FY2000, for instance, the District installed network cabling in the pre-discount amount of $281,030 and paid Chavis Electrical Co. $54,642.01 for installing electrical outlets throughout the schools.

For each of the FRNs of Application 415662, you request the name of each service provider that bid on the services requested. That list is attached to this letter.

For FRN 1142840, the establishing Form 470 in the Block 5 is in error. The establishing Form 470 for FRN 1142840 is 642620000486062.

5 of 21

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me directly.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Tom Traywick
Compliance Analyst

Attachments

cc: Renee Sanders

FRN 1142922
MAINTENANCE

SETEL
CSI TECHNOLOGY
DCS
SYSTEMS & SERVICES

FRN 1142877
FILE SERVERS

CSI TECHNOLOGY
DCS
SYSTEMS & SERVICES

FRN 1142840
IP TELEPHONY

CSI TECHNOLOGY
SETEL
SYSTEMS & SERVICES
TELECOM 1
AVAYA

FRN 1143014
STATE CONTRACT

These are all listed in our Review under Vendor Selection Process

Allendale COUNTY SCHOOLS

P. O. BOX 458, ALLENDALE, SOUTH CAROLINA 29810

November 9, 2004

Schools and Libraries Division
Box 125 – Correspondence Unit
80 South Jefferson Road
Whippany, NJ 07981

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is to inform you that Allendale County Schools has retained Tom Traywick to advise and assist the District in all matters regarding E-Rate and associated matters, and we hereby authorize you to fully and openly speak and/or correspond with Tom Traywick regarding all District matters before USAC-SLD and/or the FCC.

Additionally, Tom Traywick will serve as the District's Form 471 Block 1 contact person, and as the District's E-rate contact on any other forms and correspondence requested by the District.

This Letter of Agency will be in effect through October 31, 2007, unless canceled or extended by the District, and covers all District applications for all types of services for any Funding Year.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Paula L. Harris

Paula Harris, Superintendent
Allendale County Schools
(803) 584-4603 x112
Billed Entity 127248

cc: Tom Traywick

TELEPHONE (803) 584-4603
FAX (803) 584-5303

8 of 21

Tom Traywick

From: Renee Sanders [SandersR@acs.k12.sc.us]
Sent: Thursday, January 20, 2005 1:46 PM
To: ttraywick@serviceassoc.com
Subject: Fwd: RE: Entity 127248 - Selective Review Follow Up

This is what I have sent to Bob. He could have answered the questions if he would have looked through our review.

Thought for the day!!
The most important things in life aren't things,
they're people.

Renee Sanders
Director of Finance
PO Box 458
Allendale, SC 29810
Phone 803-584-4603
Fax 803-584-5303

>>> Renee Sanders 1/20/2005 1:45:31 PM >>>
I have reviewed your initial response and have a few additional
ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTIONS

1 - Your 471 application was filed by Tom Traywick. What is Tom's relationship to the school?
Our 471 #415662 was filed by Paula Harris, Superintendent of Allendale County Schools

2 - Would you please provide the number of bids you received for each FRN?
FRN# 1142922 Maintenance - 4 bids (SETEL, CSI, SSC, and DCS)
FRN# 1142877 File Servers - 3 bids (CSI, DCS, and SSC)
FRN# 1142840 IP Telephony - 5 bids (CSI, SETEL, SSC, Telecom, and Avaya)

3 - Is the budget you provided the final and approved budget for the School District?
The budget included in the review is a DRAFT. The final budget was approved June 28, 2004

Thought for the day!!
The most important things in life aren't things,
they're people.

Renee Sanders
Director of Finance
PO Box 458
Allendale, SC 29810
Phone 803-584-4603
Fax 803-584-5303

>>> "PIAIntegrated" <PIAIntegrated@sl.universalservice.org> 1/20/2005 10:47:27 AM >>>

9 of 21
TH

Renee,

Below is the request for additional information in support of your e rate application sent to you on 1-5-2005. We have not received a response. We are granting an additional 7 days for you to respond. Your response is due on 1-27-2005.

It is important that we receive all of the information requested so we can complete our review. Failure to do soThis may result in a reduction or denial of funding.

Please send the requested information within seven calendar days. If you need additional time to prepare your response, please let me know as soon as possible.

Thank you for cooperation and continued support of the Universal Service Program.

Bob

From: PIAIntegrated
Sent: Wednesday, January 05, 2005 2:52 PM
To: 'sandersr@acs.k12.sc.uc'
Subject: Entity 127248 - Selective Review Follow Up

Renee,

I have reviewed your initial response and have a few additional questions.

1 - Your 471 application was filed by Tom Traywick. What is Tom's relationship to the school?

2 - Would you please provide the number of bids you received for each FRN?

3 - Is the budget you provided the final and approved budget for the School District?

Thanks,

Robert Sniecinski

PIA Selective Review

Phone: 973-560-4472

Fax: 973-599-6515

bsnieci@sl.universalservice.org