Tom Traywick

From: Renee Sanders [SandersR@acs.k12.sc.us]
Sent: Wednesday, February 02, 2005 11:42 AM
To: ttraywick@serviceassoc.com
Subject: Fwd: RE: Entity 127248 - Selective Review Follow Up

This is what I got back on January 28th

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> 1/28/2005
2:04:37 PM >>>
Renee,

Below is the request for additional information sent to you on
1-10-05.
We have not received a response. We are granting an additional 7 days
to
provide the requested information.

Please fax or e-mail the requested information to my attention. If
you
have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

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

12 of 21

From: PIAIntegrated
Sent: Thursday, January 20, 2005 10:47 AM
To: 'Renee Sanders@1-803-584-5303'; 'Walter Taylor@1-803-896-0098'
Cc: 'sandersr@acs.k12.sc.us'; 'wtaylor@cio.sc.gov'
Subject: RE: Entity 127248 - Selective Review Follow Up

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

13 of 21

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

Tom Traywick

From: Renee Sanders [SandersR@acs.k12.sc.us]
Sent: Tuesday, February 08, 2005 8:56 AM
To: PIAIntegrated
Subject: *Re: Entity 127248 - Selective Review Follow Up*

Per our conversation, would you please answer the following questions?

1 - Did you have any consulting agreements in place when you filed your
application for FY 7?
NO.

2 - What were the vendor selection criteria used with the weighting factors for each criteria?
COST 30%
CAPABILITIES 20%
CLIENT REFERENCES - 20%
PREPARATION - 15%
PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE - 15%

3 - Is the budget you submitted the final approved budget?

YES

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> 2/8/2005 8:46:27 AM >>>
Renee,

Per our conversation, would you please answer the following questions?

1 - Did you have any consulting agreements in place when you filed your
application for FY 7?

2 - What were the vendor selection criteria used with the weighting factors for each criteria?

15 of 21

3 - Is the budget you submitted the final approved budget?

Thanks,

Bob

Tom Traywick

From: *PIAIntegrated [PIAIntegrated@sl.universalservice.org]*
Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2005 8:11 AM
To: sandersr@acs.k12.sc.us
Subject: Entity 127248 - Selective Review Follow Up

Renee,

I have a couple of additional questions regarding you application. Please see the attached. If you have any questions please call.

Robert Sniecinski
PIA Selective Review
Phone: 973-560-4472
Fax: 973-599-6515
bsnieci@sl.universalservice.org

17 of 21

Universal Service Administrative Company
Schools & Libraries Division

CASE SR-2004-153532

Date: 2-17-05
To: Renee Sanders
Entity: Allendale County School District
Fax #: 803-584-5305
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. 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 2-24-05. 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.

Vendor Selection:

- On the response you submitted in May, 2004, the "Allendale County Schools 2004 ERATE RFP Evaluations" the maintenance evaluation sheet shows that CSI Technology had a tie with Systems & Services and you selected CSI Technology as the winning bidder for the maintenance contract. Please explain how you broke the tie between these two companies and the factors you used to choose CSI Technology over Systems & Services.

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

Thank you.

Robert Sniecinski
Selective Reviewer

Retrofitting

Question

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 your schools for technology.

Answer

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 FY 2003 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 Company $54,642.01 for installing electrical outlets throughout the schools.

Vendor Selection

Question

On the response you submitted in May, 2004, the "Allendale County Schools 2004 ERATE RFP Evaluations" the maintenance evaluation sheet shows that CSI Technology had a tie with Systems & Services and you selected CSI Technology as the winning bidder for the maintenance contract. Please explain how you broke the tie between these two companies and the factors you used to choose CSI Technology over Systems & Services.

Answer

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.