

HENRY MCMASTER, CHAIR
GOVERNOR
CURTIS M. LOFTIS, JR.
STATE TREASURER
BRIAN J. GAINES
COMPTROLLER GENERAL



HARVEY S. PEELER, JR.
CHAIRMAN, SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE
BRUCE W. BANNISTER
CHAIRMAN, HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE
GRANT GILLESPIE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

THE DIVISION OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES
DELBERT H. SINGLETON, JR.
DIVISION DIRECTOR
(803) 734-8018
JOHN ST. C. WHITE
MATERIALS MANAGEMENT OFFICER
(803) 737-0600
FAX: (803) 737-0639

Protest Decision

Matter of: The Budd Group
File No.: 2024-105
Posting Date: October 26, 2023
Contracting Entity: The Citadel
Solicitation No.: BVB 23022-JM
Description: Janitorial and Custodial Services

DIGEST

The protest alleging irregularities in the evaluation is denied in part and granted in part. The protest of The Budd Group (TBG) is attached and included by reference. [Exhibit A]

AUTHORITY

The Chief Procurement Officer¹ (CPO) conducted an administrative review pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §11-35-4210. This decision is based on materials in the procurement file and applicable law and precedents.

BACKGROUND

Solicitation Issued	06/07/2023
Amendment 1 Issued	06/15/2023
Amendment 2 Issued	06/21/2023
Amendment 3 Issued	07/05/2023

¹ The Materials Management Officer delegated the administrative review of this protest to the Chief Procurement Officer for Information Technology.

Amendment 4 Issued	07/10/2023
Amendment 5 Issued	07/13/2023
Intent to Award Posted	08/10/2023
Protest Received	08/18/2023

The Citadel issued this Best Value Bid (BVB) under Section 11-35-1528 for janitorial and custodian services on June 7, 2023. The purpose of best value bidding is to allow factors other than price to be considered in the determination of award. However, price must be at least sixty percent of the evaluation. The Citadel subsequently issued five amendments to this solicitation. The Citadel received eleven bids on July 20, 2023, that were evaluated and ranked by three evaluators. An Intent to Award was posted to HCSG Campus Services Group (HCSG) on August 10, 2023. The Budd Group (TBG) protested the intended award on August 18, 2023.

DISCUSSION

TBG first protests that HCSG did not submit its pricing in accordance with the requirements of the BVB and addendum 3. TBG asserts that the BVB required a price for each line item in the bidding schedule and that HCSG did not provide a price for three of the line items.

The HCSG bid schedule shows a price of \$0.00 for three line items accompanied by the statement “Included in total costs.”

Seignious Hall	\$2,981.00
Seignious During Football	\$0.00 Included in total costs
Johnson Hagood Stadium Games (5)	\$3,766.77
Athletic supervisory Personnel	\$0.00 Included in total costs
Coward Hall Band Area	\$880.92
Coward Hall Riverview room	\$0.00 Included in total costs

The Citadel responds:

HCSG did not submit an alternate price schedule. HCSG (Healthcare Services Group) filled out the bid schedule as required. Please refer to **Exhibit 1**. Though, they did mark three lines “included in price” the bid schedule was completely filled out (no blanks). The lines on the bid schedule marked “included in price” are secondary lines related to a previous line. For example, Seignious During Football was included in the price of Seignious Hall. During football occurs in the same building. It is also important to point out that the only reason we request a price schedule in this format is to allow Facilities and Engineering to know how

much to charge back each department for services received. HCSG was not afforded an unfair advantage in this regard, clearly the vendor understood what was required.

HCSG did include a price for each line item as required by the solicitation. This issue of protest is denied.

TBG next protests

Protest Item 2. HCSG and HHS do not have the REQUIRED coverage in the Barracks as per the BVB document. As a result, their pricing is lower. This is an unfair advantage which causes The Budd Group price to be higher as we bid accordingly to page 34 of BVB.

BVB Document page 34 states "2 custodial staff per Barrack and 3 in Padgett Thomas". TBG currently provides this level of staffing and facilities at The Citadel desire this level of staffing as well.

TBG argues:

We recommend that HCSG and HHS be disqualified for knowingly or unknowingly not providing REQUIRED staffing levels in the barracks both in quantity of custodial staff and total hours (Referenced on pg 34 for BVB). They bid 1/2 of the required staff resulting in pricing lower than us (The Budd Group). We would win the cost proposal if we bid 1/2 the required staff as well. Evidence of them NOT bidding these requirements are in the attachments (HCSG Staffing Charts and HHS Staffing Chart) as well as the difference in pricing for the barracks attachments (HCSG Pricing Sheet, HHS Pricing Sheet, The Budd Group Pricing Sheet)

The solicitation includes a section titled Special Standards of Responsibility. The instructions for this section state:

QUALIFICATIONS - SPECIAL STANDARDS OF RESPONSIBILITY (MAR 2015): (a) This section establishes special standards of responsibility. UNLESS YOU POSSESS THE FOLLOWING MANDATORY MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS, DO NOT SUBMIT AN OFFER:

[Solicitation, Page 16]

One of the standards listed states:

- Vendor **must** currently have available the minimum required staff of 45 on-hand to meet the requirements of this agreement.

Amendment 3 included the following responses to vendor questions about the 45 FTE requirement:

4. On page 17, 2nd bullet point from the top, it states “ Vendor must currently have available the minimum required staff of 45 on-hand to meet the requirements of this agreement.” Where did the Citadel get the number of 45? **This is the approximate current number of staff available.**
37. Are the 45-employee headcount FTE or PTE? **It is the vendors responsibility to acquire as many employees to suffice the work schedule requested, in all three shifts and maintain superior Performance, reliability and contract adherence with 45 FTE or whatever the offeror determines is required.**

(emphasis added)

The Citadel responds:

The “anticipated” and proposed staffing plan from HCSG was of serious concern for us. The staffing proposed provided a total number of hours that was approximately 14 full time employees short of the number The Citadel perceives to be the correct number required. We perceive staffing requirements are approximate 45 full -time employees. HCSG proposed a number of staff and robotics service hours. Even with the robotics hours there are approximately 9 full-time employees fewer than what we perceive to be accurate. Out of concern, I sent a request for clarification to Jonathan Pannell on August 7, 2023, ... The awarded vendor clearly describes the requirement for a minimum of two staff for each barracks (highlighted in email response). Clearly, the awarded vendor is fully aware of the requirement and HCSG was not afforded any unfair advantage even if The Budd Group perceives a mis-interpretation on the part of HCSG. Unfortunately, these clarification question records had not yet been added to the records. As a result, The Budd Group did not have full context when General Counsel provided a response to their FOIA request.

The requirement for 45 personnel was modified in Amendment 3. HCSG meets the solicitation requirements to the satisfaction of The Citadel. This issue of protest is denied.

TBG next protests:

References did not meet the minimum sq. ft requirements and length of service requirements.

TGB argues:

- References were not completed/confirmed yet points were awarded for HCSG.

- HCSG - Did not provide proper references (References provided were 50% of the size of the Citadel) and references were not able to be contacted by evaluator as per the attached evaluator notes (Glenn Easterby evaluation)
- The Budd Group provided a total of 5 references- only 1 of our references was contacted (College of Charleston) We were deducted points for qualifications by evaluator
- Please see attached proposals for HCSG and TBG and notes from evaluators
- We request that TBG be given the total 20 available points for qualifications

As stated above, this solicitation included Special Standards of Responsibility as provided for in Regulation 19-445.2125(F) which states:

When it is necessary for a particular acquisition or class of acquisitions, the procurement officer may develop, with the assistance of appropriate specialists, special standards of responsibility. Special standards may be particularly desirable when experience has demonstrated that unusual expertise or specialized facilities are needed for adequate contract performance. The special standards shall be set forth in the solicitation (and so identified) and shall apply to all offerors. A valid special standard of responsibility must be specific, objective and mandatory.

(emphasis added)

The Special Standards of Responsibility are found in Section V - Qualifications section of the solicitation. The requirements listed there as special standards ask the bidder to describe and document particular aspects of their experience:

Describe the experience of your company ...

Contractor must document how ...

Contractor must document how ...

Contractor must document ...

Document the total number of core corporate employees ...

Provide a complete description and location of nearest office/warehouse ...

Contractor shall provide documentation ...

[Solicitation, Page 16]

These are not special standards of responsibility because they are not specific or objective requirements of unusual expertise or specialized facilities necessary for adequate contract performance. While the first paragraph includes a statement that the bidder's experience should

include the functions outlined in the solicitation in a multi-building account of at least 1,500,000 square feet, this is not a special standard of responsibility.

The only other reference to 1,500,00 square feet is a request for at least one reference who could attest to the bidder's performance servicing at least a 1,500,000 square feet in a multi-building complex in Section IV Information for Offerors to Submit – General, page 15.

- b) References: Provide current contact information for a total minimum of five (5) professional references (current or past) that are supportive of contractor's professional qualifications. Provide at least one who can attest to contractor's performance servicing at least 1,500,000 square feet in a multi-building complex. Include the company name, phone number, mailing address, email address, and contact person who had the direct responsibility to administer their contract with these references.

However, this is a request for information, not a performance requirement of the solicitation.

The Citadel responds:

The list of references where of a smaller square footage. In part, this is why HCSG received the score that was given. Glenn Easterby called three references and was unable to obtain a response, please refer to **Exhibit 5**. Two days prior to the award, I personally called two references and spoke to John Paro at Ohio State. He explained that they had received several responses from customers regarding the improved cleaning and appearance since transitioning to HCSG. He also confirmed that Ohio State had transitioned from another vendor and were extremely pleased with the transition process and services they are receiving. Please refer to **Exhibit 6**.

Since there is no requirement that a bidder have experience servicing a multi-building facility of at least 1,500,000 square feet, TBG's protest that HCSG lacks the required experience is denied.

Note: Section IV, titled Information for Offerors to Submit, contains numbered paragraphs 1 through 9 which appear to be performance requirements. If they are to be enforceable contractual requirements, they should appear in Section III of the solicitation, not Section IV.

TBG next protests:

Additionally, the evaluators did not score question 7 on their evaluations which stated that vendors completed the pricing sheet correctly. This was .83 of 1 point. By not scoring this HCSG gained an additional advantage as they should have

received a deduction. TBG and others completed the sheet as directed and were not awarded the .83 towards the total points.

TBG also complains that one evaluator deducted points from TBG' score for failure to submit financial statements and complete a vendor questionnaire.

The Citadel responds:

In reference to the evaluators not scoring question 7 for .83 of 1 point. This is my error.... Facilities and Engineering utilized a scoring form that comprised the factors from line 2, 3, and 4 above. When the evaluators submitted their evaluation sheets they had not reviewed any of the pricing or price schedules (which explains why there are no scores for any vendor). I immediately entered the scores in the scoring matrix. Having entered all the scores in the matrix, I neglected to ask the evaluators to go back and enter a score for the price schedule. If The Budd Group were provided the full score (everything except cost) available The Budd Group still ranks third place.

Since there were only four evaluation criteria published in Section VI of the solicitation, references to question 7 and a scoring form warrant further review of the evaluation criteria and the evaluation process.

Section 11-35-1528(7)² requires bids be evaluated using only the criteria published in the BVB in accordance with Section 11-35-1528(5).³ Three evaluation criteria, in addition to cost, were published in Section VI of the solicitation under the heading: Evaluation Factors – Best Value Bids:

- | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Total cost Bidding Schedule/ Cost Proposal | Section VIII. | 60 Points |
| 2. Meeting qualifications outlined in | Section V | 20 Points |
| 3. Ability to meet all requirements listed in | Section V | 10 Points |
| 4. Possesses or ability of acquiring equipment reflected | Section III 5b ⁴ | 10 Points |

[Solicitation, Page 17]

² Section 11-35-1528(7) - Bids shall be evaluated by using only the criteria and weightings stated in the invitation for best value bids. All evaluation factors, other than price, will be considered independent of and prior to determining the effect of price on the score for each participating bidder. Once the evaluation is complete, all responsive bidders must be ranked from most advantageous to least advantageous to the State, considering only the evaluation factors stated in the invitation for best value bids.

³ Section 11-35-1528(5) - The best value bid must state the factors to be used in determination of award and the numerical weighting for each factor. Price must be a factor in determination of award and cannot be weighted at less than sixty percent.

⁴ There is no Section III 5b in this solicitation.

For unknown reasons, the evaluation criteria were reproduced, with modification, in Section IV – Information for Offerors to Submit:

INFORMATION FOR OFFERORS TO SUBMIT – EVALUATION (JAN 2006): In addition to information requested elsewhere in this solicitation, Offerors should submit the following information for purposes of evaluation:

- A. Total cost Bidding Schedule/ Cost Proposal Section VIII. 60 Points
- B. Meeting qualifications outlined in Section V 20 Points
How well do you meet all of the documented experience and qualifications in section V?
- C. Ability to meet all requirements listed in Section IV para 1, 2 &4 10 Points
Abilities of the bidder to perform Employee Hiring, Training and Development Bidders process towards Quality Control.
- D. Possesses or ability of acquiring equipment reflected Section III 5b. 10 Points
Bidder possesses or has the ability to procure the equipment required to perform all necessary tasks in accordance with this solicitation.

[Solicitation, Page 14] (modifications highlighted)

In Section VI, the third criterion references Section V. That criterion reproduced in Section IV, references Section IV para 1, 2 &4. The Section IV description is consistent with the paragraph headings in Section IV para 1, 2 &4. This difference between the two versions of the evaluation criteria was not addressed in the amendments. In both instances, the fourth criterion references Section III 5b. There is no paragraph 5b in Section III of the solicitation. However, the description is consistent with paragraph 5 of Section IV – Information of Offerors to Submit. This paragraph also contains performance requirements that probably should appear in Section III.

A third set of evaluation criteria appears in a spreadsheet provided to the evaluators for scoring purposes. These criteria included sub criteria for the three criteria to be evaluated and scored:

The second criteria published in Section VI of the solicitation states:

- 2. Meeting qualifications outlined in Section V 20 Points

The spreadsheet broke this criteria down into 5 sub criteria worth 4 points apiece:

- Qualifications 4 Points Each (DNMQ does not meet qualifications)(sic)
- 1. Documented experience in a Multi Building, 5 yrs, Education setting and 1.5 M sq ft minimum (Section V)
 - 2. Meet scope of work for similar organizations
 - 3. Documented training

4. Overall ability to provide custodial serv.
5. Contractors profile

The third criteria published in Section VI of the solicitation states:

3. Ability to meet all requirements listed in Section V 10 Points

The spreadsheet broke this criteria down into 12 sub criteria worth 0.8333 points apiece:

Offerors Must submit (sic) (Section IV +1&2) 10 Point (.83333 per question)

1. Did the Contractor (sic) Enclose the Official Proposal Form, which must be completed and signed by a company officer with the authority to contract for services
2. Did the bidder provide with a list of references with campuses with more than 1.5 M Sq. Ft.
3. Did the bidder provide with a list of contracts terminated with POC
4. A copy of the current annual report or certified financial statement prepared by a Certified Public Accountant
5. Did the bidder provide with a Statement of continuous business? (sic)
6. Was the Attachment K Contractors questionnaire (sic) completed?
7. Was the Bidding schedule filled completely, (sic) to include additional services and schedule 2
8. Did the Bidder offered and explained the current use of Technology and the availability of the customer to participate in the communication of service performance.
9. Did the Bidder submit (sic) the current employee Hiring, (sic) training and development program that contractor company executes?
10. Does the manager have a minimum of 5 years of experience with contract of this size.
11. Does the bidder mention the company providing background checks and criminal (sic) history for employees or the process to complete this task.
12. Does the contractor mention the process to achieve APP2 on campus, inspections and meeting requirements?

The highlighted reference above corresponds to the evaluation criteria appearing in Section IV of the solicitation rather than the criterion appearing in Section VI.

Finally, the fourth published evaluation criteria states:

4. Possesses or ability of acquiring equipment reflected Section III 5b. 10 Points

The following sub criteria were used to evaluate this criterion:

Equipment availability (Section IV, 5) 10 Points (5 points Each)

Does the bidder supply with the process of compliance of furnishing all materials necessary to perform the contract

Did the offeror described the listing of equipment that resembles what The Citadel requested?

There are a number of problems with these sub criteria. First, if sub criteria are individually scored by evaluators, they must be published in the solicitation. Because the sub criteria were not published in the solicitation, this omission violated the Code.

The sub criteria heading references Section IV +1&2 while the criteria published in Section VI referenced Section V of the solicitation.

The first sub criterion is invalid since a nonbinding offer cannot be evaluated. In addition, this requirement is not found in either Section V or Section IV.

Sub criteria 7 asks if the bidding schedule was completely filled out. Section 11-35-1528(7) requires that “All evaluation factors, other than price, will be considered independent of and prior to determining the effect of price on the score for each participating bidder.” Evaluators are prohibited from reviewing the bidding schedule until after they have finalized the evaluations of all other criteria. In this case the evaluators did not award any points for this sub criteria so there is apparently no violation of this provision. However, the inclusion of this unusable sub criteria effectively changed the weighting for this criterion that is required to be published in the solicitation. This evaluation was not conducted in accordance with the Code.

DECISION

This procurement was not conducted in accordance with the Code. The award to HCSG Campus Services Group is cancelled. The protest of The Budd Group is denied in part and granted in part. The solicitation is cancelled, and the requirement for janitorial and custodial services is remanded to The Citadel for procurement in accordance with the Code.



Michael B. Spicer
Chief Procurement Officer

Attachment 1

From: [Protest-MMO](#)
To: [MMO - Procurement; Shealy, Voight; Skinner, Gail](#)
Subject: FW: [External] Protest - BVB23022 -JM
Date: Friday, August 18, 2023 3:51:48 PM
Attachments: [HCSG Staffing Chart.docx](#)
[HHS Staffing Chart.docx](#)
[Jonathan Lewellyn.pdf](#)
[Wally Nava.pdf](#)
[Glenn Easterby.pdf](#)
[HHS The Citadel Cost Proposal.pdf](#)
[The Budd Group Cost Proposal for The Citadel Janitorial RFP # BVB 23022-JM July 20, 2023 \(1\).pdf](#)
[Pricing Proposal HCSG Campus Services Group - Solicitation Number BVB 23022-JM Custodial Services Proposal for The Citadel.pdf](#)

From: Michael Bingham <mbingham@buddgroup.com>
Sent: Friday, August 18, 2023 3:51:08 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: Protest-MMO <protest-mmo@mmo.state.sc.us>
Subject: [External] Protest - BVB23022 -JM

To whom it may concern,
The Budd Group would like to formally protest the intent to award for solicitation BVB 23022-JM. Please see our protest criteria below along with the attached proof for protest. We appreciate the opportunity for the protest to be considered.

Protest Item 1. Pricing was not submitted as directed in the BVB and addendum 3 as required by HCSG

- HCSG altered the pricing sheet and did not complete 3 lines. This is a violation of the BVB requirements as referenced in the BVB document Page 25 Section VIII. Bidding Schedule/ Cost Proposal

Excerpt from Page 25 Section VIII: “The bid schedule provided must be completed and submitted. This will be the only acceptable pricing format. Unit price and extended price are required for each .Offerors must provide pricing for all items listed below to be considered for award. Partial offers and cost options will not be accepted.”

Additionally, the question below was asked and answered in addendum 3.

21. Will alternate/additional pricing options be considered?
No, please fill out the bid schedule as required.

This gives HSCG an unfair advantage in pricing as they omitted 3 locations but noted they are "included" in the total (Evidence in the attached pricing spreadsheet HSCG)

TBG completed the pricing sheet as requested.

Protest Item 2. HCSG and HHS do not have the REQUIRED coverage in the Barracks as per the BVB document. As a result, their pricing is lower. This is an unfair advantage which causes The Budd Group price to be higher as we bid accordingly to page 34 of BVB.

- BVB Document page 34 states "2 custodial staff per Barrack and 3 in Padgett Thomas" . TBG currently provides this level of staffing and facilities at The Citadel desire this level of staffing as well.

We recommend that HCSG and HHS be disqualified for knowingly or unknowingly not providing REQUIRED staffing levels in the barracks both in quantity of custodial staff and total hours (Referenced on pg 34 for BVB). They bid 1/2 of the required staff resulting in pricing lower than us (The Budd Group). We would win the cost proposal if we bid 1/2 the required staff as well. Evidence of them NOT bidding these requirements are in the attachments (HCSG Staffing Charts and HHS Staffing Chart) as well as the difference in pricing for the barracks attachments (HCSG Pricing Sheet, HHS Pricing Sheet, The Budd Group Pricing Sheet)

We recommend that HCSG and HHS be disqualified for not following the requirements of the BVB and the amendment 3. They have an unfair advantage over The Budd Group and other vendors if their inaccurate staffing and pricing are allowed.

- Although HCSG notes Athletic Supervision is "Included in the total". There is no evidence to support this claim as this position is not listed on the staffing table HCSG provides within their proposal. See attached pricing sheet provided by HCSG. Again, this gives HCSG an advantage as they have less hours and a lower price as a result.
- Additionally, the evaluators did not score question 7 on their evaluations which stated that vendors completed the pricing sheet correctly. This was .83 of 1 point. By not scoring this HCSG gained an additional advantage as they should have received a deduction. TBG and others completed the sheet as directed and were not awarded the .83 towards the total points.

Protest Item 3. References did not meet the minimum sq. ft requirements and length of service requirements.

- References were not completed/confirmed yet points were awarded for HCSG.
- HCSG - Did not provide proper references (References provided were 50% of the size of the Citadel) and references were not able to be contacted by evaluator as per the attached evaluator notes (Glenn Easterby evaluation)
- The Budd Group provided a total of 5 references- only 1 of our references was contacted (College of Charleston) We were deducted points for qualifications by evaluator

Please see attached proposals for HCSG and TBG and notes from evaluators

We request that TBG be given the total 20 available points for qualifications

Protest Item 4. Qualifications deductions on items that are yes or no and were provided

- TBG provided financial statements as requested.

2 evaluators saw this in our proposal and gave us full credit. 1 evaluator marked it as NO and deducted points.

- TBG completed the required vendor questionnaire.

2 evaluators saw this in our proposal and gave us full credit. 1 evaluator marked it as NO and deducted points.

Please see attached link for our proposal which includes the financial statement and the questionnaire and attached evaluator notes (Pages 15-25 of our proposal)

We request that TBG be given the total 20 available points for qualifications before the winner is selected from the remaining eligible vendors.

Thank you for considering our protest. We are available to answer any questions via phone or In person to provide further clarity.

Best Regards,

Michael Bingham
AVP of Customer Success
The Budd Group
(704) 236-3947

 [The Budd Group Technical Proposal for The Citad...](#)

STATEMENT OF RIGHT TO FURTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

Protest Appeal Notice (Revised May 2020)

The South Carolina Procurement Code, in Section 11-35-4210, subsection 6, states:

(6) Finality of Decision. A decision pursuant to subsection (4) is final and conclusive, unless fraudulent or unless a person adversely affected by the decision requests a further administrative review by the Procurement Review Panel pursuant to Section 11-35-4410(1) within ten days of posting of the decision in accordance with subsection (5). The request for review must be directed to the appropriate chief procurement officer, who shall forward the request to the panel or to the Procurement Review Panel, and must be in writing, setting forth the reasons for disagreement with the decision of the appropriate chief procurement officer. The person also may request a hearing before the Procurement Review Panel. The appropriate chief procurement officer and an affected governmental body shall have the opportunity to participate fully in a later review or appeal, administrative or judicial.

Copies of the Panel's decisions and other additional information regarding the protest process is available on the internet at the following web site: <http://procurement.sc.gov>

FILING FEE: Pursuant to Proviso 111.1 of the 2020 General Appropriations Act, "[r]equests for administrative review before the South Carolina Procurement Review Panel shall be accompanied by a filing fee of two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250.00), payable to the SC Procurement Review Panel. The panel is authorized to charge the party requesting an administrative review under the South Carolina Code Sections 11-35-4210(6), 11-35-4220(5), 11-35-4230(6) and/or 11-35-4410...Withdrawal of an appeal will result in the filing fee being forfeited to the panel. If a party desiring to file an appeal is unable to pay the filing fee because of financial hardship, the party shall submit a completed Request for Filing Fee Waiver form at the same time the request for review is filed. *[The Request for Filing Fee Waiver form is attached to this Decision.]* If the filing fee is not waived, the party must pay the filing fee within fifteen days of the date of receipt of the order denying waiver of the filing fee. Requests for administrative review will not be accepted unless accompanied by the filing fee or a completed Request for Filing Fee Waiver form at the time of filing." PLEASE MAKE YOUR CHECK PAYABLE TO THE "SC PROCUREMENT REVIEW PANEL."

LEGAL REPRESENTATION: In order to prosecute an appeal before the Panel, business entities organized and registered as corporations, limited liability companies, and limited partnerships must be represented by a lawyer. Failure to obtain counsel will result in dismissal of your appeal. *Protest of Lighting Services*, Case No. 2002-10 (Proc. Rev. Panel Nov. 6, 2002) and *Protest of The Kardon Corporation*, Case No. 2002-13 (Proc. Rev. Panel Jan. 31, 2003); and *Protest of PC&C Enterprises, LLC*, Case No. 2012-1 (Proc. Rev. Panel April 2, 2012). However, individuals and those operating as an individual doing business under a trade name may proceed without counsel, if desired.

**South Carolina Procurement Review Panel
Request for Filing Fee Waiver
1205 Pendleton Street, Suite 367, Columbia, SC 29201**

Name of Requestor

Address

City

State

Zip

Business Phone

-
1. What is your/your company's monthly income? _____
 2. What are your/your company's monthly expenses? _____
 3. List any other circumstances which you think affect your/your company's ability to pay the filing fee:

To the best of my knowledge, the information above is true and accurate. I have made no attempt to misrepresent my/my company's financial condition. I hereby request that the filing fee for requesting administrative review be waived.

Sworn to before me this
_____ day of _____, 20_____

Notary Public of South Carolina

Requestor/Appellant

My Commission expires: _____

For official use only: _____ Fee Waived _____ Waiver Denied

Chairman or Vice Chairman, SC Procurement Review Panel

This _____ day of _____, 20_____
Columbia, South Carolina

NOTE: If your filing fee request is denied, you will be expected to pay the filing fee within fifteen (15) days of the date of receipt of the order denying the waiver.