

**STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF RICHLAND**

In the Matter of Protest of:

Mainscape Landscape Maintenance
Services, Inc.

Coastal Carolina University
IFB No. 130506AR
Provide Lawn/Landscape Maintenance
Services at University Place Student
Residential Complex

BEFORE THE CHIEF PROCUREMENT OFFICER

DECISION

CASE NO.: 2013-121

POSTING DATE: July 26, 2013

MAILING DATE: July 26, 2013

This matter is before the Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) pursuant to a letter of protest received via email June 12, 2013, from Mainscape Landscape Maintenance Services, Inc. (Mainscape). With this invitation for bids (IFB), Coastal Carolina University (CCU) attempts to procure lawn/landscape maintenance services at the University Place student residential complex. Following the evaluation of the bids received, CCU posted its intent to award to HBH Land Group DBA US Lawns of Myrtle Beach (US Lawns). Mainscape protested the award, alleging:

As the company currently maintaining the property and has been since June 2012, Mainscape was asked to provide a proposal to continue maintenance on the property for 3 years as per the solicitation for bid. Mainscape was asked to provide this proposal based off of a different scope of work when compared to IFB130506AR....The reason for the dispute is because of the difference between the specifications that were given to Mainscape and the specifications that were in the solicitation for bids IFB130506AR. There are several items on the specifications that Mainscape was given that were not included on the solicitation for bid IFB130506AR.

In order to resolve the matter, the CPO requested responses to the protest from US Lawns and CCU and obtained the solicitation file documents from CCU. The issue to be decided is a matter of law; therefore, this decision is prepared based upon review of those documents without the benefit of a hearing.

PROTEST AND RESPONSES

The letter of protest is attached and incorporated herein by reference. [Ex. 1] The responses from CCU [Ex. 2] and US Lawns [Ex. 3] are also attached.

FINDINGS OF FACT

University Place is a student residential complex of some 3,000 beds. The property is owned by Coastal Housing Foundation, LLC. Prior to July 1, 2012, CCU managed the property for the Foundation. On July 1, 2012, the University entered into a lease agreement with the Foundation for University Place. Per the terms of the lease, the Foundation agreed to continue with several open agreements it held with outside contractors for various services – lawn and landscape maintenance of the complex being one of them – until such time as those agreements expired. The agreement in place at the time for lawn and landscape maintenance was with Mainscape, whose services were to continue through June 30, 2013. This solicitation was prompted by the approaching expiration of the Foundation’s agreement with Mainscape.

The following dates are relevant to the protest:

1. In March 2013, according to Dean Hudson, CCU Director of Procurement Services, Mainscape, the incumbent contractor, “provided a proposal to the University (through its Residential Housing area) . . . The University used this estimate as market information and a basis of determining its required source selection method, as well as, potential length of terms.” According to Mr. Hudson, “This listing of requirements was based on the agreement Mainscape held with the Foundation.” [Ex. 2]
2. On May 9, 2013, CCU issued IFB #130506AR. [Ex. 4] According to Mr. Hudson, the scope of work outlined in the IFB was not the same as the list of requirements included in Mainscape’s previous agreement with the Foundation. [Ex. 2]

Also on May 9, 2013, CCU advertised the IFB in *South Carolina Business Opportunities* (SCBO), as required by S.C. Code Section 11-35-1520(3). [Ex. 5] Advertisement of a solicitation in SCBO is the only notice of a solicitation required by the Code. [§ 11-35-1520(3)]

3. On May 24, 2013, CCU issued Amendment #1 to answer questions raised by prospective bidders. [Ex. 6]

4. On May 30, 2013, CCU opened the following bids:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Bid Amount</u>
US Lawns	\$247,500
Deason's Lawn Care & Landscaping	288,000
C & D Landscaping Services	324,000
Southland Landscaping Corp.	411,048
Thomas Lawn Services, LLC	414,000
Chichester's Home Care, LLC	450,000
Deason's Lawn Care and Landscaping	486,000

[Ex. 7]

5. On June 6, 2013, CCU posted its Intent to Award to US Lawns [Ex. 8]

6. On June 12, 2013, Mainscape filed its protest with the CPO.

DISCUSSION

Mainscape protested CCU's intent to Award to US Lawns alleging "The reason for the dispute is because of the difference between the specifications that were given to Mainscape and the specifications that were in the solicitation for bids IFB130506AR. There are several items on the specifications that Mainscape was given that were not included on the solicitation for bid IFB130506AR."

CCU stipulates that the specifications that it published as IFB130506AR on May 9, 2013 were different than the list of requirements that Mainscape used in providing its proposal to CCU in March 2013. According to Mr. Hudson of CCU, in March 2013, prior to CCU's issuance of the IFB, Mainscape provided a proposal to CCU that CCU used as a basis of determining its required source selection method, as well as, potential length of terms. CCU used Mainscape's proposal as a guide in its development of the IFB. Adjustments were made to the scope of work. The scope of work actually used in the IFB in question was not the same as Mainscape's quote. CCU issued its IFB and advertised the solicitation in *South Carolina Business Opportunities*, as

required by S.C. Code Ann. § 11-35-1520(3) (2011). Mainscape did not submit a bid in response to the IFB.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Consolidated Procurement Code (Code) grants prospective bidders the privilege of protesting a solicitation. It also grants actual bidders the privilege of protesting an award. It reads:

(1) Right to Protest; Exclusive Remedy.

(a) A prospective bidder, offeror, contractor, or subcontractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation of a contract shall protest to the appropriate chief procurement officer in the manner stated in subsection (2)(a) within fifteen days of the date of issuance of the Invitation For Bids or Requests for Proposals or other solicitation documents, whichever is applicable, or any amendment to it, if the amendment is at issue. An Invitation for Bids or Request for Proposals or other solicitation document, not including an amendment to it, is considered to have been issued on the date required notice of the issuance is given in accordance with this code.

(b) Any actual bidder, offeror, contractor, or subcontractor who is aggrieved in connection with the intended award or award of a contract shall protest to the appropriate chief procurement officer in the manner stated in subsection (2)(b) within ten days of the date award or notification of intent to award, whichever is earlier, is posted in accordance with this code; except that a matter that could have been raised pursuant to (a) as a protest of the solicitation may not be raised as a protest of the award or intended award of a contract.

[§ 11-35-4210] [Emphasis added]

While the Code grants the privilege of protest of a solicitation to prospective bidders, it requires the aggrieved bidder to file his protest with the CPO within fifteen days of the issuance of the IFB or an amendment thereto, if the amendment gives rise to the issues of protest. CCU published its specifications with the original IFB on May 9, 2013 and issued its only amendment to the IFB on May 24, 2013. Viewed in the light most favorable to Mainscape, in order to be timely filed, any protest of the solicitation specifications would have had to be filed with the

CPO by 5:00PM, Monday, June 10, 2013, fifteen days after CCU issued Amendment #1. Mainscape did not file its protest with the CPO until June 14, 2013.

The South Carolina Procurement Review Panel has repeatedly held that the time for filing cannot be waived. *See In Re: Protest of Jones Engineering Sales, Inc.*, Panel Case No. 2001-8 (finding that the CPO did not have jurisdiction to rule on the protest issue because the time for filing protests of the solicitation is jurisdictional and may not be waived); *In Re: Protest of National Cosmetology Ass'n*, Panel Case No. 1996-17 (finding that “where the appeal is not taken within the time provided, jurisdiction cannot be conferred by consent or by waiver”); *In Re: Protest of Vorec Corporation*, Panel Case No. 1994-9 (finding that a protest of award was untimely when it was filed one day after the deadline established by the Code prior to its amendment). The Panel has explained its rationale for why this time limit is jurisdictional and cannot be waived as follows:

[I]t is essential to the operation of government that challenges to its purchasing decisions be limited. If the time for filing protests can be waived, the state will be unable to determine with certainty when it can enter into a contract with one vendor for vital goods and services without the danger of being liable to another vendor.

In Re: Protest of Oakland Janitorial Services, Inc., Panel Case No. 1988-13.

Regarding notice to bidders, the Panel has addressed the issue of timeliness in the filing of protests many times writing, “Protestants are charged with knowing the law, regardless of whether State Procurement advises them of it correctly, or at all.” *Protest of Olsten Services*, Panel Case No. 1990-16 (finding that where procurement officer made a mistake and failed to send incumbent vendors a copy of the IFB and where the procurement was advertised in SCBO the protest was untimely). Therefore, because Mainscape did not file its protest with the CPO within fifteen days after Amendment #1, all allegations against the specifications were untimely filed.

The letter is laced with objections regarding the solicitation specifications, but Mainscape wrote, "This letter is to dispute the contract award." The Code grants the privilege of protest of an award, but only to "actual bidders". Mainscape did not submit a bid in response to IFB130506AR. [See Ex. 7]


The Panel has addressed this issue in several decisions, including *Protest of Winyah Dispensary, Inc.*, Panel Case No. 1994-18 ("The Panel found that only an "actual bidder" to the IFB has standing to protest the award or intended award of the IFB."); and *Protest of Smith & Jones Distrib. Co.*, Panel Case No. 1994-5 ("Smith & Jones did not submit a bid, and therefore is not an 'actual bidder'."). Since Mainscape did not submit a bid in response to IFB130506AR, it was not an "actual bidder" and therefore lacks standing to protest the award. Any allegations regarding CCU's award to US Lawns is dismissed.

DETERMINATION

For the foregoing reasons the protest is dismissed.



R. Voight Shealy
Chief Procurement Officer
For Supplies and Services



Date

Columbia, S.C.

STATEMENT OF RIGHT TO FURTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW
Protest Appeal Notice (Revised June 2013)

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>

FILE BY CLOSE OF BUSINESS: Appeals must be filed by 5:00 PM, the close of business. *Protest of Palmetto Unilect, LLC*, Case No. 2004-6 (dismissing as untimely an appeal emailed prior to 5:00 PM but not received until after 5:00 PM); *Appeal of Pee Dee Regional Transportation Services, et al.*, Case No. 2007-1 (dismissing as untimely an appeal faxed to the CPO at 6:59 PM).

FILING FEE: Pursuant to Proviso 108.1 of the 2013 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
1105 Pendleton Street, Suite 202, 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.



3540 Water Tower Rd.
Longs, SC 29568

Voight Shealy
Chief Procurement Officer
State of South Carolina
1201 Main Street, Ste. 600
Columbia, SC 29201

Dear Mr. Shealy,

This letter is to dispute and protest the contract award for landscape maintenance for University Place Apartments at Coastal Carolina University. As the company currently maintaining the property and has been since June 2012, Mainscape was asked to provide a proposal to continue maintenance on the property for 3 years as per the solicitation for bid. Mainscape was asked to provide this proposal based off of a different scope of work when compared to IFB130506AR. The specifications that were given to Mainscape are enclosed in this letter.

The reason for the dispute is because of the difference between the specifications that were given to Mainscape and the specifications that were in the solicitation for bid IFB130506AR. There are several items on the specifications that Mainscape was given that were not included on the solicitation for bid IFB130506AR. An explanation of these items follow.

Per the scope of work that was given to Mainscape to provide a proposal, on line number 7 it says 'The Landscaping Contractor shall provide pruning to maintain shrubs and trees and fertilize appropriately'. In the specifications within IFB130506AR under item II.-C. it states 'Evergreens shall require a minimum of 2 prunings per year, the first shall be performed in spring and the second shall be performed in autumn'. While maintaining the property over the past year, we learned that the shrubs should be pruned at a minimum of 5 times per growing season because of the extremely fast growth of the many Eleagnus shrubs on the property. Mainscape's proposal includes 5 prunings per year based off of the specifications given to Mainscape.

Per the scope of work given to Mainscape to provide a proposal, on line number 9 it says 'The Landscaping Contractor shall replace damaged shrubs and trees'. This was a large part of last year's services to University Place because of damage as well as declining plant material that was replaced at no extra cost to the university. There is nothing noting replacement of shrubs and trees in IFB130506AR. Mainscape included this in the proposal as per the specifications given to Mainscape.

3540 Water Tower Rd., Longs, SC 29568 P(843) 399-8616 F(843) 399-2040

Per the scope of work given to Mainscape to provide a proposal, on line number 17 it says 'The Landscaping Contractor shall regularly test and properly maintain irrigation system and water responsibility'. Based off of the current maintenance for University Place and an explanation regarding line 17, this includes making any and all repairs to the irrigation system once a full monthly audit is done to the system. IFB130506AR states 'Contractor shall be responsible for the monitoring and adjusting (setting timer clocks and water flow) of any automatic irrigation system. Contractor shall bring to the attention of Coastal Carolina University personnel any discovered malfunctions in the system for correction'. This does not state that repairs will be made at no additional charge to the University. Mainscape included this in the proposal given based off of the specifications given to Mainscape and the explanation of this specification.

These are all examples of major items that show Mainscape's proposal is not consistent with the company that was awarded the landscape maintenance on the property.

Please take this into consideration as Mainscape has been on the property for a full year and has made several improvements to the overall appearance of the property. With appearance being a very important part of University Place's grounds, Mainscape is fully committed to continue improvement and increase the aesthetic beauty that keeps Coastal Carolina's students striving for excellence in today's world.

Regards,



Preston Dellinger
Account Manager
Mainscape Inc.
3540 Water Tower Rd.
Longs, SC 29568
843-324-6303
pdellinger@mainscape.com

Enclosure

Scope of Work – Landscaping

Requirements

Furnish all labor, material, supplies, taxes, insurance, equipment, supervision, licenses, permits and any/all incidentals necessary to accomplish all landscaping work.

Scope of Work

1. Landscaping Contractor is to tend to, develop and maintain the grounds at University Place.
2. Crew sizing will be the responsibility of the contractor and approved by Management. Scheduling is to be approved by Management.
3. The Landscaping Contractor shall be responsible for securing and protecting all existing landscaping. Pre-existing damages to any landscape items/areas shall be noted prior to work commencing.
4. The Landscaping Contractor shall remove debris in the way of mowing and mow the lawn weekly in season and as needed in the off season.
5. The Landscaping Contractor shall maintain quarterly lawn treatment/fertilization.
6. The Landscaping Contractor shall replace and refresh mulch at least twice per year.
7. The Landscaping Contractor shall provide pruning to maintain shrubs and trees and fertilize appropriately.
8. The Landscaping Contractor shall provide proper pest control with pest management for the lawn, small tree/shrubs, and flower beds.
9. The Landscaping Contractor shall replace damaged shrubs and trees.
10. The Landscaping Contractor shall clean and trim around all ponds.
11. The Landscaping Contractor shall edge all sidewalks, flower beds and curbs.
12. The Landscaping Contractor shall blow sidewalks and curbs.
13. The Landscaping Contractor shall pick up and remove fallen leaves biweekly during the fall.
14. The Landscaping Contractor shall weed and maintain flower beds.
15. The Landscaping Contractor shall seed/hydroseed to maintain green turf in high visible areas such as main entry drive and around activity houses.
16. The Landscaping Contractor shall plant flowers twice per year.
17. The Landscaping Contractor shall regularly test and properly maintain irrigation system and water responsibility.
18. The Landscaping Contractor shall maintain grounds of the volleyball courts and surrounding areas.
19. The Landscaping Contractor shall trim as needed.
20. The Landscaping Contractor shall remove vegetation that is trimmed, damaged, dead or diseased.
21. The Landscaping Contractor shall trim and remove vegetation blocking vision.
22. The Landscaping Contractor shall address fallen tree problems.
23. The Landscaping Contractor shall identify and report potential problems to Management.
24. The Landscaping Contractor and crew must behave professionally at all times on site (no flirting or heckling students and visitors).
25. The Landscaping Contractor understands there shall be NO Smoking in or around any Units. There shall be no loud music from radios, boom boxes, etc. There will be no animals allowed on-site. No alcohol is allowed on site.
26. The Landscaping Contractor shall be responsible for all their employees.
27. The Landscaping Contractor invoice shall not exceed contract price. Any amount invoiced different from the contract shall have approved change order attached, signed by Management.



Procurement Services

June 14, 2013

Mr. Voight Shealy
Chief Procurement Officer
Materials Management Officer
S.C. Procurement Services
1201 Main St., Suite 600
Columbia, SC 29201
SENT VIA EMAIL ATTACHMENT

RE: Case #2013-121 Protest of Mainscape – Coastal Carolina University

Mr. Shealy,

The following provides Coastal Carolina University's (University) response to the above referenced protest.

Background

Pursuant to the processes and guidelines of section 11-35-1520 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (Code), the University issued an Invitation For Bid (IFB), number IFB130506AR, for the purpose of obtaining a source to provide lawn/landscape maintenance services at University Place student residential complex. The IFB was issued and posted on May 9, 2013 with a stipulated opening date of May 28, 2013. As required by Code section 11-35-1520 (3), notice was given through the "South Carolina Business Opportunities" (SCBO). A subsequent amendment was issued and posted on May 24, 2013 which answered questions received during the designated question period and changed the bid opening date to May 30, 2013. On May 30, 2013, a public bid opening, as stipulated in Code section 11-35-1520 (5), was held at 2:00 PM. Bids received in response to the IFB were opened and recorded. (Copies of the Record of Attendance and Bid Tabulation are provided as separate attachments.) On June 6, 2013, a Notice of Intent to Award was posted with a stated contract award to HBH Land Group DBA US Lawns of Myrtle Beach, in the amount of \$247,500. The awarded contract was to begin on July 1, 2013.

History

University Place is a student residential complex with some 3,000 beds. This property is owned by Coastal Housing Foundation, LLC (Foundation). Prior to July 1, 2012, the University had "managed" the property for the Foundation. On July 1, 2012, the University entered into a lease agreement with the Foundation for University Place. Per the terms of the lease, the Foundation agreed to continue with several open agreements it held with outside contractors for various services – lawn and landscape maintenance of the complex being one of them – until such time as those agreements expired. The agreement in place at the time for lawn and landscape maintenance was with Mainscape Landscape Maintenance Services (Mainscape), whose services were to continue through June 30, 2013.



Procurement Services

Mr. Voight Shealy
June 14, 2013
Page 2

Relative information

1. Mainscape provided a proposal to the University (through its Residential Housing area) in March 2013. The University used this estimate as market information and a basis of determining its required source selection method, as well as potential length of terms.
2. In Mr. Preston Dellinger's (Account Manager with Mainscape) letter, the references to "different scope of work" and "scope of work given to Mainscape" appear to be related to a "Scope of Work – Landscaping" page that was included with the March 2013 proposal. This listing of requirements was based on the agreement Mainscape held with the Foundation, and is not the scope of work outlined in the IFB.
3. Pursuant to section 11-35-1520 (3) of the Code, invitation for bids are published through SCBO and are posted to the University's Procurement Services website. In addition, and although not required, University Procurement Services sends courtesy notifications via email of published solicitations to potential offerors. Inadvertently with this IFB, Mainscape was left off of such notification. However, it should be noted that from the four (4) courtesy emails recipients, only one (1) submitted a response to the IFB. Additionally, five (5) bids were received from other prospective offerors who had not received such courtesy notification.
4. Section 11-35-4210 of the Code provides the following relative to protests:
 - (1) Right to Protest; Exclusive Remedy.
 - (a) A prospective bidder, offeror, contractor, or subcontractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation of a contract shall protest to the appropriate chief procurement officer in the manner stated in subsection (2)(a) within fifteen days of the date of issuance of the Invitation For Bids or Requests for Proposals or other solicitation documents, whichever is applicable, or any amendment to it, if the amendment is at issue. An Invitation for Bids or Request for Proposals or other solicitation document, not including an amendment to it, is considered to have been issued on the date required notice of the issuance is given in accordance with this code.
 - (b) Any actual bidder, offeror, contractor, or subcontractor who is aggrieved in connection with the intended award or award of a contract shall protest to the appropriate chief procurement officer in the manner stated in subsection (2)(b) within ten days of the date award or notification of intent to award, whichever is earlier, is posted in accordance with this code; except that a matter that could have been raised pursuant to (a) as a protest of the solicitation may not be raised as a protest of the award or intended award of a contract.

The content of Mr. Dellinger's letter, received by the Materials Management Office on June 12, 2013, would tend to dispute the scope of work stipulated in



Procurement Services

Mr. Voight Shealy
June 14, 2013
Page 3

the IFB which was issued May 9, 2013. Such dispute is therefore outside of the fifteen (15) day allotted time period (section (a)) and should therefore be void. In addition, Mainscape is not an actual bidder or offeror with respect to this IFB, and therefore remedies provided in section (b) are not applicable, rendering the protest of the intended award invalid.

The above is offered as the University's response to this case. Please advise if any additional information is needed.

Sincerely,

Dean P. Hudson
Director, Procurement Services
Coastal Carolina University

Pertinent attachments provided through separate PDF files:

IFB130506AR
Amendment IFB130506AR
Record of Attendance IFB130506AR
Bid Tabulation IFB130506AR
Intent To Award IFB130506AR
SCBO ad 050913

From: Bryan Smith [mailto:bryan.smith@uslawns.net]

Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 10:21 AM

To: Shealy, Voight

Subject: Re: Case # 2013-121 - Protest of Mainscape - Coastal Carolina - University Place Apartments - Landscape Maintenance

Mrs Voight

How can one company have different specs. It was clearly stated on the web site. This sounds to me like main scrapes. Now having seen my number which was posted on the website and public knowledge just wants to resubmit there numbers to make there bid more appealing Once Agian. The specs were clearly the same to all vendors

Thank you.

Bryan