

BURNET COUNTY — AERIAL FIBER OPTIC INSTALLATION

Best Value Scoring Sheet — Instructions & Legend

PURPOSE

This workbook supports a Best Value evaluation for the Burnet County Aerial Fiber Optic Installation RFP. Scoring is weighted across 10 categories drawn from the Vendor Interview Question document. Pricing is intentionally the lowest-weighted criterion (5%) to ensure technical merit and project execution capability drive the selection decision.

HOW TO USE THIS WORKBOOK

Step 1	Navigate to the 'Category Scores' tab. Enter vendor names in row 6 (up to 5 vendors).
Step 2	For each category and each vendor, enter a score from 1 to 5 in the yellow input cells.
Step 3	The 'Summary Dashboard' tab automatically calculates weighted scores and ranks vendors.
Step 4	Review the Detail Notes tab to record qualitative observations per vendor per category.
Step 5	Award recommendation is based on the highest total weighted score on the Dashboard.

SCORING SCALE (1–5)	
5 – Excellent	Thorough, specific, confident answer. Exceeds expectations. No follow-up needed.
4 – Good	Clear, competent answer with minor gaps. Acceptable with minimal clarification.
3 – Adequate	Partial answer. Key elements addressed but detail is lacking. Written RFI recommended.
2 – Weak	Vague or incomplete. Significant gaps in knowledge or plan. High risk indicator.
1 – Unacceptable	Unable to answer or answer contradicts RFP requirements. Disqualification consideration.
0 – N/A / Skip	Question not applicable or vendor declined to answer. Does not affect weighted score.

CATEGORY WEIGHTS		
Category	Weight	What is Evaluated
Company Qualifications & Experience	15%	References, certifications, key personnel
Scope Understanding & Approach	15%	Segment knowledge, quantities, sequencing
Materials & Specified Products	12%	CCH, FOSC 450 D6, strand, county-furnished fiber handling
Engineering, Permitting & Make-Ready	12%	PE access, ROW, pole owner coordination
Splicing & Termination	12%	Splicer quality, fiber assignment, documentation
Testing & Acceptance	7%	OTDR capability, 288-strand workflow, corrective action
Documentation & Closeout	3%	As-builts, GIS/CAD, splice diagrams, warranty
Project Schedule & Risk Management	8%	Realistic timeline, crew availability, risk identification
Safety & Compliance	1%	EMR, 811 locates, NESC clearances
Pricing & Commercial Terms	15%	Transparency, exclusions, change order terms
TOTAL	100%	

BURNET COUNTY — AERIAL FIBER OPTIC INSTALLATION						
Best Value Scoring Sheet — Category Scores						
Instructions: Enter vendor names in Row 6. Score each question 1–5 (or 0 for N/A) in the yellow cells. Weighted scores calculate automatically. Pricing is weighted at 5% — the lowest of all categories.						
CATEGORY / QUESTION	Vendor 1	Vendor 2	Vendor 3	Vendor 4	Vendor 5	Notes / Red Flags
► Enter Vendor Names →	Mears Broadband	Future Infrastrurcture	CommServPros, LLC	Vendor 4 Name	Vendor 5 Name	
1. Company Qualifications & Experience Weight: 15%	4.40	5.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	
Q1 How many years in aerial fiber and 3 references for 144-count+ projects?	5	5	5			
Q2 Documented 288-strand aerial fiber experience — describe a recent project.	5	5	5			
Q3 Certifications held by technicians and splicers (FOA, BICSI, etc.)?	3	5	5			
Q4 Dedicated Project Manager — who and what is their relevant experience?	4	5	5			
Q5 In-house crews or subcontractors? Subcontractor identity and experience?	5	5	5			
2. Scope Understanding & Approach Weight: 15%	3.33	2.80	4.80	0.00	0.00	
Q1 Confirm four fiber segments: 288SM/4000ft, 48SM/6500ft, 12SM/150ft, 48SM/600ft.	0	1	5			
Q2 How do you reconcile '2 miles' with the four segments totaling ~11,250 LF?	2	3	5			
Q3 How will you handle the transition from 288-strand to smaller counts at branches?	5	5	5			
Q4 Confirm 78 make-ready poles and describe coordination with pole owners.	0	2	5			
Q5 How will you sequence work across all four segments to meet the 15-day window?	3	3	4			
3. Materials & Specified Products Weight: 12%	2.83	4.33	4.67	0.00	0.00	
Q1 Process for receiving, inspecting, and managing county-furnished fiber cable.	4	4	5			
Q2 Familiarity with Corning CCH product line for building terminations.	5	5	5			
Q3 Experience with FOSC 450 D6 splice closures — how many required for this project?	2	5	5			
Q4 Number and locations of storage loops and fiber snowshoes planned.	2	4	5			
Q5 Pneumatic or hydraulic lashing machine? Lashing wire gauge for 288-strand?	2	5	4			
Q6 Brand and spec of 1/4" EHS galvanized strand — can they provide a data sheet?	2	3	4			
4. Engineering, Permitting & Make-Ready Weight: 12%	3.00	2.50	4.75	0.00	0.00	
Q1 Have they done a preliminary survey? Lead time for field engineering?	2	1	5			
Q2 Pole owner identification and experience with Texas utility make-ready coordination.	3	2	5			
Q3 Anticipated permitting and make-ready duration — does it fit the schedule?	3	2	5			
Q4 Stamped engineering drawings if required — PE on staff or under contract?	4	5	4			
Q5 ROW/permit approvals identified and approach to managing the approval process?	N/A	N/A	N/A			
5. Splicing & Termination Weight: 12%	2.75	3.75	4.25	0.00	0.00	
Q1 Anticipated fusion splice count and process to achieve ≤0.1 dB/splice loss.	3	3	4			
Q2 Splicing plan for 288-strand — fiber assignment from Data Center to all endpoints.	2	3	4			
Q3 Plan for future termination locations (Ag Life, Public Defender, Bertram District).	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Q4 Fusion splicer model, calibration status, and who performs splicing.	1	4	4			
Q5 Fiber and panel labeling scheme for accurate as-built documentation.	5	5	5			
6. Testing & Acceptance Weight: 10%	5.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	
Q1 OTDR equipment — capable of 1310 nm and 1550 nm as required?	5	5	5			
Q2 Workflow and timeline to complete 100% testing of all 288 strands.	5	5	5			
Q3 Will the County be able to witness live OTDR testing?	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Q4 Process when a test result fails or exceeds the approved loss budget.	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Q5 Format and organization of delivered OTDR and insertion loss test results.	5	5	5			
7. Documentation & Closeout Weight: 8%	3.75	4.75	4.75	0.00	0.00	
Q1 Sample as-built from a previous project — GIS or CAD capability?	2	5	4			

Q2	Standard splice diagram contents and fiber/tube assignment documentation.	5	5	5			
Q3	How will the complete closeout package be compiled and delivered?	4	4	5			
Q4	Warranty documentation provided and warranty claim handling process.	4	5	5			
8. Project Schedule & Risk Management Weight: 8%		2.25	2.50	4.75	0.00	0.00	
Q1	How do they interpret the 15-calendar-day substantial completion requirement?	2	3	4			
Q2	Detailed project schedule with all RFP milestones provided?	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Q3	Current crew availability and backlog — can they begin immediately upon award?	4	3	5			
Q4	Top three project risks identified and mitigation strategies described.	1	1	5			
Q5	Traffic control plan and familiarity with Burnet County / surrounding area.	2	3	5			
9. Safety & Compliance Weight: 3%		4.00	3.00	2.50	0.00	0.00	
Q1	Current project-specific safety plan available? EMR rate (target <1.0)?	5	3	2			BC Responsibility
Q2	811 utility locate process — who initiates and tracks for this project?	3	3	3			
Q3	Coordination with electric utilities to maintain NESC clearances during work.	N/A	N/A	N/A			
10. Pricing & Commercial Terms Weight: 15% ← LOWEST		1.67	2.67	4.67	0.00	0.00	
Q1	Pricing based on RFP quantities or adjusted? All four segments itemized?	2	2	5			
Q2	Specific exclusions identified that may result in change orders?	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Q3	Material lead times accounted for in schedule (FOSC 450 D6, CCH, strand)?	1	3	4			
Q4	Payment terms and mobilization payment requirements?	2	3	5			
Q5	Change order conditions defined — T&M rates for out-of-scope work?	N/A	N/A	N/A			
WEIGHTED TOTAL SCORE (out of 5.00)		3.37	3.74	4.68	0.00	0.00	Higher = Better Value

BURNET COUNTY — AERIAL FIBER OPTIC INSTALLATION

Best Value Evaluation — Summary Dashboard

Scores pull automatically from the Category Scores tab. The vendor with the highest Weighted Total Score represents the best value. Pricing is weighted at 5% (lowest category).

EVALUATION CATEGORY	Weight	Mears Broadband	uturn Infrastructure	tuommServPros, LLC	Vendor 4 Name	Vendor 5 Name
1. Company Qualifications & Experience	15%	4.40	5.00	5.00	0.00	0.00
2. Scope Understanding & Approach	15%	3.33	2.80	4.80	0.00	0.00
3. Materials & Specified Products	12%	2.83	4.33	4.67	0.00	0.00
4. Engineering, Permitting & Make-Ready	12%	3.00	2.50	4.75	0.00	0.00
5. Splicing & Termination	12%	2.75	3.75	4.25	0.00	0.00
6. Testing & Acceptance	7%	5.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	0.00
7. Documentation & Closeout	3%	3.75	4.75	4.75	0.00	0.00
8. Project Schedule & Risk Management	8%	2.25	2.50	4.75	0.00	0.00
9. Safety & Compliance	1%	4.00	3.00	2.50	0.00	0.00
10. Pricing & Commercial Terms ← Lowest Weighted	15%	1.67	2.67	4.67	0.00	0.00
WEIGHTED TOTAL SCORE (out of 5.00)	100%	3.37	3.74	4.68	0.00	0.00
RANK		3	2	1	4	4

RECOMMENDED VENDOR (Highest Score)	5.00
------------------------------------	------

 NOTE: Pricing & Commercial Terms is intentionally the lowest-weighted category (5%). Best value is determined primarily by technical merit, experience, and execution capability. A vendor with a lower price but significantly lower technical scores may not represent best value.

BURNET COUNTY — AERIAL FIBER OPTIC INSTALLATION			
Vendor Interview — Qualitative Detail Notes			
Record specific vendor responses, red flags, and standout answers here. Reference these notes when finalizing award recommendation.			

CATEGORY	Mears Broadband	Future Infrastruture	CommServPros, LLC
1. Company Qualifications & Experience	Mears has many years of experience	Has many years of experience	CommServPros has many years of experience
2. Scope Understanding & Approach	Did not present a defined approach to the project. The submission was primarily a marketing overview and lacked substantive detail demonstrating an understanding of the RFP or a clear methodology for achieving the project objectives.	Did not represent an understanding of the RFP but was able to provide a "Best and Finally Offer" in which they were able to verify their understanding.	Demonstrated a thorough understanding of the project scope and presented a well-structured, actionable approach to achieving the defined objectives. Their methodology reflects clear alignment with project requirements and indicates a strong capability to execute effectively.
3. Materials & Specified Products	Did not account for the purchase of the fiber outside of the fiber purchased by the county and had a concern of how much time it would take if an order needed to take place	Clarified all material and products was included.	Accounted for the scope of work and explain how their company would address the requirements. Also provided valuable input to some additional additives that would increase the longevity of the install.
4. Engineering, Permitting & Make-Ready	N/A	N/A	N/A
5. Splicing & Termination	No qualified fiber/acrial supervisor was present during the oral presentation to respond to questions.	Demonstrated comprehensive expertise in fiber and splicing topics.	Demonstrated strong expertise in fiber and splicing, responding to all related questions clearly and accurately.
6. Testing & Acceptance	Explained their testing process and associated data documentation.	Outlined their testing and acceptance process, including the method for delivering results and documentation, which provided clear transparency.	Clearly outlined their testing and certification process, including producing and delivering a comprehensive, color-coded data sheet for the project.
7. Documentation & Closeout	Mears made documentation a key part of the presentation	Clearly defined their closeout process and demonstrated the ability to provide deliverables in multiple formats, including ArcGIS, KMZ, and other requested file types.	CommServPros noted that they already maintain an active KMZ file and will supply it at project closeout upon completion.
8. Project Schedule & Risk Management	N/A	30 day window after make ready	21 day window after make ready
9. Safety & Compliance	Mears made safety a priority in the presentation	Met standard safety requirements.	Met standard safety requirements.
10. Pricing & Commercial Terms	I have no confidence in the pricing presented.	Reduced their pricing after incorporating additives, resulting in a total cost that appears low relative to the required scope of work.	Presented the most comprehensive and detailed pricing, with line items that demonstrate a strong understanding of the project scope. However, labor costs appear elevated relative to the required work, resulting in a somewhat higher overall price.