

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	5%	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 Infrastructure	CommServPros, LLC	Vendor 4 Name	Vendor 5 Name	
1. Company Qualifications & Experience Weight: 15%		4.00	4.40	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.)?	2	3	5			
Q4	Dedicated Project Manager — who and what is their relevant experience?	3	4	5			
Q5	In-house crews or subcontractors? Subcontractor identity and experience?	5	5	5			
2. Scope Understanding & Approach Weight: 15%		3.00	2.60	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	2	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?	2	3	4			
3. Materials & Specified Products Weight: 12%		2.50	4.00	4.50	0.00	0.00	
Q1	Process for receiving, inspecting, and managing county-furnished fiber cable.	2	3	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	4			
Q5	Pneumatic or hydraulic lashing machine? Lashing wire gauge for 288-strand?	2	4	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%		2.75	2.75	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.	4	3	5			
Q3	Anticipated permitting and make-ready duration — does it fit the schedule?	2	2	5			
Q4	Stamped engineering drawings if required — PE on staff or under contract?	3	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	4.50	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	4			
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	4.00	0.00	0.00	
Q1	Pricing based on RFP quantities or adjusted? All four segments itemized?	2	2	4			
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	4			
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)		3.19	3.61	4.61	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	Meters	Broadband	Infrastructure	Services	Provision	LL Vendor 4 Name	15
1. Company Qualifications & Experience	15%	4.00	4.40	5.00	0.00	#		
2. Scope Understanding & Approach	15%	3.00	2.60	4.80	0.00	#		
3. Materials & Specified Products	12%	2.50	4.00	4.50	0.00	#		
4. Engineering, Permitting & Make-Ready	12%	2.75	2.75	4.75	0.00	#		
5. Splicing & Termination	12%	2.75	3.75	4.25	0.00	#		
6. Testing & Acceptance	7%	5.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	#		
7. Documentation & Closeout	3%	3.75	4.75	4.50	0.00	#		
8. Project Schedule & Risk Management	8%	2.25	2.50	4.75	0.00	#		
9. Safety & Compliance	1%	4.00	3.00	2.50	0.00	#		
10. Pricing & Commercial Terms ← Lowest Weight	15%	1.67	2.67	4.00	0.00	#		
WEIGHTED TOTAL SCORE (out of 5.00)	100%	3.19	3.61	4.61	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 Infrastructure	CommServPros, LLC
1. Company Qualifications & Experience	Mears has many years of experience, stated ran 1728 strand	Future Infrastructure has many years of experience Project running a backbone across all of Austin	CommServPros has many years of experience, currently owns the COTA contracts
2. Scope Understanding & Approach	The submission lacked a clearly defined project approach and read largely as a marketing overview rather than a substantive response to the RFP. They did not demonstrate a sufficient understanding of the project requirements.	Future brought a predetermined engineering approach and route that was not grounded in the evaluation criteria. Their response did not reflect a thorough review of the evaluation questions or scoring framework.	CommServ demonstrated a strong understanding of the project scope and presented a well-structured, actionable methodology aligned with the defined objectives. Their approach reflects clear responsiveness to the project requirements and a solid capability to deliver 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 of BABA needed to take place	Did not account for the purchase of fiber outside of the fiber purchased by the county. Stated lead times for receiving BABA certified cable could be tough.	CommServ clearly addressed the full scope of work and articulated how their team would meet the project requirements. They also provided valuable recommendations for additional measures that would enhance the long-term durability of the installation.
4. Engineering, Permitting & Make-Ready	N/A	N/A	N/A
5. Splicing & Termination	No qualified Fiber/Aerial supervisor was available during the presentation to address questions related to splicing and termination, leaving key technical areas without adequate representation.	Future Infrastructure demonstrated a thorough command of fiber and splicing topics, providing accurate and detailed responses including gauge and model specifications.	CommServPros demonstrated a strong command of fiber and splicing topics, providing clear and accurate responses to all related questions.
6. Testing & Acceptance	Mears walked through a thorough and detailed explanation of their testing process and associated data documentation.	Future Infrastructure clearly outlined their testing and acceptance process, including how results and documentation would be delivered, providing helpful transparency.	CommServPros clearly described their testing and certification process, including the creation and delivery of a comprehensive, color-coded data sheet for the project.
7. Documentation & Closeout	Mears indicated they would provide a comprehensive closeout document upon project completion.	Future Infrastructure outlined their closeout process and demonstrated the capability to deliver documentation in multiple formats, including ArcGIS KMZ or other requested	CommServPros indicated they already maintain a working KMZ file and would provide it upon project closeout and 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	Standard safety criteria met	Standard safety criteria met
10. Pricing & Commercial Terms	The pricing presented by Mears does not inspire confidence, and the defined line items raise concerns regarding their ability to successfully deliver the project	Future Infrastructure reduced their pricing after incorporating additives, resulting in a total that appears low for the required scope of work, though the proposed line items	CommServPros presented the most comprehensively detailed pricing, with line items that reflect a solid understanding of the project scope; however, labor costs appear elevated for the required work, resulting in a somewhat high overall price