

**E-Rate Response Evaluations for FY2022 - 2023  
USAC Form 470 and DeKalb County School District  
(DCSD) Requirements**

**Executive Summary and Supporting Document**

**E-Rate Project Team:**

**Natalie Terrell, PMO Manager**

**Jimmy Crum, Network Services Manager**

**Manager William Clowers, Sr. Project Manager**

**Cedric Brown, System Engineer**

**Consulting Team: Educational Funding Group, Inc. (EFG)**

## TABLE OF CONTENT

Executive Summary.....	Page 3
Supporting Documents	
Appendix I Evaluation Team’s Credentials.....	Page 4
Appendix II: Evaluation Summaries.....	Page 5
Category 2: Wireless Access Points (APs) .....	Page 5 - 6
Category 2: Internal Connections.....	Page 7
Category 1: SPF Maintenance.....	Page 8
Category 2: Stadiums Fiber.....	Page 9

**E-Rate Response Evaluations for FY2022 – 2023**  
**USAC Form 470 and DeKalb County School District (DCSD) Requirements**  
**Executive Summary**

**Purpose**

The purpose of this evaluation is to request funding from Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC), which manages the contribution of revenue to and distribution of E-Rate funding from the Universal Service Fund. The funding is provided for broadband, Internet access, and internal connections to eligible schools and libraries. DeKalb County School District (DCSD) is eligible for these services. Funding is being requested in two categories:

- Category 1 (includes services needed to support broadband connectivity to schools and libraries) - The district has requested: Self-Provisioned Fiber Maintenance
- Category 2 (includes the internal connections needed for broadband connectivity) - The district has requested: Internal Connections (Cabling) and Wireless Access Points (APs)

**Background and Process**

The evaluation team was made up of five (5) district staff members in the Division of Information and Instructional Technology (DIIT). A (brief) summary of each team member's IT experience and education is in Appendix I, p.4. Form 470, which is the form published by USAC of the district's requirements for each solicitation. The form was written by the district E-Rate consulting team and approved by IT's management staff. It was published on February 17 for 28 days as required by USAC. Evaluations began on Friday, March 18 and completed on Monday, March 21 to meet USAC deadlines for March 22. There were 18 responses for 5 different solicitations in the two categories in the Form 470 requirements. The team reviewed 18 of the 18 responses in 2 days (for 6 hours). Due to the immediate needs of the district, the team made recommendations for 4 of the 16 solicitations for the funding year 2022 - 2023.

**Evaluation Results**

See the results in the evaluation table in Appendix II, pp. 6 - 14.

## Appendix I: Evaluation Team's Credentials

1. Natalie Terrell, IT PMO Manager III
  - a. Role: Evaluation Facilitator – Led the RFP process for most of the IT RFPs for the last 7 years
  - b. Years in IT: 27 Years (technology teacher, trainer, project manager, and IT PMO Manager) with 21 years in DCSD IT and 15 years in the IT PMO
  - c. Education: BBA in Management and MS in Education in Instructional Technology, PMP Certified
2. Jimmy Crum, Information Security Officer
  - a. Role: Team Member – Two years of experience at DCSD evaluating solicitations
  - b. Years in IT: 17.5 years with 2.5 years in DCSD IT with 10 Years as Senior Internet Engineer and 5 Years as Program Director Cybersecurity/Cybersecurity
  - c. Education: MS in Computer Science and CCSENT (Cisco networking) Certified
3. William Clowers, IT Project Manager
  - a. Role: Team Member and Project Manager of all E-Rate Projects
  - b. Years in IT: 31 years with 13 years in DCSD IT PMO
  - c. Education: BEE in Electrical Engineering and Executive MBA, PMP
4. Cedric Brown, Wireless Network Engineer
  - a. Role: Team Member – Secure wireless technologies, internet service operations and managed wi-Fi product development
  - b. Years in IY: 21.5 years as Sr. Director and above within the Internet Service Provider Industry
  - c. Education: BS Dual Degree in Mathematics and Computer Science
5. Educational Funding Group, Inc. (EFG)

This organization was formed in 2004 in Cleveland, Ohio. EFG provides full-service E-rate consulting services to its clients offering comprehensive, personalized services designed to maximize the benefits received from the E-rate program.

  - i. Paul Karas - Founder and President of EFG, has been an E-rate consultant since the inception of the E-rate program and provides high-level solution-based support, as well as extensive technical expertise.
  - ii. Courtney Cikach – Has served as the district's account manager for the past seven years and tends diligently to all the District's E-rate needs.

Appendix II: Evaluation Summaries

<b>VENDOR DECISION/EVALUATION MATRIX</b>				
<b>SCHOOL OR LIBRARY NAME:</b> DeKalb Co. SD		<b>Date: March 18 and 22, 2022</b>		<b>E-rate: 2022-23</b>
			<b>Choose and indicate the service (1 per Matrix):</b>	<b>Int. Connections or MIBS or Basic Maintenance:</b>
<b>Eligible Service:</b>		<b>CATEGORY 2:</b>	→'→'→'→'→'→	<b>Internal Connections (APs)</b>
				<b>SERVICE PROVIDERS</b>
<b>Factors</b>	<b>Total Points Available</b>	<b>VENDOR 1</b>	<b>VENDOR 2</b>	<b>VENDOR 3</b>
		<b>ICN</b>	<b>PCS</b>	<b>Layer 3</b>
		<b>\$3,700,920.00</b>	<b>\$2,784,000.00</b>	<b>\$3,729,571.80</b>
<b>Price</b>	<b>30</b>	25	30	25
<b>Past Experience / Relationship with Respondent</b>	<b>20</b>	20	10	20
<b>Technical Capability, Quality of Work, Ability to Provide Services Purchased / Turnkey Solution, Qualified Personnel</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Comparable Work for Other Applicants</b>	<b>10</b>	10	10	10
<b>Changeover Costs</b>	<b>10</b>	10	0	10
<b>Willingness to invoice via SPI</b>	<b>5</b>	5		5

<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Winning bidder based on most points was: ICN</b>				
<b>NOTES:</b>				
<b>PCS - We will not consider the Extreme; it may be cheaper, the district already has licenses for 6400 devices already installed; All new licenses and infrastructure, training, and operational tools would be required. the cost of these items is prohibited.</b>				

VENDOR DECISION/EVALUATION MATRIX															
SCHOOL OR LIBRARY NAME: DeKalb Co. SD			Date: March 18 - 22, 2022									E-rate: 2022-23			
Eligible Service:		SELF-PROVISIONED NETWORK, including maintenance (MUST ALSO BID LIT AND DARK FIBER ON THE SAME 470 AND PROVE COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF YOUR DECISION OVER THE TIME PERIOD OF YOUR CONTRACT.													
Factors	Total Points Available	Lit Fiber	IA/DTS	IA/DTS	IA/DTS	IA/DTS	IA Only	IA Only	IA/Dark Fiber	IA/Dark Fiber	Dark Fiber	Cost of Equip	Cost of Maint		
		Vendor 1	Vendor 1	Vendor 2	Vendor 3	Vendor 5	Vendor 1	Vendor 2	56 Marietta to AIC	56 Marietta to AIC	Vendor 1				
		Zayo	Zayo	ENA	AT&T	Proficient	Zayo	Cogent	Zayo/Zayo	Cogent/Zayo	Zayo	Layer 3	N/A		
Total Price (MRC)		\$2,725	\$6,578	\$16,400	\$12,139.37	\$16,467.00	\$4,104	\$8,130.00	\$6,704.00	\$10,730.00	\$2,600	\$10,884.49 (Per Location NRC)	N/A		
NOTE: Eligible costs include monthly charges, special construction, installation and activation, modulating electronics and other necessary equipment to make the broadband service functional.							\$6,829	\$10,855							
Bids are necessary for equipment, services, maintenance and operation. Remember to consider the number of years your contract extends so that you can prove the most cost-effective solution.															
Price	25		25	15	20	10	20	15	24	22					
Experience with vendor	20		20	20	20	0	20	20	20	20					
Technical Capability & Quality of work for other districts	20		20	20	20	10	20	20	20	20					
Ability of vendor to provide a complete solution	15		15	15	15	7	15	15	15	15					
Quality of Personnel	10		10	10	10	5	10	10	10	10					
Responsiveness	10		10	10	10	0	10	10	10	10					
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>97</b>					
Winning bidder based on most points was: Zayo															
NOTES:															
1) Cost for Column H = Column C + Column H															
2) Cost for Column I = Column C + Column I															
3) Cost for Column J = Column H + Column L															
4) Cost for Column K = Column I + Column L															

VENDOR DECISION/EVALUATION MATRIX			
SCHOOL OR LIBRARY NAME: DeKalb Co. SD			E-rate: 2022-23
Eligible Service:	Self-Provisioned Network Maintenance		
Factors	Total Points Available	Vendor 1	
<b>Zayo</b>			
Price	30	30	
Experience	25	25	
Product/ Service Features	20	20	
Reliability	20	20	
Local Preference	5	5	
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	
The winning bidder based on the most points was: Zayo			
NOTES:			
1) multi-year relationship			
2) one-respondent, the incumbent			

**BID EVALUATION MATRIX**  
**Dekalb CSD Self-Provisioned Fiber 60 months**  
**03/22/22**  
**E-Rate Funding Year 2022**  
**Eligible Service: Data Transmission Service**

**Halford Stadium**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Total Points Available</b>	<b>Zayo (SP Fiber) 2, 4, or 6 strand</b>	<b>Zayo (DF Fiber) 2, 4, or 6 strand</b>	<b>Zayo lit fiber</b>
Price	30	30	30	25
Responsiveness	20	20	20	20
Reliability	25	25	25	25
Past Experience	25	25	25	25
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>	100	100	100	95
Pricing: Monthly		\$14,160.00	\$14,160.00	\$42,000.00
NRC		\$116,806.68	\$116,806.68	\$116,806.68
Total Fiber		\$130,966.68	\$130,966.68	\$158,806.68
Total Electronics - Layer 3		\$21,768.98	\$21,768.98	\$0.00
Project Total		\$152,735.66	\$152,735.66	\$158,806.68

The winning bidder based on most points was:

SF

Selection team member initials:

Disqualified bidders, if any:

Notes:

**Adams Stadium**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Total Points Available</b>	<b>Zayo (SP Fiber) 2, 4, or 6 strand</b>	<b>Zayo (DF Fiber) 2, 4, or 6 strand</b>	<b>Zayo lit fiber</b>
Price	30	30	30	25
Responsiveness	20	20	20	20
Reliability	25	25	25	25
Past Experience	25	25	25	25

<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>	100	100	100	95
Pricing: Monthly		\$14,160.00	\$14,160.00	\$42,000.00
NRC		\$29,199.96	\$29,199.96	\$29,199.96
Total Fiber		\$43,359.96	\$43,359.96	\$71,199.96
Total Electronics - Layer 3		\$21,768.98	\$21,768.98	\$0.00
Project Total		\$65,128.94	\$65,128.94	\$71,199.96

The winning bidder based on most points was:

SF

Selection team member initials:

Disqualified bidders, if any:

Notes:

**Godfrey Stadium**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Total Points Available</b>	<b>Zayo (SP Fiber) 2, 4, or 6 strand</b>	<b>Zayo (DF Fiber) 2, 4, or 6 strand</b>	<b>Zayo lit fiber</b>
Price	30	30	30	25
Responsiveness	20	20	20	20
Reliability	25	25	25	25
Past Experience	25	25	25	25
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>	100	100	100	95

Pricing: Monthly		\$14,160.00	\$14,160.00	\$42,000.00
NRC		\$33,641.88	\$33,641.88	\$33,641.88
Total Fiber		\$47,801.88	\$47,801.88	\$75,641.88
Total Electronics - Layer 3		\$21,768.98	\$21,768.98	\$0.00
Project Total		\$69,570.86	\$69,570.86	\$75,641.88

The winning bidder based on most points was:

SF

Selection team member initials:

Disqualified bidders, if any:

Notes:

**Avondale Stadium**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Total Points Available</b>	<b>Zayo (SP Fiber) 2, 4, or 6 strand</b>	<b>Zayo (DF Fiber) 2, 4, or 6 strand</b>	<b>Zayo lit fiber</b>
Price	30	30	30	25
Responsiveness	20	20	20	20
Reliability	25	25	25	25
Past Experience	25	25	25	25
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>	100	100	100	95
Pricing: Monthly		\$14,160.00	\$14,160.00	\$42,000.00
NRC		\$63,522.45	\$63,522.45	\$63,522.45
Total Fiber		\$77,682.45	\$77,682.45	\$105,522.45
Total Electronics - Layer 3		\$21,768.98	\$21,768.98	\$0.00
Project Total		\$99,451.43	\$99,451.43	\$105,522.45

The winning bidder based on most points was:

SF

Selection team member initials:

Disqualified bidders, if any:

Notes:

**North Dekalb Stadium**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Total Points Available</b>	<b>Zayo (SP Fiber) 2, 4, or 6 strand</b>	<b>Zayo (DF Fiber) 2, 4, or 6 strand</b>	<b>Zayo lit fiber</b>
Price	30	30	30	25
Responsiveness	20	20	20	20
Reliability	25	25	25	25
Past Experience	25	25	25	25
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>	100	100	100	95
Pricing: Monthly		\$14,160.00	\$14,160.00	\$42,000.00

NRC	\$63,620.09	\$63,620.09	\$63,620.09
Total Fiber	\$77,780.09	\$77,780.09	\$105,620.09
Total Electronics - Layer 3	\$21,768.98	\$21,768.98	\$0.00
Project Total	\$99,549.07	\$99,549.07	\$105,620.09

The winning bidder based on most points was:

SF

Selection team member initials:

Disqualified bidders, if any:

Notes: