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On April 20, 2011, MEL BLOUNT YOUTH HOME filed an Appeal from the USAC’s Administrators denial of funding. Subsequently, the Telecommunications Access Policy Division of the Wireline Competition Bureau released an Order, DA 11-723. The AMENDMENT of the Appeal is indicated below:

Fn “1” previously read:

While the USAC references “cost effective” this necessarily includes “most cost effective” which by definition means a fair and open bid process.

Fn “1” should now read:

While the USAC references “cost effective” this necessarily includes “most cost effective” which by definition means a fair and open bid process. Additionally, “[s]ee 47 C.F.R. § 54.723 (setting forth the Wireline Competition Bureau’s obligation to conduct a de novo review of appeals of decisions made by USAC). Allendale considered five criteria, including cost, which was given the highest weight. In order to break a tie between
two vendors receiving the same rating, however, Allendale re-evaluated the **cost-effectiveness of each vendor’s bid**, which included a review of whether the vendor had knowledge of the district’s network, facilities, staff, and the type of technical support that would be available. See Allendale Request for Review at 2-3. Chesterfield considered 16 criteria, including cost, which was 30 percent of the total evaluation weighting, while the next most heavily weighted factor represented 25 percent. ***Goose Creek evaluated eight criteria. Two criteria, price and long-term costs, related to price and, when combined, had more weight than any other evaluation criteria. ***Richland considered five criteria in its evaluation process, including a cost criterion, which was 25 percent of the total evaluation weighting. ***The next most heavily weighted factor represented 20 percent of the total evaluation weighting. Id. Richland states that it selected the vendor with the highest number of cumulative points. ***.” DA 11-723, Allendale County School District, Cedar Mountain, North Carolina, et al., fn 37, Released: April 21, 2011 [Emphases added]
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