CITY OF OAKLAND

AGENDA REPORT

TO: Office of the City Administrator
ATTN: Dan Lindheim
FROM: Community and Economic Development Agency
DATE: July 14, 2009

RE: **Resolution Awarding A Construction Contract To Mosto Construction, Inc. For The Rehabilitation Of Sanitary Sewers In Jean Street And Santa Clara Avenue And In The Easement Between Hood Street And Malcolm Avenue (Project No. C282892) In Accord With Plans Specifications For The Project And Contractor's Bid In The Amount Of Two Hundred Sixty-One Thousand Four Hundred Thirty-Four Dollars ($261,434.00)**

SUMMARY

A resolution has been prepared awarding a construction contract in the amount of $261,434.00 to Mosto Construction, Inc. for the Rehabilitation of Sanitary Sewers in Jean Street and Santa Clara Avenue and in the Easement Between Hood Street and Malcolm Avenue (Project No. C282892). The work to be completed under this project is part of the City's annual Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation program. The work is located in Council Districts 2 and 7 and as shown in ***Attachment A***.

FISCAL IMPACT

Approval of this resolution will authorize the City Administrator to award a construction contract to Mosto Construction, Inc. in the amount of $261,434.00. Funding for this project is available in

- Sewer Service Fund (3100); Capital project – sanitary sewer design organization (92244); sewers account (57417); Project C282892; $261,434.00.

This project will rehabilitate existing sewer pipes, reduce rain-related sewer overflows, and help reduce the demand for sanitary sewer maintenance.

BACKGROUND

On April 30, 2009, the City Clerk received three bids for this project in the amounts of $261,434.00, $269,030.00 and $295,416.00 as shown in ***Attachment B***. The lowest bidder, Mosto Construction, Inc., is deemed responsive and responsible, and therefore is recommended for the award. The Engineer's estimate for the work is $348,880.00.

Under the proposed contract with Mosto Construction, Inc., LBE/SLBE participation of $261,434.00 (100%) exceeds the City's 20% LBE/SLBE requirement. The contractor shows $2,500.00 (100%) for trucking exceeding the 20% Local Trucking requirement. The contractor received 5% credit for LBE/SLBE preference, or $13,072.00. The contractor is required to have 50% of the work hours performed by Oakland residents, and 50% of all new hires are to be Oakland residents. The LBE/SLBE information has been verified by the Contract Compliance Division of the Department of Contracting and Purchasing, and is shown in ***Attachment C***.

KEY ISSUES AND IMPACTS

Construction is scheduled to begin in August 2009 and should be completed by October 2009. The contract specifies $1,000.00 in liquidated damages per calendar day if the contract is not completed within 40 working days. The project schedule is shown in ***Attachment B***.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In general, the proposed work consists of replacement of 1,916 lineal feet of 8-inch diameter sewer mains by pipe expanding, reconnecting house connection sewers, and other ancillary works as indicated on the plans and specifications.

EVALUATION OF PAST PERFORMANCE

The Contractor Performance Evaluation for Mosto Construction, Inc. from a previously completed project is included as ***Attachment D***.

SUSTAINABLE OPPORTUNITIES

Economic: The contractor is required to have 50% of the work hours performed by Oakland residents, and 50% of all new hires are to be Oakland residents.

Environmental: The replacement of the sanitary sewers will eliminate the possibility of sewer leakage and overflows and thus prevent potential harm to groundwater resources and the bay. The contractor will be required to make every effort to reuse clean fill materials and use recyclable concrete and asphalt products. Best Management Practices for the protection of storm water runoff during construction will be required.

Social Equity: This project is part of the citywide program to eliminate wastewater overflows thereby benefiting all Oakland residents.

DISABILITY AND SENIOR CITIZEN ACCESS

There is no direct impact or benefit to seniors or people with disabilities. During construction, the Contractor will be required to monitor safe access through the construction area.

RECOMMENDATION AND RATIONALE

It is recommended that the construction contract be awarded to Mosto Construction, Inc., the lowest responsive responsible bidder, in the amount of $261,434.00 for the rehabilitation of sanitary sewers in Jean Street and Santa Clara Avenue and in the easement between Hood Street and Malcolm Avenue (Project No. C282892). Mosto Construction, Inc. has met the LBE/SLBE requirements, and there are sufficient funds in the project account.

ACTION REQUESTED OF THE CITY COUNCIL

Staff recommends that the City Council approve the resolution.

Respectfully submitted,

Walter S. Cohen, Director
Community and Economic Development Agency

Reviewed by:
Michael Neary, P.E., Deputy Director,
CEDA, Department of Engineering and Construction

Prepared by:
Allen Law, P.E., Supervising Civil Engineer
Engineering Design & R.O.W. Management Division

APPROVED AND FORWARDED TO
THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE:

Office of the City Administrator

Item: _____
Public Works Committee
July 14, 2009

Attachment A

PLANS FOR THE REHABILITATION OF SANITARY SEWERS IN JEAN STREET AND SANTA CLARA AVENUE AND IN THE EASEMENT BETWEEN HOOD STREET AND MALCOLM AVENUE

CITY PROJECT NO. C282892



LOCATION MAP

NOT TO SCALE

LIMIT OF WORK

Attachment B

The Rehabilitation of Sanitary Sewers in Jean Street and Santa Clara Avenue and in the Easement Between Hood Street and Malcolm Avenue

(Project No. C282892)

List of Bidders

Company	Location	Bid Amount
Mosto Construction Inc.	Oakland	$261,434.00
Pacific Trenchless, Inc.	Oakland	$269,030.00
Andes Construction, Inc.	Oakland	$295,416.00

Project Schedule

ID	Task Name	Start	Finish
1	**Project No. C282892**	**Mon 12/1/08**	**Mon 10/12/09**
2	Pre-Design	Mon 12/1/08	Wed 12/17/08
3	Design	Thu 12/18/08	Tue 3/10/09
4	Bid/Award	Wed 3/11/09	Fri 8/14/09
5	Construction	Mon 8/17/09	Mon 10/12/09



Attachment C

Contract Compliance Review

CITY OF OAKLAND

Memo

Department of Contracting and Purchasing

Social Equity Division

To: Allen Law - Project Manager
From: Sophany Hang - Acting Contract Compliance Officer
Through: Deborah Barnes - DC & P Director
Shelley Darensburg - Sr. Contract Compliance Officer S. Darensburg
CC: Gwen McCormick - Contract Administrator Supervisor
Date: May 28, 2009
Re: C282892- The Rehabilitation of Sanitary Sewers In Jean Street and Santa Clara Avenue and in the Easement Between Hood Street and Malcolm Avenue

The Department of Contracting and Purchasing (DC&P), Division of Social Equity, reviewed three (3) bids in response to the above referenced project. Below is the outcome of the compliance evaluation for the minimum 20% Local and Small Local Business Enterprise (L/SLBE) participation requirement, a preliminary review for compliance with the Equal Benefits Ordinance (EBO), and a brief overview of the lowest responsible bidder's compliance with the 50% Local Employment Program (LEP) and the 15% Oakland Apprenticeship Program on the bidder's most recently completed City of Oakland project.

Responsive		Proposed Participation				Earned Credits and Discounts			Banked Credits Eligibility	EBO Compliant? Y/N
Company Name	Original Bid Amount	Total LBE/SLBE	LBE	SLBE	Trucking	Total Credited participation	Earned Bid Discounts	Adjusted Bid Amount		
Mosto Construction	$261,434	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	5%	$248,362	2%	Y
Pacific Trenchless, Inc.	$282,080	95.07%	0%	95.07%	100%	95.07%	5%	$267,976	2%	Y
Andes Construction	$295,416	100%	1.69%	98.31%	100%	100%	5%	$280,645	2%	Y

Comments: As noted above, all firms met and/or exceeded the minimum 20% Local/Small Local Business Enterprise participation requirement. All firms are EBO compliant.

Non-Responsive		Proposed Participation				Earned Credits and Discounts			Banked Credits Eligibility	EBO Compliant? Y/N
Company Name	Original Bid Amount	Total LBE/SLBE	LBE	SLBE	Trucking	Total Credited participation	Earned Bid Discounts	Adjusted Bid Amount		
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Comments: NA

For Informational Purposes

Listed below is the lowest responsible bidder's compliance with the 50% Local Employment Program (LEP) and the 15% Oakland Apprenticeship Program for the lowest bidder's most recently completed City of Oakland project.

Contractor Name: Mosto Construction
Project Name:
Project No.

50% Local Employment Program (LEP)

Was the 50% LEP Goal achieved?	NA	If no, shortfall hours?	NA
Were all shortfalls satisfied?	NA	If no, penalty amount	NA

15% Oakland Apprenticeship Program

Was the 15% Apprenticeship Goal achieved?	NA	If no, shortfall hours?	NA
Were shortfalls satisfied?	NA	If no, penalty amount	NA

The spreadsheet below provides details of the 50% LEP and 15% Apprenticeship Programs. Information provided includes the following data: A) total project hours, B) core workforce hours deducted, C) LEP project employment and work hour goal; D) LEP employment and work hours achieved; E)# resident new hires; F) shortfall hours; G) percent LEP compliance; H) total apprentice hours; I) apprenticeship goal and hours achieved; and J) Apprentice shortfall hours.

	50% Local Employment Program (LEP)							15% Apprenticeship Program				
Total Project Hours	Core Workforce Hours Deducted	LEP Project Employment and Work Hours Goal		LEP Employment and Work Hours Achieved		# Resident New Hires	Shortfall Hours	% LEP Compliance	Total Apprenticeship Hours	Apprenticeship Goal and Hours		Apprentice Shortfall Hours	
A	*B*	*C*		*D*		*E*	*F*	*G*	*H*	*I*		*J*	
		Goal	Hours	Goal	Hours					Goal	Hours		

Comments: All projects completed by Mosto Construction were less than 30 days; therefore, the LEP and Apprenticeship requirements were not applicable.

Should you have any questions, you may contact Sophany Hang at (510) 238-3723.

DEPARTMENT OF CONTRACTING AND PURCHASING

Social Equity Division

PROJECT EVALUATION FORM

PROJECT NO.: C282892

PROJECT NAME: The Rehabilitation of Sanitary Sewers In Jean Street and Santa Clara Avenue and in the Easement Between Hood Street and Malcolm Avenue

CONTRACTOR: *Mosto Construction*

Engineer's Estimate:	Contractors' Bid Amount	Over/Under Engineer's Estimate
$348,880	$261,434	$87,446
Discounted Bid Amount:	**Amount of Bid Discount**	**Discount Points:**
$248,362	$13,072	5%

1. Did the 20% requirements apply? **YES**

2. Did the contractor meet the 20% requirement? **YES**

   b) % of LBE participation **0%**
   c) % of SLBE participation **100%**

3. Did the contractor meet the Trucking requirement? **NA**

   a) Total SLBE/LBE trucking participation **0%**

4. Did the contractor receive bid discounts? **YES**

   (If yes, list the percentage received) **5%**

5. Additional Comments.

6. Date evaluation completed and returned to Contract Admin./Initiating Dept.

5/28/2009
Date

Reviewing Officer: Stephanie Hom **Date:** 5/28/09

Approved By: Shelley Darensburg **Date:** 5/29/09

LBE/SLBE PARTICIPATION

BIDDER 1

Project Name: The Rehabilitation of Sanitary Sewers In Jean Street and Santa Clara Avenue and in the Easement Between Hood Street and Malcolm Avenue

Project No.: C282892 | **Engineers Est:** 348,880 | **Under/Over Engineers Estimate:** 87,446

Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert. Status	LBE	SLBE	Total LBE/SLBE	L/SLBE Trucking	Total Trucking	TOTAL Dollars	For Tracking Only Ethn.	MBE	WBE
PRIME	Mosto Construction	Oakland	CB		258,934	258,934			258,934	H	258,934	
Trucking	Monroe Trucking	Oakland	CB		2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	AA	2,500	
Project Totals				$0	$261,434	$261,434	$2,500	$2,500	$261,434		$261,434	$0
				0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%	0%

Requirements:
The 20% requirements is a combination of 10% LBE and 10% SLBE participation. An SLBE firm can be counted 100% towards achieving 20% requirements.

LBE 10%	SLBE 10%	TOTAL LBE/SLBE	20% LBE/SLBE TRUCKING

Legend

LBE = Local Business Enterprise
SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise
Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses
NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise
NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Local Business Enterprise
UB = Uncertified Business
CB = Certified Business
MBE = Minority Business Enterprise
WBE = Women Business Enterprise

Ethnicity
AA = African American
AI = Asian Indian
AP = Asian Pacific
C = Caucasian
H = Hispanic
NA = Native American
O = Other
NL = Not Listed
MO = Multiple Ownership

DEPARTMENT OF CONTRACTING AND PURCHASING

Social Equity Division

PROJECT EVALUATION FORM

PROJECT NO.: C282892

PROJECT NAME: The Rehabilitation of Sanitary Sewers In Jean Street and Santa Clara Avenue and in the Easement Between Hood Street and Malcolm Avenue

CONTRACTOR: **Pacific Trenchless**

Engineer's Estimate:	Contractors' Bid Amount	Over/Under Engineer's Estimate
$348,880	$282,080	$66,800
Discounted Bid Amount:	**Amount of Bid Discount**	**Discount Points:**
$267,976	$14,104	5%

1. Did the 20% requirements apply? **YES**

2. Did the contractor meet the 20% requirement? **NO**

   b) % of LBE participation **0%**
   c) % of SLBE participation **95.07%**

3. Did the contractor meet the Trucking requirement? **NA**

   a) Total SLBE/LBE trucking participation **100%**

4. Did the contractor receive bid discounts? **YES**

   (If yes, list the percentage received) **5%**

5. Additional Comments.

6. Date evaluation completed and returned to Contract Admin./Initiating Dept. **5/28/2009** Date

Reviewing Officer: Sophia Hayes **Date:** 5/28/09

Approved By Shelley Darensburg **Date:** 5/29/09

LBE/SLBE PARTICIPATION
BIDDER 2

Project Name: The Rehabilitation of Sanitary Sewers In Jean Street and Santa Clara Avenue and in the Easement Between Hood Street and Malcolm Avenue

Project No.: C282892 | **Engineers Est: 348,880** | **Under/Over Engineers Estimate: 66,800**

Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert. Status	LBE	SLBE	Total LBE/SLBE	L/SLBE Trucking	Total Trucking	TOTAL Dollars	For Tracking Only Ethn.	MBE	WBE
PRIME	Pacific Trenchless	Oakland	CB		266,281	266,281			266,281	C		
Trucking	Williams Trucking	Oakland	CB		1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	AA	1,900	
HDPE Pipe	P& F Distributors	Brisbane	UB						10,099	C		
Manhole Materials	US Concrete	Livermore	UB						3,800	C		
Project Totals				$0	$268,181	$268,181	$1,900	$1,900	$282,080		$1,900	$0
				0%	95.07%	95.07%	100%	100%	100%		0.67%	0%

Requirements:
The 20% requirements is a combination of 10% LBE and 10% SLBE participation. An SLBE firm can be counted 100% towards achieving 20% requirements.

LBE 10%	SLBE 10%	TOTAL LBE/SLBE	20% LBE/SLBE TRUCKING

Legend

- LBE = Local Business Enterprise
- SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise
- Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses
- NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise
- NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Local Business Enterprise
- UB = Uncertified Business
- CB = Certified Business
- MBE = Minority Business Enterprise
- WBE = Women Business Enterprise

Ethnicity

- AA = African American
- AI = Asian Indian
- AP = Asian Pacific
- C = Caucasian
- H = Hispanic
- NA = Native American
- O = Other
- NL = Not Listed
- MO = Multiple Ownership

DEPARTMENT OF CONTRACTING AND PURCHASING

OAKLAND

Social Equity Division

PROJECT EVALUATION FORM

PROJECT NO.: C282892

PROJECT NAME: The Rehabilitation of Sanitary Sewers In Jean Street and Santa Clara Avenue and in the Easement Between Hood Street and Malcolm Avenue

CONTRACTOR: **Andes Construction**

Engineer's Estimate:	Contractors' Bid Amount	Over/Under Engineer's Estimate
$348,880	$295,416	$53,464
Discounted Bid Amount:	**Amount of Bid Discount**	**Discount Points:**
$280,645	$14,771	5%

1. Did the 20% requirements apply? **YES**

2. Did the contractor meet the 20% requirement? **YES**

   b) % of LBE participation **1.69%**
   c) % of SLBE participation **98.31%**

3. Did the contractor meet the Trucking requirement? **NA**

   a) Total SLBE/LBE trucking participation **100%**

4. Did the contractor receive bid discounts? **YES**

   (If yes, list the percentage received) **5%**

5. Additional Comments.

6. Date evaluation completed and returned to Contract Admin./Initiating Dept.

5/28/2009
Date

Reviewing Officer: Soohung Hong **Date:** 5/28/09

Approved By Shelley Darensburg **Date:** 5/29/09

LBE/SLBE PARTICIPATION
BIDDER 3

Project Name: The Rehabilitation of Sanitary Sewers In Jean Street and Santa Clara Avenue and in the Easement Between Hood Street and Malcolm Avenue

Project No.: C282892		Engineers Est: 348,880				Under/Over Engineers Estimate: 53,464						
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert. Status	LBE	SLBE	Total LBE/SLBE	L/SLBE Trucking	Total Trucking	TOTAL Dollars	For Tracking Only Ethn.	MBE	WBE
Prime	Andes Construction	Oakland	CB		285,416	285,416			285,416	H	285,416	
Saw Cutting	Bay Line	Oakland	CB	5,000		5,000			5,000	H	5,000	
Trucking	Irvin Trucking	Oakland	CB		5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	AA	5,000	
Project Totals				$5,000	$290,416	$295,416	$5,000	$5,000	$295,416		$295,416	$0
				1.69%	98.31%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100.00%	0%

Requirements:
The 20% requirements is a combination of 10% LBE and 10% SLBE participation. An SLBE firm can be counted 100% towards achieving 20% requirements.

LBE 10%	SLBE 10%	TOTAL LBE/SLBE	20% LBE/SLBE TRUCKING

Legend

LBE = Local Business Enterprise
SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise
Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses
NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise
NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Local Business Enterprise
UB = Uncertified Business
CB = Certified Business
MBE = Minority Business Enterprise
WBE = Women Business Enterprise

Ethnicity
AA = African American
AI = Asian Indian
AP = Asian Pacific
C = Caucasian
H = Hispanic
NA = Native American
O = Other
NL = Not Listed
MO = Multiple Ownership

Attachment D

Contractor Performance Evaluation

Schedule L-2
City of Oakland
Community & Economic Development Agency
CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Project Number/Title: C282891-The Rehabilitation of Sanitary Sewers in an easement bounded by Glenbrook Drive, Beechwood Drive, and Romany Road.

Work Order Number (if applicable): _____.

Contractor: Mosto Construction.

Date of Notice to Proceed: 10/6/2008.

Date of Notice of Completion: 2/19/2009.

Date of Notice of Final Completion: 2/19/2009.

Contract Amount: $210,850.00.

Evaluator Name and Title: David Ng, Resident Engineer.

The City's Resident Engineer most familiar with the Contractor's performance must complete this evaluation and submit it to Manager, CEDA Project Delivery Division, within 30 calendar days of the issuance of the Final Payment.

Whenever the Resident Engineer finds the Contractor is performing below Satisfactory for any category of the Evaluation, the Resident Engineer shall discuss the perceived performance shortfall at the periodic site meetings with the Contractor. An Interim Evaluation will be performed if at any time the Resident Engineer finds that the overall performance of a Contractor is Marginal or Unsatisfactory. An Interim Evaluation is required prior to issuance of a Final Evaluation Rating of Unsatisfactory. The Final Evaluation upon Final Completion of the project will supersede interim ratings.

The following list provides a basic set of evaluation criteria that will be applicable to all construction projects awarded by the City of Oakland that are greater than $50,000. Narrative responses are required to support any evaluation criteria that are rated as Marginal or Unsatisfactory, and must be attached to this evaluation. If a narrative response is required, indicate before each narrative the number of the question for which the response is being provided. Any available supporting documentation to justify any Marginal or Unsatisfactory ratings must also be attached.

If a criterion is rated Marginal or Unsatisfactory and the rating is caused by the performance of a subcontractor, the narrative will note this. The narrative will also note the General Contractor's effort to improve the subcontractor's performance.

ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES:

Outstanding (3 points)	Performance among the best level of achievement the City has experienced.
Satisfactory (2 points)	Performance met contractual requirements.
Marginal (1 point)	Performance barely met the lower range of the contractual requirements or performance only met contractual requirements after extensive corrective action was taken.
Unsatisfactory (0 points)	Performance did not meet contractual requirements. The contractual performance being assessed reflected serious problems for which corrective actions were ineffective.

WORK PERFORMANCE

		Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Satisfactory	Outstanding	Not Applicable
1	Did the Contractor perform all of the work with acceptable Quality and Workmanship?	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
1a	If problems arose, did the Contractor provide solutions/coordinate with the designers and work proactively with the City to minimize impacts? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment. Provide documentation.	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
2	Was the work performed by the Contractor accurate and complete? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment and provide documentation. Complete (2a) and (2b) below.	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
2a	Were corrections requested? If "Yes", specify the date(s) and reason(s) for the correction(s). Provide documentation.			Yes ☐	No ☐	N/A ☐
2b	If corrections were requested, did the Contractor make the corrections requested? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment. Provide documentation.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	Was the Contractor responsive to City staff's comments and concerns regarding the work performed or the work product delivered? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment. Provide documentation.	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
4	Were there other significant issues related to "Work Performance"? If Yes, explain on the attachment. Provide documentation.				Yes ☐	No X
5	Did the Contractor cooperate with on-site or adjacent tenants, business owners and residents and work in such a manner as to minimize disruptions to the public. If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment.	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
6	Did the personnel assigned by the Contractor have the expertise and skills required to satisfactorily perform under the contract? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment.	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
7	**Overall, how did the Contractor rate on work performance? The score for this category must be consistent with the responses to the questions given above regarding work performance and the assessment guidelines. Check 0, 1, 2, or 3.**	0 ☐	1 ☐	2 X	3 ☐	

TIMELINESS

		Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Satisfactory	Outstanding	Not Applicable
8	Did the Contractor complete the work within the time required by the contract (including time extensions or amendments)? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment why the work was not completed according to schedule. Provide documentation.	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
9	Was the Contractor required to provide a service in accordance with an established schedule (such as for security, maintenance, custodial, etc.)? If "No", or "N/A", go to Question #10. If "Yes", complete (9a) below.			Yes ☐	No X	N/A ☐
9a	Were the services provided within the days and times scheduled? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment and specify the dates the Contractor failed to comply with this requirement (such as tardiness, failure to report, etc.). Provide documentation.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10	Did the Contractor provide timely baseline schedules and revisions to its construction schedule when changes occurred? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment. Provide documentation.	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
11	Did the Contractor furnish submittals in a timely manner to allow review by the City so as to not delay the work? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment. Provide documentation.	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
12	Were there other significant issues related to timeliness? If yes, explain on the attachment. Provide documentation.				Yes ☐	No X
13	**Overall, how did the Contractor rate on timeliness?** **The score for this category must be consistent with the responses to the questions given above regarding timeliness and the assessment guidelines. Check 0, 1, 2, or 3.**	0 ☐	1 ☐	2 X	3 ☐	

FINANCIAL

		Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Satisfactory	Outstanding	Not Applicable
14	Were the Contractor's billings accurate and reflective of the contract payment terms? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment. Provide documentation of occurrences and amounts (such as corrected invoices).	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
15	Were there any claims to increase the contract amount? If "Yes", list the claim amount. Were the Contractor's claims resolved in a manner reasonable to the City? Number of Claims: _____ Claim amounts: $_____ Settlement amount:$_____				Yes ☐	No X
16	Were the Contractor's price quotes for changed or additional work reasonable? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment. Provide documentation of occurrences and amounts (such as corrected price quotes).	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
17	Were there any other significant issues related to financial issues? If Yes, explain on the attachment and provide documentation.				Yes ☐	No X
18	**Overall, how did the Contractor rate on financial issues?** **The score for this category must be consistent with the responses to the questions given above regarding financial issues and the assessment guidelines.** **Check 0, 1, 2, or 3.**	0 ☐	1 ☐	2 X	3 ☐	

COMMUNICATION

		Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Satisfactory	Outstanding	Not Applicable
19	Was the Contractor responsive to the City's questions, requests for proposal, etc.? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment.	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
20	Did the Contractor communicate with City staff clearly and in a timely manner regarding:					
20a	Notification of any significant issues that arose? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment.	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
20b	Staffing issues (changes, replacements, additions, etc.)? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment.	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
20c	Periodic progress reports as required by the contract (both verbal and written)? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment.	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
20d	Were there any billing disputes? If "Yes", explain on the attachment.				Yes ☐	No X
21	Were there any other significant issues related to communication issues? Explain on the attachment. Provide documentation.				Yes ☐	No X
22	**Overall, how did the Contractor rate on communication issues? The score for this category must be consistent with the responses to the questions given above regarding communication issues and the assessment guidelines. Check 0, 1, 2, or 3.**	0 ☐	1 ☐	2 X	3 ☐	

SAFETY

		Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Satisfactory	Outstanding	Not Applicable
23	Did the Contractor's staff consistently wear personal protective equipment as appropriate? If "No", explain on the attachment.				Yes X	No ☐
24	Did the Contractor follow City and OSHA safety standards? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment.	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
25	Was the Contractor warned or cited by OSHA for violations? If Yes, explain on the attachment.				Yes ☐	No X
26	Was there an inordinate number or severity of injuries? Explain on the attachment. If Yes, explain on the attachment.				Yes ☐	No X
27	Was the Contractor officially warned or cited for breach of U.S. Transportation Security Administration's standards or regulations? If "Yes", explain on the attachment.				Yes ☐	No X
28	**Overall, how did the Contractor rate on safety issues? The score for this category must be consistent with the responses to the questions given above regarding safety issues and the assessment guidelines. Check 0, 1, 2, or 3.**	0 ☐	1 ☐	2 X	3 ☐	

OVERALL RATING

Based on the weighting factors below, calculate the Contractor's overall score using the scores from the four categories above.

1. Enter Overall score from Question 7 ____2____ X 0.25 = ____0.5____
2. Enter Overall score from Question 13 ____2____ X 0.25 = ____0.5____
3. Enter Overall score from Question 18 ____2____ X 0.20 = ____0.4____
4. Enter Overall score from Question 22 ____2____ X 0.15 = ____0.3____
5. Enter Overall score from Question 28 ____2____ X 0.15 = ____0.3____

TOTAL SCORE (Sum of 1 through 5): ____2____

OVERALL RATING: __Satisfactory____

Outstanding:	Greater than 2.5
Satisfactory	Greater than 1.5 & less than or equal to 2.5
Marginal:	Between 1.0 & 1.5
Unsatisfactory:	Less than 1.0

PROCEDURE:

The Resident Engineer will prepare the Contractor Performance Evaluation and submit it to the Supervising Civil Engineer. The Supervising Civil Engineer will review the Contractor Performance Evaluation to ensure adequate documentation is included, the Resident Engineer has followed the process correctly, the Contractor Performance Evaluation has been prepared in a fair and unbiased manner, and the ratings assigned by the Resident Engineer are consistent with all other Resident Engineers using consistent performance expectations and similar rating scales.

The Resident Engineer will transmit a copy of the Contractor Performance Evaluation to the Contractor. Overall Ratings of Outstanding or Satisfactory are final and cannot be protested or appealed. If the Overall Rating is Marginal or Unsatisfactory, the Contractor will have 10 calendar days in which they may file a protest of the rating. The Public Works Agency Assistant Director, Design & Construction Services Department, will consider a Contractor's protest and render his/her determination of the validity of the Contractor's protest. If the Overall Rating is Marginal, the Assistant Director's determination will be final and not subject to further appeal. If the Overall Rating is Unsatisfactory and the protest is denied (in whole or in part) by the Assistant Director, the Contractor may appeal the Evaluation to the City Administrator, or his/her designee. The appeal must be filed within 14 calendar days of the Assistant Director's ruling on the protest. The City Administrator, or his/her designee, will hold a hearing with the Contractor within 21 calendar days of the filing of the appeal. The decision of the City Administrator regarding the appeal will be final.

Contractors who receive an Unsatisfactory Overall Rating (i.e., Total Score less than 1.0) will be allowed the option of voluntarily refraining from bidding on any City of Oakland projects within one year from the date of the Unsatisfactory Overall Rating, or of being categorized as non-responsible for any projects the Contractor bids on for a period of one year from the date of the Unsatisfactory Overall Rating. Two Unsatisfactory Overall Ratings within any five year period will result in the Contractor being categorized by the City Administrator as non-

responsible for any bids they submit for future City of Oakland projects within three years of the date of the last Unsatisfactory overall rating.

Any Contractor that receives an Unsatisfactory Overall Rating is required to attend a meeting with the City Administrator, or his/her designee, prior to returning to bidding on City projects. The Contractor is required to demonstrate improvements made in areas deemed Unsatisfactory in prior City of Oakland contracts.

The Public Works Agency Contract Administration Section will retain the final evaluation and any response from the Contractor for a period of five years. The City shall treat the evaluation as confidential, to the extent permitted by law.

COMMUNICATING THE EVALUATION: *The Contractor's Performance Evaluation has been communicated to the Contractor. Signature does not signify consent or agreement.*

Contractor / Date

2/20/2009
Resident Engineer / Date

2/20/09
Supervising Civil Engineer / Date

Approved as to Form and Legality

City Attorney

OAKLAND CITY COUNCIL

RESOLUTION NO._____C.M.S.

Introduced by Councilmember _____

RESOLUTION AWARDING A CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT TO MOSTO CONSTRUCTION, INC. FOR THE REHABILITATION OF SANITARY SEWERS IN JEAN STREET AND SANTA CLARA AVENUE AND IN THE EASEMENT BETWEEN HOOD STREET AND MALCOLM AVENUE (PROJECT NO. C282892) IN ACCORD WITH PLANS SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE PROJECT AND CONTRACTOR'S BID IN THE AMOUNT OF TWO HUNDRED SIXTY-ONE THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED THIRTY-FOUR DOLLARS ($261,434.00)

WHEREAS, on April 30, 2009, three bids were received by the Office of the City Clerk of the City of Oakland for the Rehabilitation of Sanitary Sewers in Jean Street and Santa Clara Avenue and in the Easement Between Hood Street and Malcolm Avenue (Project No. C282892); and

WHEREAS, Mosto Construction, Inc., a certified SLBE bidding as a prime, is deemed the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for the project; and

WHEREAS, there are sufficient funds in the project budget for the work. Funding for this project is available in the following project account:

- Sewer Service Fund (3100); Capital Projects - Sanitary Sewer Design Organization (92244); Sewers Account (57417); Project No. C282892; $261,434.00; and these funds were specifically allocated for this project; this project will help reduce the amount of sanitary sewer maintenance requirement; and

WHEREAS, the City lacks the equipment and qualified personnel to perform the necessary work; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds and determines that the performance of this contract is in the public interest because of economy or better performance; and

WHEREAS, Mosto Construction, Inc. complies with all LBE/SLBE and trucking requirements; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds and determines that the performance of this contract shall not result in the loss of employment or salary by any person having permanent status in the competitive services; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the construction contract for the Rehabilitation of Sanitary Sewers in Jean Street and Santa Clara Avenue and in the Easement Between Hood Street and Malcolm Avenue (Project No. C282892) is hereby awarded to Mosto Construction, Inc. in accordance with plans and specifications for the project and the terms of its bid therefore, dated April 30, 2009, in the amount of Two Hundred Sixty-One Thousand Four Hundred Thirty-Four Dollars ($261,434.00); and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the plans and specifications prepared by the Deputy Director of the Community and Economic Development Agency for this project are hereby approved; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the amount of the bond for faithful performance, $261,434.00, and the amount for a bond to guarantee payment of all claims for labor and materials furnished and for the amount due under the Unemployment Insurance Act, $261,434.00, with respect to such work are hereby approved; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the City Administrator or his designee is hereby authorized to enter into a contract with Mosto Construction, Inc. on behalf of the City of Oakland and to execute any amendments or modifications to said agreement within the limitations of the project specifications; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That all other bids are hereby rejected; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the contract shall be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney for form and legality and placed on file in the Office of the City Clerk; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the City Clerk is hereby directed to post conspicuously forthwith notice of the above award on the official bulletin board in the Office of the City Clerk.

IN COUNCIL, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, _____, 20_____

PASSED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES - BROOKS, DE LA FUENTE, KAPLAN, KERNIGHAN, NADEL, QUAN, REID, and PRESIDENT BRUNNER

NOES -

ABSENT -

ABSTENTION -

ATTEST:_____
LaTonda Simmons
City Clerk and Clerk of the Council
of the City of Oakland, California