CITY OF OAKLAND

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERN

AGENDA REPORT

TEOIDEC Office Hite City Administrator

- ATTN: Dan Lindheim
- FROM: Public Works Agency
- DATE: December 14, 2010
- RE: Resolution Awarding Construction Contracts For As-Needed On-Call Construction Services To Fourteen Pre-Qualified Contractors Shown In Exhibit A For An Amount Not-To-Exceed Two Hundred And Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$250,000.00) Each For Tier I Or \$500,000.00 For Tier II For A Three-Year Period, And Waiving The Advertising Requirements Of Oakland Municipal Code Chapter 2.04 For Specific On-Call Construction Jobs To Be Let To Said Contractors

SUMMARY

Resolutions have been prepared authorizing the City Administrator, or his designee, to award construction contracts for on-call construction work to fourteen contractors. Eleven of these firms are Small Local Business Enterprise (SLBE) companies. The other three firms met the minimum 20% Local and Small Local Business Enterprise (L/SLBE) program participation requirements.

Consistent in part with the "Implement a Small Contracts Rotation Program" recommendation of the Fairness in Purchasing and Contracting Disparity Study report of September 29, 2009, these contractors were solicited through a two-tier Request for Qualifications process. Our initial attempt in August 2010 produced only five responses. In order to establish a large pool of participants, the project was re-advertised in October 2010.

The first tier shown in *Attachment A* targeted qualified contractors that are certified by the City as Small Local Business Enterprise (SLBE) firms. Some of these firms have not worked with the City before as a general, prime contractor. Each Tier 1 contract is for an amount not-to-exceed \$250,000.00 over a three-year period.

The second tier (tier II) shown in *Attachment B* was created and opened to all proposers. Each Tier II contract is for an amount not-to-exceed \$500,000.00 over a three year period. On-call construction work contracts facilitate the delivery of small projects promptly and efficiently, and help to spread the work to small local contractors that do not usually bid on City projects.

These on-call construction services will be utilized for various capital improvement projects within the City's right-of-way and will include work on sidewalks, curb ramps, and sanitary sewer pipes. All contractors will be required to comply with local hire provisions.

So that the work can be awarded to prequalified contractors on a rotating, solicitation basis,

(

the resolution will also waive Oakland Municipal Code Chapter 2.04 open-market advertising and bidding requirements for on-call construction work.

FISCAL IMPACT

When approved, 2 tier I contracts, each in a not-to-exceed amount of \$250,000.00, and 12 tier II contracts, each in a not to exceed amount of \$500,000.00 will be executed for a three year period. The construction services will be funded through appropriations within the various individual projects. Funds are available for construction of sidewalk and curb ramp in the following projects:

- Measure B- ACTIA Fund (2211), Capital Projects- Sidewalk Repair Maintenance
- . Organization (92242), Street Construction Account 57411, Project No. C370610, \$1,044,080.00
- Measure B- ACTIA Fund (2211), Capital Projects- Sidewalk Repair Maintenance Organization (92242), Street Construction Account 57411, Project No. C370510, \$1,056,000.00
- Measure B- Bicycle/Pedestrian Pass-Thru Fund (2212), Capital Projects- Sidewalk Repair Maintenance Organization (92242), Street Construction Account 57411, Project No. C370510, \$425,000.00.

The available \$2,525,080.00 will be spent in 2011; any remainder work will be performed as funding becomes available in the following years. The approval of these contracts will not result in any additional appropriation of funds.

Additionally, these contracts will be used to repair private sidewalk damage when the responsible property owners fail to do so. Funding for the private damage repairs are provided by the Sidewalk Repair Revolving Fund. Costs incurred by the City are recouped through a notification and lien process. The current balance of the revolving fund is approximately \$280,000.00 in Project 5510.92452.C269180.

BACKGROUND

The City's Fairness in Purchasing and Contracting Disparity Study report of September 29, 2009, provides recommendations on how to increase and support the hiring of small local businesses. One of the recommendations, to implement a small contracts rotation program, involves establishing a program or process for small, local construction-licensed contractors to undertake some of the City's routine maintenance and repair work that is more streamlined, expeditious and less costly. The proposed contracts are in support of this concept. The City issued a two-tier Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for on-call construction services with the expressed goal of enhancing contracting opportunities for qualified Oakland contractors meeting the definition of a Small Local Business Enterprise (SLBE) in August 2010 and October 2010.

The on-call work will involve various small capital improvement projects within the City's rightof-way, including streets and sidewalks, curb and gutter, and sanitary sewers. The RFQ targeted general contractors possessing either a current "A" or "C42" or "C8" type contractor license. Contractors with Class A license can perform general engineering and construction work including, but not limited to street, sewer, sidewalk, curb ramp and other infrastructure improvements within the public right-of-way; class C42 contractors will be utilized to perform sanitary sewer lateral work while contractors with C8 can perform concrete work. Our initial attempt in August 2010 produced only five responses. In order to nurture and encourage new small local general contractors to bid on City projects, staff re-advertised the project and reached out to small local business enterprise firms by telephone and email to offer assistance with completing the submittal package. Nine additional firms responded on time to the RFQ from the re-advertisement, resulting in a total of fourteen responses. Reviews of the proposals indicate that all fourteen contractors are qualified to perform on different aspects of the work based on their licenses. The names of the fourteen contractors are shown on the compliance evaluations as *Attachments A* and *B*.

Upon execution of the on-call contracts and as work arises, staff will award on-call work through a rotating solicitation process with the contractors. The \$2,525,080.00 is the amount available for the immediate work.

Three informational attachments are provided with this report. Attachments A and B provide summaries of compliance evaluation of all the contractors. Attachment C provides a summary background on sidewalk conditions in Oakland; facts about the sidewalk program and sidewalk frequently asked questions.

KEY ISSUES AND IMPACTS

Small, local contractors and the City will benefit from utilizing on-call contracts to award work to a prequalified contractor pool instead of open-market advertising and bidding. Projects with limited scope and budget, or urgent, unplanned projects will occur throughout the three-year period and will most likely require use of the on-call construction contracts. In addition to making it far easier and expeditious for the prequalified contractors to bid on City work, the oncall construction contracts enable the City to promptly respond to and provide the construction work in an efficient and timely manner. The contracts will eliminate the lengthy process and costs associated with formally bidding and awarding projects on an individual project-by-project basis.

Compliance evaluations of the qualifications submitted by the fourteen contractors are provided in *Attachments A* and B.

Additionally, these contracts will be used to repair private sidewalk damage when the responsible property owners fail to do so. In FY 2009-10, a total of 103 private sidewalks damage locations were repaired. The property owners voluntarily repaired 96 locations while seven locations were repaired using the Sidewalk Repair Revolving Fund. This Fund was

established by the City Council in 2008. Costs of private damage repairs incurred by the City are recouped through notification and lien process.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In general, the proposed work consists of installing or retrofitting curb ramps, removing/replacing lineal feet of curb and gutter, driveway, sidewalk, repairing private sewer laterals and sewer main and other ancillary works as indicated on the plans and specifications.

EVALUATION OF PAST PERFORMANCE

Some contractors have not performed work in the City of Oakland as a general, prime contractor. Staff will evaluate the performance at the end of each project. AJW Construction and Rosas Brothers Construction are working on current sidewalk and curb ramp contracts and their work appear to be satisfactory. Performance Evaluations for Mosto Construction and Andes Construction are included as *Attachment D* and *Attachment E*.

SUSTAINABLE OPPORTUNITIES

Economic: The proposed on-call contracts will generate business tax, sales tax, and other revenues for the City by those firms who work on the project. These contracts specifically target small local businesses in an effort to spend local dollars locally.

Environmental: Environmental factors and opportunities will be considered and incorporated to the extent feasible in terms of specifying recycled materials and integrating other environmental opportunities for waste reduction and energy conservation. Contractors will be required to comply with the City's waste reduction and recycling policies for construction debris.

Social Equity: The proposed on-call construction services will facilitate implementation of capital improvements that have the potential to reduce blight to neighborhoods and enhance various neighborhoods throughout Oakland.

DISABILITY AND SENIOR CITIZEN ACCESS

The capital improvements performed by the on-call contractors will be designed to comply with applicable accessibility codes and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

RECOMMENDATION AND RATIONALE

On-call construction services contracts will expedite the implementation of capital improvement projects. The administrative burden and cost currently expended to formally bid and award projects to contractors on a project-by-project basis will be reduced. In addition, these contracts enhance the contracting opportunities for certified SLBE firms.

It is recommended that the City Administrator, or designee, award fourteen construction contracts for on-call construction services. Each Tier 1 contract is for an amount not-to-exceed \$250,000.00 and Tier 2 contract is in an amount not to exceed \$500,000.00. It is also recommended that the City Council waive Oakland Municipal Code (OMC) Chapter 2.04 open-market advertising and bidding requirements for construction work to be awarded under the on-call contracts.

ACTION REQUESTED OF THE CITY COUNCIL

Staff recommends that the City Council approve the resolutions.

Respectfully submitted,

Utul 3 A

Vitaly Troyan, P.E., Interim Director Public Works Agency

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

Prepared by: Marcel Uzegbu, P.E, Supervising Civil Engineer Right-of-Way Management Department of Engineering and Construction

APPROVED AND FORWARDED TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE:

Office of the City Administrator

Memo



Department of Contracting and Purchasing Social Equity Division

To:	Marcel Uzegbu, Project Manager
From:	Sophany Hang, Acting Contract Compliance Officer
Through:	Shelley Darensburg, Sr. Contract Compliance Officer 3, Darensburg
CC:	Deborah Bames, Director, DC&P
	Gwen McCormick, Contract Administration Supervisor
Date:	November 17, 2010
Re:	Request For Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-
	Tier I

The Department of Contracting and Purchasing (DCP), Division of Social Equity, reviewed two (2) proposals in response to the above RFQ. The RFQ was limited to certified Small Local Business Enterprises (SLBE). Below is the outcome of the compliance evaluation for the minimum 20% Local and Small Local Business Enterprise (L/SLBE) participation requirement, and a preliminary review for compliance with the Equal Benefits Ordinance (EBO).

Responsive			Propos	Earned and Dis		igibility	۲/N			
Company Name	Original Bid Amount	Total LBE/ SLBE	อยา	SUNE	Trucking	Total Credited participation	Earned Bid Discounts	Adjusted Bid Amount	Banked Credits Eligibi	EBO Compliant? Y/
Yes Construction Group Inc.	NA	55%	10%	45%	NA	55%	5 points	NA	0 points	Y
Peters Construction	NA	100%	0%	100%	NA	100%	5 points	NA	2 points	Y

<u>Comments:</u> As noted above, both firms met and/or exceeded the minimum 20% L/SLBE participation requirement. Both firms are EBO compliant.

Non-Respons	ive		Proposed	Participatio	n	Earned C	credits and	d Discounts]	1
Company Name	Original Bid Amount	Total LBE/SLBE	LBE	SLBE	Trucking	Total Credited participation	Earned Bid Discounts	Adjusted Bid Amount	Banked Credits Eligibility	EBO Compliant? Y/N
.NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Comments: NA

Should you have any questions you may contact Sophany Hang at (510) 238-3970.



Social Equity Division

PROJECT COMPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR : Project No.

<u>NSUL</u>	<u>TANT/CONTRACTOR:</u> Engineer's Estimate: NA	Yes Construction Contractors' NA		<u>Over/Under</u> NA	· · · ·	
	Bid discounted am N/A	5	eference Points:			
	1. Did the 20% local/small loc	al requirement apply		YES	·	
	2. Did the contractor meet th	e 20% requirement a) % of LBE	-	YES	•.	
	• • •	b) % of SLBE	<u>55%</u>			
	5. Additional Comments.					ð
	6. Date evaluation completed	and returned to Con	tract Admin./Initiati	ng Dept.		
	•	11/9/201 Date	0			
iewin ficer:	Sophanez Her	5	Date:	9/10		
roved	By: Shellow Qares	string	<u>Date: </u>	9/10		

LBE/SLBE Participation

Yes Construction Group Inc. Project Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier I and Tier II Name:

Project No.:	•````````	Engineer's E	stimate			Under/Over	Engineers Estimate:	4		
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert.	LBE	SLBE	Total	Total	For	Tracking	Only
			Status			LBE/SLBE %	Percentages	Ethn	MBE	WBE
PRIME	Yes Construction Group Inc.	Oakaind	CB		45%	45%	45%	AP	45%	
Plumbing & Electrical	American Emperor	Oakaind	СВ	10%		. 10%	10%	AP		
Trucking	A & J Trucking	Oakaind	UB	1			. 15%			
Concrete	Right Away	OakaInd	UB	[· .	30%			-
			-	1		· . ·				
				40.84	4504					
	Project	Totals		10%	45%	55%	100%		45%	0%
participation.	rents: irrements is a combination of 10% L An SLBE firm can be counted 1009		BE ing 20%	LBE 10%	SLBE 10%	TRUCKING 20%		Ethnicity AA = African / A = Asian		·
requirements.	and the second	MALL COLOR						C = Caucasia	In	
								H = Hispanic		
Legend	LBE = Local Business Enterprise				UB = Uncertified B			NA = Native A	American	
	SLBE = Small Local Business Enterpri				CB = Certified Bus	•		0 = Other		
	Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local a		inesses .			Business Enterprise		NL = Not List	ed	
	NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business En NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Local Busin	•			WBF = Mowen	Business Enterprise				



Social Equity Division

PROJECT COMPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR : Project No.

RE: Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier I

CONSULTANT/CONTRACTOR:Peters ConstructionEngineer's Estimate:Contractors' Bid AmountNANA	<u>Over/Under Engineer's</u> NA
Bid discounted amount: Discount/Preference Point N/A 5	
1. Did the 20% local/small local requirement apply:	YES
 2. Did the contractor meet the 20% requirement a) % of LBE b) % of SLBE 	YES
Υ	
3. Did the contractor receive bid discount/preference point \underline{YES}	
(If yes, list the points receivec	5 points
5. Additional Comments.	
6. Date evaluation completed and returned to Contract Admin./Init	iating Dept.
11/9/2010 Date	
<u>Reviewin</u> <u>g Officer:</u> Sphang Hug <u>Date:</u> 11 Approved <u>By: Shollowy Darensburg</u> <u>Date:</u> 11	19/10 19/10

LBE/SLBE Participation Peters Construction

Project Name: Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier I

	<u> </u>		· · · · ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		l		
Project No.	:	Engineer's Es	stimate			Under/Over E	ngineers Estimate:			
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert.	LBE	SLBE	· Total	Total	For	Tracking	Only
			Status		•	LBE/SLBE %	Percentages	Ethn.	MBE	WBE
PRIME	Peters Construction	Oakalnd	CB		100%	100%	100%	С	100%	
Landscaping	Green Acres Landscaping and Maintenance, Inc.	OakaInd	СВ				TBD	н		
Trucking	Camese Transportation	OakaInd	UB				TBD	AA		
Engineering	Seri Ngernwattana	Hayward	UB				TBD	AP		
			•	·						
	Projec	t Totals		0%	100%	100%	100%		100%	0%
participation. A requirements.	ents: rements is a combination of 10% n SLBE firm can be counted 100	% towards achievi	ng 20%	LBE-10%	SUBE 10%	TRUCKING 20%		Ethnicity AA = African A = Asian C = Caucasia	American	
				<u></u>				H = Hispanic	:	
Legend	LBE = Local Business Enterprise				UB = Uncertified	Business		NA = Native	American	
	SLBE = Small Local Business Enter	orise			CB = Certified B	usiness	·	O = Other		
	Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Local Bu	Enterprise	sinesses 			ty Business Entern In Business Enterp		NL = Not Lis	ted	•

Revised 11/10/10

Мето

ATTACHMENT B



Department of Contracting and Purchasing Social Equity Division

Ţo:	Marcel Uzegbu, Project Manager
From:	Sophany Hang, Acting Contract Compliance Officer
Through:	Shelley Darensburg, Sr. Contract Compliance Officer
CC:	Deborah Barnes, Director, DC&P
	Gwen McCormick, Contract Administration Supervisor
Date:	November 10, 2010
Re:	Request For Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-
	Tier II

Department of Contracting and Purchasing (DCP), Division of Social Equity, reviewed twelve (12) proposals. Below is the outcome of the compliance evaluation for the minimum 20% Local and Small Local Business Enterprise (L/SLBE) participation requirement, and a preliminary review for compliance with the Equal Benefits Ordinance (EBO).

Responsive	,	T	Propos	ed Particip	ation			Credits	bility	z
Company Name	Original Bid Amount	Tolal LBE/ SLBE	TBE	SLBE .	Trucking	Total Credited participation	Earned Bid Discounts	Adjusted Bid Amount	Banked Credits Eligibility	EBO Compliant? Y/N
Andes Construction, Inc.	NA	100%	30%	50%	NA	80%	5 points	NA	2 points	Y
B Side Inc.	NA	100%	0%	100%	NA	100%	5 points	NA	2 points	Y
Beliveaue Engineering Contractors Inc.	NA	100%	0%	100%	NA · ·	100%	5 points	NA	2 points	Y
AJW Construction	. NA	100%	- 0%	100%	NA	100%	5 points	NA	2 points	Y
Pipe Spy Inc.	NA	100%	0%	100%	NA	100%	5 points	ŇĂ	2 points	• Y
Rosas Brothers Construction Inc.	NA	100%	0%	100%	NA	100%	5 points	NA	2 points	Y
Mosto Construction	NA	100%	0%	100%	, NA	20%	5 points	NA	2 points	Y
CAS Financial & Construction Services	NA	62%	16%	46%	NA	62%	5 points	NA	1 points	Y
Ghilotti Bros., Inc.	NA	20%	5%	15%	NA	20%	2 points	NA ,	0 points	Y
Magdave Associates Inc.	NA	20%	0%	20%	NA	20%	2 points	NA	0 points	Y
The Plumbing Ministry	NA	20%	0%	20%	NA	20%	2 points	NA N.	0 points	N
Malachi Paving & Grading, Inc.	NA	20%	0%	20%	NA	20%	2 points	NA	0 points	Y

<u>Comments</u>: As noted above, all firms met and/or exceeded the minimum 20% L/SLBE participation requirement. All firms are EBO compliant except The Plumbing Ministry. They have to come into compliance prior to full contract execution.

Page 2

Non-Responsi	ve		Proposed	Participatio	n	Earned (credits and	Discounts		
Company Name	Original Bid Amount	Total LBE/SLBE	LBE	SLBE	Trucking	Total Credited participation	Earned Bid Discounts	Adjusted Bid Amount	Banked Credits Eligibility	EBO Compliant? Y.N
.NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Comments: NA

Should you have any questions you may contact Sophany Hang at (510) 238-3970.



Social Equity Division

PROJECT COMPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR :

Project No.

RE:

Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II

CONSULTANT/CONTRACTOR: Andes Construction, Inc.

	Engineer's Estimate: NA	Contractors' Bid Amou NA	<u>unt</u>	<u>Over/Unde</u> Estimate	er Engineer's NA	•	-
	Bid discounted amount: N/A	5			BCIKING NAME OF A POINT OF A	New York Parton	.,,
	1. Did the 20% local/small lo	· ·	· · · · ·	YES	······································		
	 Did the contractor meet the a) % of particip 	f LBE	<u>30%</u>	YES			
· .	b) % of particip		<u>50%</u>	· · ·			
		· ·			. <i>.</i>		
	3. Did the contractor receive	bid discount/preference p	ooints? <u>YE</u>	<u>8</u>	:		
	(If yes, list the poin	ts received)	5	i points			
	5. Additional Comments.						×
		·		. '	N		
1	6. Date evaluation completed	and returned to Contrac	t Admin./Initia	ating Dept.		`	

 International
 International

 Reviewing Officer:
 Solution of the provided by:
 Date:
 Il 19/2010

 Date:
 Date:
 Il 19/2010

 Date:
 Date:
 Il 19/2010

LBE/SLBE Participation Andes Construction, Inc.

Project No.	:	Engineer's Es	timate			Under/Over Engi	ineers Estimate:	•		
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert. Status	LBE	SLBE	Total LBE/SLBE %	Total Percentages		racking (MBE	Dnly 😳
PRIME	Andes Construction, Inc.	Oakland	СВ		20%	20%	20%	н	20%	
Concrete	Rosa's Brothers	Oakland	СВ		10%	10%	10%	Н	10%	
Paving	Gallagher & Burk	Oakland	СВ	10%		10%	10%	С		
Gen.Building Saw Cut	J.C. Framing Bay Line	San Leandro Oakland	UB CB	10%		10%	10% 10%	н	10% 10%	
Electrical Landscape Sewer Trucking	Ray's Electric RMT Landscape Mosto Construction Foston Trucking	Oakland Oakland Oakland San Leandro	CB CB CB UB	10%	10% 10%	10% 10% 10%	10% 10% 10% 10%	H H	10% 10% 10%	
	Projec	t Totals		30%	50%	80%	100%		 80%	0%
	nts: ments is a combination of 10% SLBE firm can be counted 100			 LBE 10%	SLBE 10%	TRUCKING 20%		Ethnicity AA = African Ame A = Asian C = Caucasian	nican	
Legend	LBE = Local Business Enterprise SLBE = Small Local Business En Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Lo NPLBE = NonProfit Local Busine NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Local	terprise ocal and Small Local ss Enterprise	÷.		-			H = Hispanic NA = Native Amer O = Other NL = Not Listed	ican	

.'



Social Equity Division

PROJECT COMPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR : Project No.

RE: Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II

<u>CONSULTAI</u>	NT/CONTRACTOR: Engineer's Estimate: NA	Magdave Associates, In <u>Contractors' Bid</u> NA		<u>der Engineer's</u> NA
1915 TH TH & F STOCIMUE TO LOUGH A 29 1944 TO LOUGH A	Bid discounted N/A	4	eference Points:	
	1. Did the 20% local/sma	all local requirement apply:	YES	
	2. Did the contractor me	aet the 20% requirement a) % of LBE b) % of SLBE	YES <u>40%</u>	•
		eive bid discount/preference		
	(If yes, list 5. Additional Comments	the points received)	4 points	
	6. Date evaluation comp	ieted and returned to Contrac 11/9/2010 Date		
Reviewing Officer:	Suphany of	torg	Date: 119/10	
Approved By:	NO 1001 00	<u>urenouring</u>	<u>Date: [[]4]]D</u>	

LBE/SLBE Participation Magdave Associates Inc.

Magdave Associates Inc. Project Name: Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II

Project No.	:	Engineer's I	Estimate				lineers Estimate:			
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert.	LBE	SLBE	Total	Total	For	Iracking	Only
			Status			LBE/SLBE %	Percentages	Ethn,	MBE	WBE.
PRIME	Magdave Associates Inc.	OakaInd	UB				60%	AA	60%	
Gen.Engrg	Rosas Construction	OakaInd	СВ		20%	20%	20%	Н	20%	
Trucking	CJC Trucking	Oakalnd	СВ		20%	20%	20%	AA	20%	
	Project	Totals	L	0%	40%	40%	100%	· · · ·	100%	0%
participation. A 20% requirement	rements is a combination of 10% n SLBE firm can be counted 100	0% towards achie	eving	11BE 10%	SLEE 10%	TRUCKING 20%		Ethnicity AA = African A = Asian C = Caucasia	American	
Legend	LBE = Local Business Enterprise SLBE = Small Local Business Ente Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Loc NPLBE = NonProfit Local Businese NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Local B	erprise al and Small Local s Enterprise	Businesses		-	siness		H = Hispanic NA = Native / O = Other NL = Not List	American	-

C___



Social Equity Division

PROJECT COMPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR : Project No.

RE: Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II

<u>CONSU</u>	LTANT/CONTRACTOR:	Beliveau Engineering	Contractors Inc.		
	Engineer's Estimate:	Contractors'	Bid Amount	Over/Under Engi	ineer's
•	· NA	NA	· .	NA	
	Bid discount	ed amount: Discount/Pr	eference Points:	• .	
	. N/A	5			
-3854566667584C-855	nesen and an		ት አስር ተሳማ የአለት እና ይገኛ በት አመራ የአለ ብት በ	- 15-7 1 FT 10-1 PRO 6 - 11790 (2)-110	NEW CONTRACTOR
• .	1. Did the 20% local/small loca	al requirement apply:	,	YES	•
	2. Did the contractor meet the	20% requirement		YES	
••		a) % of LBE		·	
		b) % of SLBE	<u>100%</u>	•	
					,
•	· · ·			•	
	3. Did the contractor receive b	id discount/preference poin	its? <u>YES</u>	•	
	, (If ves. li	st the points received)	5	i points	
	5. Additional Comments.				
	6. Date evaluation completed a	and returned to Contract Ac	imin./Initiating Dep	t.	
	·	11/9/201	10		
		Date			
			•		
<u>Reviewin</u> g Officer:	Sopher H	u p	Date: 11 9	110	
Approved	By: Shollow Qa	renstring	Date: 119	10	

LBE/SLBE Participation

Project Name: Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier I and Tier II

Project No.: Engineer's Estimate			• •	Under/Over E	ngineers Estimate:			.		
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert.	LBE	SLBE	Total	Total	Fo	r Tracking	Only
		1	Status			LBE/SLBE %	Percentages	Ethn	MBE	WBE
PRIME	Beliveau Engineering Contractors Inc.	OakaInd	СВ		98%	98%	98%	С		
Trucking	Williams Trucking	OakaInd	СВ		2%	2%	2%	AA	2%	
	• •					· · ·				
							•	 -		
								, ,	╏──────┤	
Project Totals		·	0%	100%	100%	100%		2%	0%	
	Flojeci	101015								
Requirem	ents: ements is a combination of 10%		LBE					Ethnicity AA = African		
participation. An requirements.	n SLBE firm can be counted 10	0% towards achie	eving 20%	LBE 10%5	SLBE(10%	TRUCKING		A = Asian		
· ·	and match in the contract and contract and and and a state	-	27) AS #24000 AL					C = Caucasi	an .	
								H = Hispanic	;	
Legend	LBE = Local Business Enterpris				UB = Uncertified B			NA = Native American		
	SLBE = Small Local Business E Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified I	•	d Bueinesse		CB = Certified Busi	ness Business Enterp	dee.	O = Other NL = Not Lis	1	
	NPLBE = NonProfil Local Busin		n Dažniesses	•	•	Business Enterpr		INE - MOLLES	ted.	
	NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Loca	•	20			Pasiness cureth				

Social Equity Division

PROJECT COMPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR :

Project No.

ŕ

RE:

Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II

CONSULTAN	NT/CONTRACTOR: B Side Inc. Engineer's Estimate: Contractors' Bid Amount NA NA	<u>Over/Under Engineer's</u> <u>Estimate</u> NA
1 17777-010-0010-200-200-0413-0400-040	Bid discounted amount: Discount/Preference Po	
	1. Did the 20% local/small local requirement apply: /	YES
	 Did the contractor meet the 20% requirement a) % of LBE 0% participation 	YES
· .	b) % of SLBE <u>100%</u> participation	
		•
	3. Did the contractor receive bid discount/preference points? \underline{Y}	ES
	(If yes, list the points received)	5 points
	5. Additional Comments.	
,)	
· ·	6. Date evaluation completed and returned to Contract Admin./initia	ting Dept
•	11/9/2010	
Reviewing Officer:	Date Date Date:	11/9/10
Approved By:	Shellow Qarenstring Date:	11/4/10
х. 	· · · ·	



Over/Under

Engineer's Estimate

Social Equity Division

PROJECT COMPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR : Project No.

RE:

Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II

CONSULTANT/CONTRACTOR: The Plumbing Ministry

Engineer's Estimate: Contractors' Bid Amount

	NA	NA .	•	NA	
See Lonissin waterbare	Bid discounted amount: N/A	Discount/Prefere 2		88320°-20°-20°-20°-20°-20°-20°-20°-20°-20°-	2000
	1. Did the 20% local/small local requ	irement apply:	YES	3	
	 Did the contractor meet the 20% r a) % of LBE b) % of SLBi 	-	YES <u>20%</u>	5	
				.* •	
	3. Did the contractor receive bid disc	ount/preference p	oints? <u>YES</u>		
-	(If yes, list the points re	eceiv_	2 poir	nts	•
	5. Additional Comments.				

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

11/9/2010 Date

Reviewing Officer: Approved By:

Date: Date:

LBE/SLBE Participation

The Plumbing Ministry
Project Name: Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II

Project No		Engineer's l	Estimate			Under/Over E	Ingineers Estimate:	· ·		,
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert.	LBE	SĻBE	Total	Total	For Tracking Only		
:			Status			LBE/SLBE %	Percentages	Ethn.	MBE	WBE
PRIME	The Plumbing Ministry	Dakaling	UB				80%	AA	80%	
Contractor	Chapple Building Construction, Inc.	Øakalnt)	СВ		20%	20%	. 20%	. NL		
						· · · ·				
	Project	Totals		0%	20%	20%	100%	 	80%	0%
participation. An SLE requirements.	S: Its is a combination of 10% LBE E firm can be counted 100% to	wards achieving	20%	LBE 10%	SLBE 10%	TRUCKING 20%		Ethnicity AA = African A A = Asian C = Caucasian		
Legend	LBE = Local Business Enterprise SLBE = Small Local Business En Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Lo NPLBE = NonProfit Local Busine NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Local	ferpri se Ical and Small Loc ss Enterprise	al Businesse	es			•	H = Hispanic NA = Native A O = Other NL = Not Liste	•	



Social Equity Division	Π
------------------------	---

PROJECT COMPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR : Project No.

RE:

J

Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II

...

CONSULTANT/CONTRACTOR:	Mosto Construction

Engineer's Estimate: 0 NA	Contractors' Bid Amount NA	<u>Over/Under Engineer's</u> NA		
Bid discounted amount: N/A	Discount/Preference Point		*##%%%%##214#="+##	
1. Did the 20% local/small local requ	irement apply:	YES		
 Did the contractor meet the 20% r a) % o b) % o 		YES		
3. Did the contractor receive bid disc	count/preference point YES			
(if yes, list the point	ts receivec_	5 points		
5. Additional Comments.				
6. Date evaluation completed and ret	turned to Contract Admin./Initi	ating Dept.	· · ·	
	11/9/2010			
-	Date		•	

<u>Reviewing</u> Officer:	Suppor	1 Hung	Date:	1191
Approved By:	Shellory	Carensbring.	<u>Date:</u>	11/9/10

LBE/SLBE Participation Mosto Construction

Project Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services- Tier II Name:

Project No.	:	Engineer's E	stimate	· · ·		Under/Over Eng	ineers Estimate:	•		,
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert.	LBE	SLBE	Total	Total	For	Fracking	Only
			Status			LBE/SLBE %	Percentages	Sibn.	MBE	WBE
PRIME	Mosto Constructon	OakaInd	СВ		100%	100%	100%	Н	100%	
Trucking	Monroe Trucking	OakaInd	СВ		`.		TBD	AA		
				t						
						•				
				· · ·		· .				
	Project	Totals		0%	100%	100%	100%		100%	0%
	rements is a combination of tion. An SLBE firm can be			LBE 10%	-SUBE, 10%5	TRUGKING 20%		Ethnicity AA = African A = Asian C = Caucasi	American	
Legend	LBE = Local Business Enter SLBE = Small Local Busines Total LBE/SLBE = All Certific NPLBE = NonProfit Local Bu NPSLBE = NonProfit Small L	prise s Enterprise ed Local and Small Isiness Enterprise	Local Busine	sses		······································		H = Hispanic NA = Native O = Other NL = Not Lis	American	•



Social Equity Division

PROJECT COMPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR : Project No.

RE: Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II

CONSULTA	NT/CONTRACTOR: CAS Financial & Construction Service	
	Engineer's Estimate: <u>Contractors' Bid Amount</u> NA NA	<u>Dver/Under Engineer's</u> NA
	NA NA	
	Bid discounted amount: Discount/Preference Points:	
**********	N/A 5	CONCERNMENTAL LINES STATISTICS AND STATISTICS AND ADDRESS OF
	1. Did the 20% local/small local requirement apply:	/ES
- 	2. Did the contractor meet the 20% requirement 16% a) % of LBE 16% b) % of SLBE 46%	'ES
· .	3. Did the contractor receive bld discount/preference points? YES (If yes, list the points received) 5 p	ocints
	5. Additional Comments.	
,		
	· 、	
	6. Date evaluation completed and returned to Contract Admin./Initiating D	ept.
	11/9/2010	
	Date	
Reviewing Officer:	Sophany Hog Date: 11/9	10
Approved By:	<u>Sheller</u> ; Daranstrung <u>Date: 11/91</u>	10

LBE/SLBE Participation CAS Financial & Construction Services Inc.

Project No.:		Engineer's Est	timate			Under/Over Eng	gineers Estimate:			
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert.	LBE	SLBE	Total	Total	For	Iracking (Only
			Status			LBE/SLBE %	Percentages	Ethn.	MBE I	WBE
PRIME	CAS Financial & Construction Services Inc.	Oakaind 🦾	CB		46%	46%	46%	AA	46%	<u> </u>
Clay Pipe Products	Mission Clay Products, LLC	Oakaind	UB				12%	С		
Plumbing Supplies	American Emperor Inc.	OakaInd	СВ	16%		16%	16%	AP	16%	
Equipment Rentals	Rocket Rentals	Glendale	UB				18%	NL.		
Dumping Recycling	Waste Management ECO Box	San Leandro San Jose	UB UB				4% 4%	NL NL		
<u></u>	Project	Totals		16%	46%	62%	100%		62%	0%
participation. <i>I</i> requirements.	Irements is a combination of 10% An SLBE firm can be counted 100	% towards achiev 	ing 20%	LUBE 10%	SLBE10%	TRUCKING 20%		Ethnicity AA = African A = Asian C = Caucasi	American	<u> </u>
Legend LBE = Local Business Enterprise			Contraction of the Contract	UB = Uncertified Business			H = Hispanic NA = Native American			
SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise						iness Business Enterpris Business Enterpris				

: -



Social Equity Division

PROJECT COMPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR : Project No.

RE:

,

Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II

_ <u>Engine</u> e	er's Estimate: NA	<u>Contractors'</u> NA	Construction Ind Bid Amount				
Bic	I discounted amour N/A	n <u>t:</u> <u>Discount/Pr</u> 5	eference Points:	an and a state of the second and and a state of the	Aleria and and a		
1. Did the 20)% local/small local r	equirement apply		YES			
2. Did the c		% of LBE		YES			
) .	b)	% of SLBE	<u>100%</u>		· .		
3. Did the co	ontractor receive bid of (If yes, list the p	,		5 points			
5. Additional	Comments.	•		•			
6. Date eval	uation completed and			ing Dept.			
		11/9/201 Date					
	an Atu	P	Date:	9/10			
iicer:				_			

LBE/SLBE Participation Rosas Brothers Construction Inc.

Project Name: Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier I and Tier II

Engineer's Estimate Under/Over Engineers Estimate: Project No.: Discipline Prime & Subs Location Cert. LBE SLBE Total Total For Tracking Only Status LBE/SLBE % Percentages Elin MBE WRE PRIME Rosas Brothers Construction Inc. OakaInd CB 80% 80% 80% 80% Н Truckina Royal Trucking OakaInd CB 20% 20% 20% 20% AA 0% 100% 100% 0% 100% 100% **Project Totals Requirements:** Ethnicity AA = African American The 20% requirements is a combination of 10% LBE and 10% SLBE participation. RUCKING An SLBE firm can be counted 100% towards achieving 20% requirements. BE 10 A = Aslan C = Caucasian SK.S.PPAR H = Hispanic LBE = Local Business Enterprise **UB = Uncertified Business** NA = Native American Legend CB = Certified Business O = Other SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses MBE = Minority Business Enterprise NL = Not Listed NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise WBE = Women Business Enterprise NPSLBE = NonProfit Small Local Business Enterprise



Social Equity Division

PROJECT COMPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR : Project No.

RE:

Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II

`

		化学说和 计算法 经国际管理 副同步行为 化现在分词	
<u>CONSULTA</u>	<u>NT/CONTRACTOR:</u> Pipe Spy <u>Engineer's Estimate:</u> <u>Contractors' Bid Amount</u> NA NA	<u>Over/Under</u> NA	· · ·
an a	Bid discounted amount: Discount/Preference Points: N/A 5	, 	· ,
·····	1. Did the 20% local/small local requirement apply:	YES	
	 2. Did the contractor meet the 20% requirement a) % of LBE b) % of SLBE <u>100%</u> 	YES	
	3. Did the contractor receive bid discount/preference poi <u>YES</u> (If yes, list the points received)_	5 points	
	5. Additional Comments.		• • • • •
	6. Date evaluation completed and returned to Contract Admin./Init <u>11/9/2010</u> Date	iating Dept.	
Reviewing Officer: Approved By:	Sholley Qarenslring Date: 11/9	1/10	
L	U Q		

LBE/SLBE Participation

Pipe Spy Inc. Project Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II Name:

Project No.:		Engineer's	Estimate			Under/Over Engi	neers Estimate:				
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert.	LBE	SLBE	Total	Total	For	Trackinç) Only	
	-	11	Status			LBE/SLBE %	Percentages	 Ethn. 	MBE	WBE	
PRIME	Pipe Spy Inc.	Oakaind	СВ		100%	100%	100%	Ċ	100%		
					(·	:	• .				
L.						· · ·	1				
1 • •	1							L			
·	L			0%	100%	100%	100%		100%	0%	
	Project	lotais									
Requirem	ents:							Ethnicity			
	rements is a combinatio				SLBÉ			AA = African American			
	tion. An SLBE firm can ing 20% requirements.	be counted 10	J% 56	LBE 10%	10%	TRUCKING 20%		A = Asian			
								C = Caucasian			
							- · ·	H = Híspan			
Legend LBE = Local Business Enterprise			,	UB = Uncertifie			NA = Nativ	e American			
SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise					CB = Certified		-	O = Other			
	Total LBE/SLBE = All Certifled Local and Small Local Busin NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise				•	rity Business Enterp		NL = Not L	sted		
	NPSLBE = NonProfit Sma	•				ien Business Enterp					



Social Equity Division

PROJECT COMPLIANCE EVALUATION FOR : Project No.

RE:

Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II

CONSULTANT/CONTRACTOR:	Ghilotti Bros., Inc.	
Engineer's Estimate:	Contractors' Bid Amount	Over/Under Engineer's
NA	. NA	NA

	Bid discounted amount: Discount/Preference Poi N/A 5 points	112.
1277338729-5-577772844	+#31873.09874-09874-99338538541049144678378347498649853985445941944994178444-5-3887917487476848757938467878847 -	SOLON IS HANDON IN SCHRIMMOND SEIDE BEIDERSCHRIMMON SOM IST SCHRIMISCH IN SIGE
	1. Did the 20% local/small local requirement apply:	YES
	 Did the contractor meet the 20% requirement a) % of LBE b) % of SLBE 	YEŞ
	3. Did the contractor receive bid discount/preference $p_1\underline{YES}$	

(If yes, list the points receiving

Darens

5 points

5. Additional Comments.

Shaller

		,	
	^		J
	6. Date evaluation completed and returned to Contra 11/9/2010	ect Admin./Initiating Dept.	
	Date		
<u>Reviewing</u> Officer:	Suphamy Hug Date	e: 11/9/10	

Approved By:

Date: 11/9/10

LBE/SLBE Participation Ghilotti Bros., Inc.

	or On-Call Ca	pital Impre	ovements Co	Instruction Se	ervices-Tier II				
·····	Engineer's E	stimate			Under/Over Eng	ineers Estimate:			
Prime & Subs	Location	Cert.	LBE	SLBE	Total	Total	For Tracking (Only
		Status			· LBE/SLBE %	Percentages	Ethn.	MBE	WBE
Ghilotti Bros., Inc.	San Rafael	UC				80%	С		
Williams Trucking	Oakland	CB	1			15%	AA	15%	
Bay Line Cutting & Coring	Oakland	CB .	5%		5%	- 5%	Н	5%	
	1								
				4 60/	0.0%	400%		· 2017	00/
Project Totals			5%	15%	· 20%	100%		20%	0%
-									
ents:	•						Ethnicity		·
rements is a combination of 10% I							.AA = African /	American	
n SLBE firm can be counted 1009	% towards achiev	ing 20%	LBE 10%	SLBE 10%	TRUCKING 20%		A = Asian		
							C = Caucasia	n	
with the second to the second s	Contractor and the second	hten and the tot							
				10-1			H = Hispanic		
Legona					· · ·			Inencan	
•						:e		ed ,	
•						:			
	-								
	Prime & Subs Ghilotti Bros., Inc. Williams Trucking Bay Line Cutting & Coring Project Project ents: rements is a combination of 10% L n SLBE firm can be counted 1009 LBE = Incal Business Enterprise SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise SLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise	Engineer's Es Prime & Subs Location Ghilotti Bros., Inc. San Rafael Williams Trucking Oakland Bay Line Cutting & Coring Oakland Project Totals ents: rements is a combination of 10% LBE and 10% SLE n SLBE firm can be counted 100% towards achiev LBE = Local Business Enterprise SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise	Engineer's Estimate Prime & Subs Location Cert. Shilotti Bros., Inc. San Rafael UC Williams Trucking Oakland CB Bay Line Cutting & Coring Oakland CB Oakland CB Bay Line Cutting & Coring Oakland CB Project Totals ents: Project Totals rements is a combination of 10% LBE and 10% SLBE SLBE firm can be counted 100% towards achieving 20% State	Engineer's Estimate Prime & Subs Location Cert. LBE Ghilotti Bros., Inc. San Rafael UC Williams Trucking Oakland CB Bay Line Cutting & Coring Oakland CB Oakland CB 5% Project Totals 5% ents: ************************************	Engineer's Estimate Prime & Subs Location Cert. LBE SLBE Ghilotti Bros., Inc. San Rafael UC June Status 15% Ghilotti Bros., Inc. San Rafael UC June Status 15% Williams Trucking Oakland CB 5% 15% Bay Line Cutting & Coring Oakland CB 5% 15% Project Totals 5% 15% ents: rements is a combination of 10% LBE and 10% SLBE in SLBE firm can be counted 100% towards achieving 20% Jule 10% SLBE 10% LBE = Local Business Enterprise UB = Uncertified Is SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise UB = Uncertified Business Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses MBE = Minorit MBE = Minorit NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise WBE = Womer WBE = Womer	Engineer's Estimate Under/Over Eng Prime & Subs Location Cert. LBE SLBE Total Ghilotti Bros., Inc. San Rafael UC LBE/SLBE % LBE/SLBE % Ghilotti Bros., Inc. San Rafael UC LBE/SLBE % 15% 15% Williams Trucking Oakland CB 5% 15% 15% Bay Line Cutting & Coring Oakland CB 5% 15% 5% Project Totals 5% 15% 20% ents: ements is a combination of 10% LBE and 10% SLBE in SLBE firm can be counted 100% towards achieving 20% SLBE 10% SLBE 10% TRUCKING 20% LBE = Local Business Enterprise UB = Uncertified Business CB = Certified Business CB = Certified Business LBE = Small Local Business Enterprise UB = Uncertified Business MBE = Minority Business Enterprise MBE = Minority Business Enterprise NPLBE = NonProfit Local and Small Local Businesses MBE = Minority Business Enterprise WBE = Women Bustness Enterprise	Engineer's Estimate Under/Over Engineers Estimate: Prime & Subs Location Cert. LBE SLBE Total Total Ghilotti Bros., Inc. San Rafael UC 80% 80% Williams Trucking Oakland CB 15% 15% 80% Bay Line Cutting & Coring Oakland CB 5% 5% 5% 5% Project Totals 5% 15% 20% 100% Percentages 80% 15% 15% 15% 15% Bay Line Cutting & Coring Oakland CB 5% 15% 20% 100% Project Totals 5% 15% 20% 100%	Engineer's Estimate Under/Over Engineers Estimate: Prime & Subs Location Cert. LBE SLBE Total Total For Ghilotti Bros., Inc. San Rafael UC 15% 15% 9ercentages 80% C Williams Trucking Oakland CB 15% 15% 15% 5% AA Bay Line Cutting & Coring Oakland CB 5% 15% 20% 100% Project Totals 5% 15% 20% 100% Ethnicity ents: ents: SLBE is a combination of 10% LBE and 10% SLBE SLBE 10% TRUCKING 20% A = Asian c = Caucasia SLBE 10% SLBE 10% TRUCKING 20% H = Hispanic LBE = Local Business Enterprise UB = Uncertified Business 0 = Other NA = Native A SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise WBE = Women Business Enterprise NL = Nd LBEM NL = Nd LBEM	Engineer's Estimate Under/Over Engineer's Estimate Prime & Subs Location Cert. LBE SLBE Total Total Engineer's Estimate Original Status Status Image: Status Status Image: Status Total Total Ethin MBE Ghilotti Bros., Inc. San Rafael UC Bay Line Cutting & Coring Oakland CB 15% 15% 15% AA 15% Bay Line Cutting & Coring Oakland CB 5% 15% 15% 20% AA 15% Project Totals 5% 15% 20% 100% 20% Project Totals 5% 15% 20% 100% 20% ents: Size and 10% SLBE Size 10% TRUCKING 20% A = Afrean American A = Asian C = Caucasian LBE + Local Business Enterprise UB = Uncertified Business CB = Cartified Business N = Hopanic N = Not Listed VBL = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise WBE = Women Bustness Enterprise N = Not Listed N = Not Listed

LBE/SLBE Participation Malachi Paving & Grading Inc. Project Name: Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II

Project	No.:	Engineer's Estimate				Under/Over Engineers Estimate:				
Discipline	Prime & Subs	Location	Cert. Status	LBE	SLBE	Total LBE/SLBE %	Total Percentages	For T Ethn	racking (MBE	
PRIME	Malachi Paving & Grading Inc.	OakaInd	CB				60%		60%	
Trucking	Brook's Trucking	OakaInd	CB		10%	10%	10%	AA	10%	
Asphalt/Concre Trucking	e Astro Construction Irvin Trucking	Oakalnd Oakalnd	UB CB		10%	10%	20% 10%		20% 10%	
<u></u>		0%	20%	20%	100%	· · · · ·	100%			
An SLBE firm ca	ents: ments is a combination of 10% LBE and n be counted 100% towards achieving 20)% requirement:	s.	ШВЕ (10%) К	SLBE	TRUGKING-20%		Ethnicity AA = African Ai A = Asian C = Caucasian		
LBE = Local Business Enterprise SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise				, ,			prise	H = Hispanic NA = Native Ar O = Other NL = Not Listed		



Social Equity Division

	DEPARTMENT OF CONTRACTING AND PURCHASING
Project No.	Social Equity Division
Froject No.	
RE:	Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier II
CONSULTA	ANT/CONTRACTOR: AJW Construction
	Engineer's Estimate: <u>Contractors' Bid Amount</u> <u>Over/Under</u> NA NA NA NA
	Bid discounted amount: Discount/Preference Points:
	N/A 5
	1. Did the 20% local/small local requirement apply: YES
	2. Did the contractor meet the 20% requirement YES
	a) % of LBE b) % of SLBE <u>100%</u>
•	3. Did the contractor receive bid discount/preference points? YES
	(If yes, list the points received) 5 points
	(If yes, list the points received) 5 points
	5. Additional Comments.
	· · ·
	6. Date evaluation completed and returned to Contract Admin./Initiating Dept.
	11/9/2010
	Date
<u>Reviewing</u>	C D and tend ula lin
Officer:	Date: 119110
Approved By	: Sheddow Qarensbring Date: 11910
, aproved by	- CHICONOLO CONTRACTOR

LBE/SLBE Participation

AJW Construction
Project Name: Request for Qualification for On-Call Capital Improvements Construction Services-Tier I and Tier II

roject No.: Engineer's Estimate Under/Over Engineers Estimate: scipline Prime & Subs Location Cert. LBE SLBE Total Total Form									
ime & Subs	Location	Cert.	LBE	SLBE	Total	Total	For Tracking		Only
		Status			LBE/SLBE %	Percentages	Ethn.	MBE	W8E
onstruction	OakaInd	СВ		100%	100%	100%	н	100%	<u></u>
		:	· ·						
		•			·				
				4					
						• •			
Project	Totals	, <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	0%	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%	TRUGKING 120%		A = Asian		
Legend LBE = Local Business Enterprise SLBE = Small Local Business Enterprise Total LBE/SLBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Business NPLBE = NonProfit Local Business Enterprise				CB = Certified Bus MBE = Minority	iness Business Enterp		O = Other		
ca m S No	can be counted f Business Enterpris all Local Business E LBE = All Certified i onProfit Local Busin	can be counted 100% towards act annot Vie Service Constant of Service I Business Enterprise all Local Business Enterprise LBE = All Certified Local and Small Loc onProfit Local Business Enterprise	can be counted 100% towards achieving	I Business Enterprise all Local Business Enterprise LBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses onProfit Local Business Enterprise	I Business Enterprise UB = Uncertified Business Enterprise I Business Enterprise CB = Certified Business Enterprise LBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses MBE = Minority on Profit Local Business Enterprise WBE = Women WBE = Women	can be counted 100% towards achieving IBEI0% SIBE10% 20% I Business Enterprise UB = Uncertified Business all Local Business Enterprise CB = Certified Business LBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses MBE = Minority Business Enterprise VBE = Women Business Enterprise WBE = Women Business Enterprise	I Business Enterprise UB = Uncertified Business I Local Business Enterprise CB = Certified Business LBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses MBE = Minority Business Enterprise DonProfit Local Business Enterprise WBE = Women Business Enterprise	Combination of 10% LBE and 10% SLBE IBE 10% ITRUCKING A = African A Can be counted 100% towards achieving IBE 10% ITRUCKING A = Asian SLBE 10% IBE 10% ITRUCKING C = Caucasian A = Asian C = Caucasian C = Caucasian I Business Enterprise UB = Uncertified Business NA = Native A all Local Business Enterprise CB = Certified Business O = Other LBE = All Certified Local and Small Local Businesses MBE = Minority Business Enterprise NL = Not Liste onProfit Local Business Enterprise WBE = Women Business Enterprise NL = Not Liste	Combination of 10% LBE and 10% SLBE IBE 10% SLBE 10% TRUCKING A = Asian Can be counted 100% towards achieving IBE 10% SLBE 10% TRUCKING C = Caucasian SLBE 10% IBE 10% IBE 10% IBE 10% IBE 10% IBE 20% <

	~ · · ~			۱
ATT/	۱UDA	MEN	IT C	

tbd	CITY OF OAKLAND	
GRADE		
	CITY SIDEWALKS FACT SHEET	

- Oakland has 1,126 miles of sidewalks (44.7 million square feet) located in front of or next to 79,390 parcels of land.
- Sidewalks are owned by the City, but maintained by the fronting property owner (Oakland Municipal Code Section 12.04.020). When a defective sidewalk is identified, a "Notice to Repair" is sent to the fronting property owner asking that the sidewalk be repaired within 30 days. If the owner fails to do so, the City may repair the sidewalk and bill the property owner. If the owner doesn't pay for the repairs, a tax lien will be placed on the property.
- As an exception to the paragraph above, if the sidewalk has been damaged by roots of a Cityowned tree or other City operation, the City will fix the sidewalk at its expense.
- In FY 2009-10, the City paid \$432,005 for 34 claims related to sidewalk "trip and falls".
- The City has three inspectors who inspect sidewalks, four staff who grind uplifted sidewalks to make them safe, and a four-person concrete crew who repair sidewalks and make other concrete repairs.
- A survey conducted in 2006, identified 110,715 defective sidewalk locations. 17% of these
 defects were caused by City-owned trees; 83% were the responsibility of the property owner.
 The estimated cost of fixing defective sidewalks for which the City is responsible is estimated to
 be \$19.8 million.
- Oakland's City Council appropriated the following amounts to fix defective sidewalks for which the City is responsible:
 - > FY 2008-09 \$700,000
 - > FY 2009-10 \$870,000
 - > FY 2010-11 \$870,000
- In FY 2009-10, the City repaired defective sidewalks at 859 locations and ground uneven sidewalks ("make safe") at an additional 21 locations.
- The City also has an extensive program of curb ramp installation. Curb ramps are mandated by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and are installed at intersections to improve the path of travel for people with disabilities. In FY 2009-10, the City installed 600 curb ramps at various intersections.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS CITY SIDEWALKS

Q. Why does the City claim to own my sidewalk, but then requires me to fix problems in the sidewalk?

A. Property owners are responsible for sidewalk maintenance and repair in front of and adjacent to their property. Oakland Municipal Code Section 12.04.020 provides: "Whenever any portion of any street, lane, alley, court or place in the city, or any sidewalk constructed thereon, according to law, shall be out of repair and in condition to endanger persons or property passing thereon... it shall be the duty of the Superintendent of Streets/Director of Public Works of said city to require, by notice in writing, to be delivered to them personally or left on the premises, the owners or occupants of lots ... to repair forthwith said sidewalk in front of the property of which he or she is the owner or tenant or occupant, specifying in said notice what repairs are required to be made."

Q. Why should I repair my sidewalk?

A. If someone trips in front of your house, you could be sued for damages. Sidewalk defects could also create problems for blind people, people in wheelchairs, and people with other disabilities.

Q. How do I repair my sidewalk?

A. You can do the work yourself or hire a licensed contractor to do the repairs. All work must be done in accordance with City specifications. Defective sidewalks must be removed to the nearest score line. Replacement sidewalks must be made of concrete. Sidewalk repairs which exceed 25 square feet require a permit from the City which may be obtained at CEDA Building Permits Office, 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 2nd floor. The "Curb, Gutter, Sidewalk (CGS) Permit" fee is \$392.40 for less than 200 square feet and \$0.93 additional per square foot if greater than 200 square feet.

Q. May a property owner repair a sidewalk damaged by an official City tree?

A. Property owners may repair the sidewalk at their own expense if they so choose. The City will assist with inspection and, while a Sidewalk Permit is still required, the City will waive the cost of the permit.

Q. How do I report a sidewalk defect?

A. Call the Public Works Call Center at (510) 615-5566 and report the address and the problem. We will send an inspector to look at the sidewalk and, if there's a problem, issue a "Notice to Repair" to the responsible person to fix the defect.

ATTACHMENT D

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

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

Work Order Number (if applicable):	
Contractor: Mosto Construction	
Date of Notice to Proceed: <u>10/6/2008</u>	
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.

700E00mENT (JOIDELINES.
Outstanding	Performance among the best level of achievement the City has experienced.
(3 points)	
Satisfactory	Performance met contractual requirements.
¹ (2 points)	
Marginal	Performance barely met the lower range of the contractual requirements or
[:] (1 point)	performance only met contractual requirements after extensive corrective
	action was taken.
Unsatisfactory	Performance did not meet contractual requirements. The contractual,
(0 points)	performance being assessed reflected serious problems for which corrective
· · · ·	actions were ineffective.

ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES:

C66 Contractor Evaluation Form Contractor: <u>Mosto Construction</u> Project No. <u>C282891</u>

- -

Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory
Marginal	Outstanding

		Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Satisfactory	Outstanding	Not Applicable
	WORK PERFORMANCE	r				
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.			х		
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.			х́		
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.		Ģ	x	۵	D
7	Overall, how did the Contractor rate on work performance?					
	The score for this category must be consistent with the responses to the	0	1	2	3	
	questions given above regarding work performance and the assessment guidelines. Check 0, 1, 2, or 3.			х		

÷

	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.				۵	
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		a
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		D
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 □	

C68 Contractor Evaluation Form

÷

Contractor: Mosto Construction

.

Project No. C282891

Marginal	Satisfactory	Outstanding	Not Applicable
----------	--------------	-------------	----------------

Unsatisfactory

F	l	N	Α	Ν	С	IJ	٩.	
					_			_

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).		D	x		
17	Were there any other significant issues related to financial issues? If Yes, explain on the attachment and provide documentation.		ispiecije Vi Vili (Som Vili (Som Vili (Som Vili (Som Vili (Som Vili (Som Vili (Som Vili (Som Vil		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	0	1	2	3	
	questions given above regarding financial issues and the assessment guidelines. Check 0, 1, 2, or 3.			x		

÷ .

	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:			k ef Fyrig		
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.	D		х		
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.				Yės □	No X
21	Were there any other significant issues related to communication issues? Explain on the attachment. Provide documentation.		1973-19 2-1949 4764		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	0	1	2	3	常体
	questions given above regarding communication issues and the assessment guidelines. Check 0, 1, 2, or 3.			x		

C70 Contractor Evaluation Form Contractor: Mosto Construction

÷

Project No. C282891

	SAFETY	<u> </u>	~ .	0,	0	4
23	Did the Contractor's staff consistently wear personal protective equipment as appropriate? If "No", explain on the attachment.				Yes	No
					х	
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
	- Addimient.					X
26	Was there an inordinate number or severity of injuries? Explain on the attachment.				Yes	No
	If Yes, explain on the attachment.					x
7	Was the Contractor officially warned or cited for breach of U.S. Transportation Security Administration's standards or regulations? If "Yes", explain on the			an a	Yes	No
	attachment.					X
8	Overall, how did the Contractor rate on safety issues?	1.1.1.2.102	1		1	
	The score for this category must be consistent with the responses to the	0	1	2	3	
	Questions given above regarding safety issues and the assessment			x		
	Check 0, 1, 2, or 3.	1	<u> </u>	1	1	

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 72 X 0.25 =0.5
2. Enter Overall score from Question 132 X 0.25 =0.5
3. Enter Overall score from Question 182X 0.20 =0.4
4. Enter Overall score from Question 22 X 0.15 =0.3
5. Enter Overall score from Question 28X 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 Ratings within any five year period will result in the Contractor being categorized by the City Administrator as non-

C72 Contractor Evaluation Form Contractor: <u>Mosto Construction</u> Project No. <u>C282891</u>

2

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.

2/20/2009 Resident Engineer / Date

Supervising Civil Engineer / Date

C73 Contractor Evaluation Form Contractor: Mosto Construction

ATTACHMENT TO CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:

Use this sheet to provide any substantiating comments to support the ratings in the Performance Evaluation. Indicate before each narrative the number of the question for which the response is being provided. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

C74 Contractor Evaluation Form Contractor: Mosto Construction

Project No. C282891

ATTACHMENT E

City of Oakland Public Works Agency CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Project Title: REHABILITATION OF SANITARY SEWERS AND STORM CULVERT IN THE EASEMENT OFF BUTTERS DRIVE Work Order Number: C 135410

Contractor: ANDES CONSTRUCTION

Date of Notice to Proceed: 9-11-07

Date of Notice of Completion: 12-10-07

Date of Notice of Final Completion: 12-10-07

Contract Amount: \$ 285, 167.99

Evaluator Name and Title: Jun OSALBO, RESIDENT ENGUNEEL

The City's Resident Engineer most familiar with the Contractor's performance must complete this evaluation and submit it to Manager, PWA 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 supersed 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 is 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.

Contractor Evaluation Form Contractor: AND es Construction Project No. _____

	WORK PERFORMANCE	UnsatIsfactory	·Marginal	Satisfactory	Outstanding	Not Applicable
1	Did the Contractor perform all of the work with acceptable Quality and Workmanship?					
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.					
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.					
· 2a	Were corrections requested? If "Yes", specify the date(s) and reason(s) for the correction(s). Provide documentation.			Yes	No III	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.		· 🗆 ·			5
. 4	Were there other significant issues related to "Work Performance"? If Yes, explain on the attachment, Provide documentation.				Yes	No Mi
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.					
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.			B		Ū
7	Overall, how did the Contractor rate on work performance? The score for this category must be consistent with the responses to the questions	0	1	2	3	
	given above regarding work performance and the assessment guidelines. Check 0, 1, 2, or 3.					

Contractor Evaluation Form

Contractor: ANDES CONSTRUCTION Project No. C135410

		TIMELINESS	Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Satisfactory	· Outstanding	Not Applicable	
ſ	8	Did the Contractor complete the work within the time required by the contract (including time extensions or amendments)?		Ċ				
		If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory", explain on the attachment why the work was not completed according to schedule. Provide documentation.	٦					
	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 #8. If "Yes", complete (9a) below.			Yes	No III	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.						
		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.					۵	
	•	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.	D				٦	
- -	12	Were there other significant issues related to timeliness? If yes, explain on the attachment. Provide documentation.				Yes	No	 -
	13	Overall, how did the Contractor rate on timeliness? The score for this category must be consistent with the responses to the questions	0	.1	, 2	3		
, 		given above regarding tmeliness and the assessment guidelines. Check 0, 1, 2, or 3.						

Contractor Evaluation Form

ANDER CONSTRUCTION Contractor:

Project No. CIBTULO

	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).			R		
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:				Yes	No
.	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).	.				
17	Were there any other significant issues related to financial issues? If Yes, explain on the attachment and provide documentation.				Yes	No I
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	3	

Contractor Auroes CONSTRUCTION

Contractor Evaluation Form

Project No. C13540

i. .

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

Contractor Evaluation Form

. ..

•

ι...

. : .____

:

i T Contractor: ANDES CONSTRUCTION

Project No. CI35410

								<u> </u>
								ł
					•			
						,		٦
			<u>∑</u> o		~	5	eldi	Į -
			fact	-		ding	olica	<u> </u>
•			Jnsatisfactory	Marginai	Satisfactory	Outstanding	Not Applicable	
			٦hs	Mar	Sati	Outs	Vot	1;
		SAFETY			0,	0	<u> </u>	[]
	23	Did the Contractor's staff consistently wear personal protective equipment as appropriate? If				Yes	No	1
		"No", explain on the attachment.		en de la composition Sector de la composition de la composit				·
	24	Did the Contractor follow City and OSHA safety standards? If "Marginal or Unsatisfactory",						
	24	explain on the attachment.						1. 1
	25	Was the Contractor warned or cited by OSHA for violations? If Yes, explain on the				Yes	No	
		attachment.						.
		20 Mine II and the stand have been a subject in the Of Explain on the other heads the						ſ
	26	26. Was there an inordinate number or severity of injuries? Explain on the attachment. If Yes, explain on the attachment.		n de la Esta esta	с. С	Yes	No	[
								Į.j.
Į	27	Was the Contractor officially warned or cited for breach of U.S. Transportation Security				Yes	No	
		Administration's standards or regulations? If "Yes", explain on the attachment.						
								(* *
	28	Overall, how did the Contractor rate on safety issues? The score for this category must be consistent with the responses to the questions	0	1	2	3 /		-;
	. ,	given above regarding safety issues and the assessment guidelines.						: ;
_ [Check 0, 1, 2, or 3.						
						<u>_</u>		`
							(
				•	·		. ([
								ĺ:
					•			_
			•					ĺ
							I	l
							1	r
							4	, <u>'</u>
	-						•	
					-		[
							<u> </u>	
				>	•	• •	1	
•				7			{	
•		n na ann an ann ann ann ann ann ann ann			••			
							Ì	•
							1	
			•		`		ŗ	
							•	
	•			•			1.	;
	•			•			· {	
	• ;						. [
	•	X in Carine 1		12-	10		:	
	. ,	Contractor Evaluation Form Contractor: ANDES CONSTRUCTION Project I	No	127	10	<u> </u>		
	• •			•	•		•	
		}				· .		
						-	1.2	

.

ATTACHMENT TO CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:

|

.....

, ,_.

. .

;----!

j

Use this sheet to provide any substantiating comments to support the ratings in the Performance Evaluation. Indicate before each narrative the number of the question for which the response is being provided. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

ANDES CONSTRUCTOR

C135410

Project No

OVERALL'RATING:

- '' i

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	3	_ X 0.25 = _	. 75				
2. Enter Overall score from Question 13	2	_ X 0.25 = _	, 50				
3. Enter Overall score from Question 18	2_	X 0.20 = _	.40				
4. Enter Overall score from Question 22	2	X 0.15 = _	. 30	•			
5. Enter Overall score from Question 28	3	X 0.15 =	,45				
TOTAL SCORE (Sum	ı of 1 throu	gh 5):	2.4	.			
OVERALL RATING: SATISFACTORY							
Outstanding: Greater than 2.5 Satisfactory Greater than 1.5 & less than or equal to 2.5 <u>Marginal: Between 1.0 & 1.5</u> 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.

10-0R

Resident Engineer / Date

roject No

Contractor / Date

limay. 1/11/2008 Supervising Civil Engineer / Date

Contractor Evaluation Form Contractor

pproved as to Form and Legality Attorney's Office

2010 DEC -2 PM 12: 39 OAKLAND CITY COUNCIL

RESOLUTION NO.

Y CLERT

OFFICE OF THE CIT

C.M.S.

Introduced by Councilmember

RESOLUTION AWARDING CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS FOR AS-NEEDED ON-CALL CONSTRUCTION SERVICES TO FOURTEEN PRE-QUALIFIED CONTRACTORS SHOWN IN *EXHIBIT A* FOR AN AMOUNT NOT-TO-EXCEED TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$250,000.00) EACH FOR TIER I OR \$500,000.00 FOR TIER II FOR A THREE-YEAR PERIOD, AND WAIVING THE ADVERTISING REQUIREMENTS OF OAKLAND MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 2.04 FOR SPECIFIC ON-CALL CONSTRUCTION JOBS TO BE LET TO SAID CONTRACTORS

WHEREAS, the City's Fairness in Purchasing and Contracting Disparity Study report of September 29, 2009, included a recommendation to implement a small contracts rotation program or process for small, local construction-licensed contractors to undertake some of the City's routine maintenance and repair work, that is more streamlined, expeditious and cost efficient; and

WHEREAS, the City would benefit from maintaining a list of prequalified contractors to perform construction work on an on-call basis to undertake projects with limited scope, budget, or of an urgent nature so that it can promptly respond to and provide construction services in an efficient and timely manner; and

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

- Measure B- ACTIA Fund (2211), Capital Projects- Sidewalk Repair Maintenance Organization (92242), Street Construction Account 57411, Project No. C370610, \$1,044,080.00
- Measure B- ACTIA Fund (2211), Capital Projects- Sidewalk Repair Maintenance Organization (92242), Street Construction Account 57411, Project No. C370510, \$1,056,000.00
- Measure B- Bicycle/Pedestrian Pass-Thru Fund (2212), Capital Projects- Sidewalk Repair Maintenance Organization (92242), Street Construction Account 57411, Project No. C370510, \$425,000.00; and

WHEREAS, the construction services beyond the immediate work will be funded through the various individual projects and funds will be identified prior to the performance of the construction services; and

WHEREAS, the City conducted a pre-qualification process issuing a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) that was limited to certified Small Local Business Enterprise contractors for Tier I and all

proposers for Tier II with "A" or "C8", and C42 licenses and 14 firms responded as shown in Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the fourteen firms that responded to the RFQ are licensed and qualified per the requirements of the RFQ to undertake on-call construction work; and

WHEREAS, once on-call contracts are executed with the list of prequalified licensed contractors and a project arises, the City will solicit bids for work from groups of prequalified contractors on a rotating basis in light of factors such as type of work, contractor's experience and expertise, contractor's availability and contractor's bonding capacity at the time of solicitation, and will award work orders to the lowest responsive bidder; and

WHEREAS, it is in the City's best interests not to advertise or solicit competitive bids on the open market for on-call construction work that can be handled by the list of prequalified contractors in the interest of supporting the recommendation for a small contracts rotation program and because such advertising and bidding delays work, would result in unnecessary administrative cost and burden, does not facilitate the participation of small local licensed contractors in bidding for the work and would be unlikely to render significantly better prices for the work; and

WHEREAS, the City Council may waive the advertising and bidding requirements of the Oakland Municipal Code (OMC) for construction work under Section 2.04.050.I.5 upon a finding that it is in the best interest to do so; and

WHEREAS, the City Administrator has determined that the construction contracts approved hereunder are technical and temporary in nature and that the City lacks the equipment and qualified personnel to perform the necessary work; and

WHEREAS, the City Administrator has determined 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 service; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the City Council awards construction contracts to the fourteen contractors shown in **Exhibit A**, prequalified for construction work to be let/assigned thereunder, in an amount not-to-exceed two hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000.00) for Tier I, or five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000.00) for Tier II, on-call construction work; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That for any work orders issued under this resolution requiring the use of any City General Purpose Fund money not already specifically appropriated by City Council to the project, the City Administrator shall return to the City Council for approval of the allocation of the General Purpose Fund money; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the City Council approves the on-call construction specifications, and authorizes the execution of any amendments or modifications of said contract within the

limitations of the specifications for the on-call construction work; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the contract term will be for three (3) years from the date of contract execution; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the City Council hereby finds, pursuant to OMC Section 2.04.050.I.5 and the reasons stated above and in the City Administrator's report accompanying this resolution, that it is in the best interests of the City to waive the open-market advertising and competitive bid requirements of OMC Chapter 2.04.050 for any on-call construction work to be awarded to said prequalified contractor, and so waives the requirements; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the contractor shall provide performance and payment bonds for 100% of the value of the work assignment prior to the commencement of any work under its on-call construction services contract; 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.

IN COUNCIL, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, _____,

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

EXHIBIT A

CONTRACTOR'S TIER CATEGORY

TIER I

- 1. Yes Construction Group Inc
- 2. Peters' Construction

TIER II

- 3. Andes Construction Inc
 - 4. Magdave Associates
 - 5. Beliveau Engineering Contractors Inc
 - 6. B-Side Construction
 - 7. The Plumbing Ministry
 - 8. Mosto Construction
- 9. Cas Financial Services, Inc
- 10. Rosas Brothers Construction, Inc.
- 11. Pipe Spy Inc
- 12. Ghilotti Bros, Inc.
- 13. Malachi Paving & Grading Inc.
- 14. AJW Construction