



# Contra Costa County Public Works Department

Warren Lai, Director  
Deputy Directors  
Stephen Kowalewski, Chief  
Allison Knapp  
Sarah Price  
Carrie Ricci  
Joe Yee

August 6, 2025

***Via Email [bmarin@wbeinc.com] and UPS Overnight: 1Z9703141395620364***

W. Bradley Electric, LLC  
Attn: Bob Marin, Senior Estimator, Traffic Division  
90 Hill Road  
Novato, CA 94945

Re: Your Firm's Appeal Letter  
Vasco Road Safety Improvements Project,  
Walnut Boulevard to Frisk Creek Bridge  
County Project #0662-6R4100

Dear Mr. Marin:

This responds to your July 29, 2025 letter, in which your firm appealed and requested reconsideration of the determination that your bid did not comply with the Outreach Program (GFE) requirements set forth in Section 2-1.12 of the project specifications. As explained below, your firm's appeal is without merit because you have not shown that the original determination of GFE deficiencies was incorrect. Therefore, your firm's appeal is denied.

In your appeal letter, you have made the following arguments to question the determination that your firm's bid was non-responsive and subject to rejection for failure to comply with the Outreach Program (GFE) requirements:

## **(1) Bid Summary Sheet**

In response to this issue, you stated in your appeal letter that your firm submitted a detailed sheet organized by work area, listing the bids received, name of the company that submitted the bid, dollar amount of the bid with the subcontractor that was selected for the work area that was provided (reference to page 57 of the attached GFE package). Having reviewed page 57, I do not see that it is a summary sheet of the type described above and required by the project specifications. Instead, page 57 is a List of Subcontractors listing only one subcontractor (Chrisp Co. for \$218,650). Moreover, there is nothing else in your firm's two GFE submittals that would qualify as the summary sheet required by the project specifications. This deficiency, which was for a major GFE item and required the deduction of 26 points, resulted in your firm having failed to achieve the minimum 75 GFE points required by the project specifications. Your firm has not shown that determination was incorrect.

## **(2) Paid Advertisements**

In response to this issue, your appeal letter did not dispute that the advertisements placed by your firm failed to mention assistance with bonds, lines of credit and insurance. This deficiency, which required the deduction of 9 points, further supported the determination that your firm failed to achieve the minimum 75 GFE points required by the project specifications.

**(3) Written Notices**

In response to this issue, your appeal letter did not dispute that the written notices sent by your firm were sent only to DBEs, not also to MBEs, WBEs, DVBES, OBEs, SBEs and LBEs, as required by the broad Outreach requirements in the project specifications. Your appeal letter also did not dispute that the notices sent by your firm failed to mention assistance with bonds, lines of credit and insurance. This deficiency, which required the deduction of 10 points, further supported the determination that your firm failed to achieve the minimum 75 GFE points required by the project specifications.

**(4) Follow-Up Solicitations**

Same as #3 above; deduction of 10 points.

**(5) Bonding and Financial Assistance**

Same as #2 and #3 above; deduction of 7 points.

Based on the above, I have determined that your firm's appeal is without merit in that you have not shown that the GFE scoring, and the determination of non-responsiveness were incorrect.

Our department has reviewed and evaluated the bids submitted and determined that St. Francis Electric, LLC is the lowest responsible bidder, having fully complied with all project requirements, including the Outreach Program requirements. Accordingly, I plan to recommend that the contract be awarded to the low bidder at the Board of Supervisors meeting on August 12, 2025, which begins at 9:00 a.m. If your firm still disagrees with the determination that your bid was non-responsive and subject to rejection, you may appear and address the Board at that time.

Although I have denied your appeal on this project, the County appreciates your firm bidding on our projects and hopes you will continue to do so as other projects come up.

Sincerely,



for Warren Lai  
Public Works Director  
Contra Costa County Public Works

WL:AH:KR:DFS:ts  
\\Pw-data\grpdata\design\PROJECTS\Vasco Road Safety Improvement Project - Walnut Blvd to Camino Diablo - WO4100\CONSTRUCTION\1 - Bid\GFE  
- PW Ltr to Bradley Electric\_Final.docx

cc: M. Nino, County Administrator  
T. Ewell, County Administrator  
D. Schmidt, County Counsel  
M. George, County Counsel  
L. Strobel, County Administrator  
A. Wilson, Risk Management  
W. Lai, Public Works Director  
J. Yee, Deputy Director  
A. Huerta, Division Manager, Design/Construction  
K. Rodriguez, Design/Construction Division  
K. Dahl, Design/Construction Division