



**Judicial Council of California**  
**Administrative Office of the Courts**

**Finance Division**

455 Golden Gate Avenue ♦ San Francisco, CA 94102-3660  
Telephone 415-865-7960 ♦ Fax 415-865-4325 ♦ TDD 415-865-4272

RONALD M. GEORGE  
**Chief Justice of California**  
**Chair of the Judicial Council**

WILLIAM C. VICKREY  
**Administrative Director of the Courts**

*RONALD G. OVERHOLT*  
*Chief Deputy Director*

**CHRISTINE HANSEN**  
*Director*  
*Finance Division*

**TO:** POTENTIAL PROPOSERS

**FROM:** Administrative Office of the Courts  
Office of Capital Planning, Design, and Construction

**DATE:** November 8, 2002

**SUBJECT/ PURPOSE OF MEMO:** REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
SEISMIC ASSESSMENT PROGRAM - SUPERVISING  
STRUCTURAL ENGINEER

**ACTION REQUESTED:** You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Qualifications ("RFQ").  
Project Title: Court Building Seismic Assessment Program - Supervising Structural Engineer  
**RFQ Number: SSE01**

**DEADLINE:** **Proposals must be received by 5 p.m. on November 25, 2002.**

**SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL:** Proposals should be sent to:  
**Judicial Council of California**  
**Administrative Office of the Courts**  
**Attn: Nadine McFadden**  
**455 Golden Gate Avenue**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**

**CONTACT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** **NAME:** Clifford Ham **TEL:** 415-865-7550 **FAX:** 415-865-7524 **EMAIL:** clifford.ham@jud.ca.gov

## **1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION**

### **1.1 Background**

The Judicial Council of California, chaired by the Chief Justice of California, is the chief policy making body of the California judicial system. The California Constitution directs the Council to improve the administration of justice by surveying judicial business, recommending improvements to the courts, and making recommendations annually to the Governor and the Legislature. The Council also adopts rules for court administration, practice, and procedure, and performs other functions prescribed by law. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is the staff agency for the Council and assists both the Council and its chair in performing their duties.

### **1.2 Seismic Assessment**

The Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 (SB 1732) establishes a process for the transfer of ownership and management responsibility for approximately 451 of California's court buildings containing about 10 million usable square feet from the counties to the state. This legislation requires that the State evaluate buildings containing court facilities for seismic safety, in preparation for the possible transfer of responsibility. The evaluations will be based on the risk acceptability methods and criteria developed by the Department of General Services (DGS) and FEMA 310 guidelines. The AOC has reviewed the entire inventory of court buildings statewide and identified approximately 240 buildings that require seismic evaluation. The purpose of the Court Building Seismic Assessment Program is to develop defensible risk level assessments for the identified court buildings in an expeditious and responsible manner.

## **2.0 PURPOSE OF THIS RFQ**

The AOC seeks the services of a structural engineer licensed in California, with expertise in supervision of a seismic risk assessment program.

## **3.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES**

The Supervising Structural Engineer shall assist the AOC, Office of Planning, Design & Construction, in the administration of a program to screen, evaluate and assign risk levels (DGS risk acceptability I to VII) to court buildings throughout the state. This will occur in two stages. A Consulting Engineers Group comprised of 6 to 8 expert structural engineers (to be selected under separate solicitation by the AOC) will provide the initial screening in a group workshop. Subsequently, these engineers will individually conduct detailed evaluations of certain buildings that could not be assigned risk levels in the initial screening. Both stages of evaluation will use criteria; procedures and forms developed by the supervising structural engineer and accepted by DGS and the AOC.

The Supervising Structural Engineer shall also provide quality assurance and review all risk level findings. The Supervising Structural Engineer will be precluded from performing seismic risk evaluations of individual court buildings for the AOC.

3.1. Services will be performed by the consultant between approximately December 2002 and December 2003. Refer to the attached preliminary schedule (Attachment C) for the approximate and desired durations of individual program components.

3.2. The consultant will be asked to:

Initial Screening:

- 3.2.1 Develop with the AOC; criteria for pre-screening of identified approximately 240 court buildings. Together with the AOC examine the identified buildings to declare certain ones exempt from risk assessments based on the pre-screening criteria.
- 3.2.2 Advise the AOC on the required existing building documents necessary for the initial screening.
- 3.2.3 Develop seismic evaluation criteria and procedures for an initial screening of the identified buildings (based on FEMA 310, Tier 1 procedures). The Supervising Structural Engineer shall review methodology and criteria with identified DGS Seismic and Special Project section representatives.
- 3.2.4 Coordinate the activities of the Consulting Engineers Group and a 4 –5 day workshop to initially evaluate and assign risk levels to as many of the identified 240 buildings as warranted under the criteria.
  - 3.2.4.1 Review in a substantive manner, with the AOC & representatives of DGS, risk level assignments from the initial screening. Verify that the findings are consistent with the criteria, objective, and based on sound engineering judgments.
  - 3.2.4.2 Resolve questions and disputes arising from the Consulting Engineers Group's initial findings, if any.
  - 3.2.4.3 Document the specific building-by-building findings of the initial screening workshop in a mutually agreed form. Document which buildings are deemed by the Consulting Engineers Group to require a more detailed evaluation under the criteria. Document the findings of the quality review performed by the Supervising Structural Engineer.

Detailed Evaluations:

- 3.2.5 Develop seismic criteria, instructions, worksheets, report and summary sheet templates in a handbook form (based on FEMA 310 Tier 2 procedures), to be used by consulting structural engineers (members of the Consulting Engineers Group) for the detailed evaluations of buildings identified in the initial screening, if applicable. The Supervising Structural Engineer shall review methodology and criteria with identified DGS Seismic and Special Project section representatives.

These evaluations will occur during a 60-90 day period following the workshop.

Each consulting engineering firm may evaluate approximately eight to ten (8 to 10) buildings depending on results of the initial screening.

Assignments of buildings to consulting engineering firms, if any, will be made at the sole discretion of the AOC, but in consultation with the Supervising Structural Engineer.

3.2.5.1 Coordinate the schedule and activities of the consulting structural engineers in the detailed evaluation and risk level assignments of the identified court buildings.

3.2.5.2 Review in a substantive manner, with the AOC & DGS representatives, risk level assignments from the detailed evaluations. Verify that the findings are consistent with the criteria, objective, and based on sound engineering judgments.

3.2.5.3 Resolve questions and disputes arising during the consulting engineer's detailed evaluations, if any.

3.2.5.4 Compile the findings of individual detailed evaluations and the quality reviews into a single report that list risk level assignments for all buildings including those in the initial screening.

Cost Estimation:

3.2.6 The Supervising Structural Engineer shall retain a Cost Estimator to:

3.2.6.1 Review cost estimates of seismic improvements developed by the Task Force on Court Facilities, (which will be made available). Prepare a similar per square foot, order of magnitude estimate to include construction costs; costs for relocation; temporary facilities and other owner's costs.

3.2.6.2 Prepare conceptual estimates of seismic improvement construction cost for certain court buildings, as determined by the AOC and Supervising Structural Engineer.

3.2.6.3 Prepare a summary, by building, and county by county of the conceptual costs for seismic improvements to all the identified court buildings.

Geotechnical Consultation:

3.2.7 The Supervising Structural Engineer shall retain one or two Geotechnical engineer(s) to participate in the initial screening workshop. This engineer(s) shall advise the Consulting Engineers Group and provide resources to support the assessment screening.

3.2.7.1 The geotechnical engineer(s) shall be familiar with local conditions in the San Francisco Bay region and Southern California to the extent that advice and consultation can be given expeditiously in the screening workshop.

General Project Management:

- 3.2.8 The Supervising Structural Engineer will provide:
  - 3.2.8.1 An overall project schedule (MS Project format), developed with the Consulting Engineers Group and listing specific activities of principal participants. Regularly update this schedule to reflect current activities and completed tasks.
  - 3.2.8.2 Sufficient personnel to effectively manage the Consulting Engineers Group; the initial screening workshop and the detailed building evaluations in order to meet the approved schedule.
  - 3.2.8.3 Weekly or bi-weekly project coordination conference calls and meeting notes of same. Participants will include all consultants (active at the time) and the AOC Project Manager.
  - 3.2.8.4 Reports and communications will be produced, duplicated and distributed in the general manner listed below:
    - 3.2.8.4.1 Agendas, meeting notes, interim instructions electronically via e-mail to all participants.
    - 3.2.8.4.2 Initial screening criteria (see 3.2.3): an electronic file plus twelve (12) paper copies, suitably bound, to the Consulting Engineers Group and the AOC.
    - 3.2.8.4.3 Initial screening findings (see 3.2.4.3): an electronic file plus twelve (12) paper copies, suitably bound to the Consulting Engineers Group and AOC.
    - 3.2.8.4.4 Handbook for detailed evaluations (see 3.2.5): an electronic file plus twelve (12) paper copies, suitably bound to the Consulting Engineers Group and AOC.
    - 3.2.8.4.5 Detailed evaluation report (see 3.2.5.4): an electronic file (CD format) plus four (4) paper copies, in three-ring binders, to the AOC. County by County summaries indicating evaluation findings.
- 3.2.9 Provide one training seminar to present an overview of this Seismic Assessment program, and associated structural design principles for interested AOC staff. This two to three hour seminar will be held at the AOC office in San Francisco, prior to the initial screening workshop.
- 3.2.10 The Supervising Structural Engineer may be required to defend the assessment criteria, procedures and the findings on individual buildings in property transfer negotiations with effected counties. This service will be authorized on a case-by-case basis by the AOC.

Miscellaneous:

- 3.2.11 The Supervising Structural Engineer may be required to travel to the sites of the court buildings.
- 3.2.12 The AOC will provide existing building documents, structural evaluations and local geological information to the extent available.

3.2.13 The AOC will provide meeting facilities at our offices in San Francisco for the workshop and other meetings.

#### **4.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL**

The following information shall be included in the proposal using the AOC Form 001-01 and 002-01, and additional pages, if necessary.

- 4.1 Name, address, e-mail address, telephone, fax numbers, and California Structural Engineer license number for the Principal and Project Engineers.
- 4.2 The background and experience of key engineers in conducting the proposed activities, specifically project management skill and knowledge, (use AOC form 002-01 and please limit resumes to four in section 7).
- 4.3 Description of key staff's knowledge of FEMA 310 and DGS risk acceptability standards and experience with seismic assessment programs of multiple buildings for large institutional owners and public entities.
- 4.4 The background and experience of the proposed Cost Estimator, each individual's ability and experience in development of conceptual budgets for seismic improvements of multiple buildings for large institutional owners and public entities, (use AOC form 002-01 and please limit resumes to two in section 7).
- 4.5 Description of levels of involvement for the principal engineer and project engineer (a commitment of hours per month).
- 4.6 Names, addresses, e-mail addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of five (5) clients for whom the consultant has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by the consultant.
- 4.7 Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted above. Elaborate brochures are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on brevity, conformity to the state's instructions, requirements of this RFQ, and completeness and clarity of content.
- 4.8 Four (4) copies of the proposal signed by an authorized representative of the Structural Engineering firm including name, title, address, and telephone number of one individual who is the responder's designated representative.

## 5.0 RIGHTS

The AOC reserves the right to reject any and all proposals, in whole or in part, as well as the right to issue similar RFQs in the future. This RFQ is in no way an agreement, obligation, or contract and in no way is the AOC or the State of California responsible for the cost of preparing the proposal. One copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and becomes a public record.

Only written responses will be accepted. Responses should be sent by registered or certified mail or by hand delivery.

## 6.0 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The Project Manager for this RFQ process is:

Clifford W. Ham, AIA  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
Office of Capital Planning, Design and Construction  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660  
(415) 865-7550  
(415) 865-7524  
clifford.ham@jud.ca.gov

## 7.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals will be evaluated by the AOC using the following method:

<u>Points</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
20	Knowledge and experience of the principal engineer
25	Experience with seismic assessment programs of multiple buildings for large institutions and/or public entities
25	Communication, organizational, management and quality assurance skills of the principal project engineer
15	Ability to work cooperatively and effectively with other engineers
10	Capacity to provide resources available to meet the schedule and manage the work

## **8.0 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

A telephone conference call will be held to clarify the requirements of this RFQ.

Date: November 14, 2002

Time: 9:30 AM

Call-in phone number: 415-396-9613 (in SF)  
800-644-1484 (outside SF)

The AOC will summarize the questions and answers of the conference call. These notes will be sent electronically to all participants or issued as an addendum (see item D in Attachment A).

It may be necessary to interview prospective service providers to clarify aspects of their submittal. The AOC will notify prospective service providers regarding the interview arrangements.

## **9.0 PROPOSED CONTRACT TERMS AND ADMINISTRATIVE RULES**

Contracts with successful firms will be signed by the parties on a State of California Standard Agreement form and will include terms appropriate for this project. Generally, the terms of the contract will include, but are not limited to: (1) completion of the project within the timeframe provided; (2) no additional work authorized without prior approval; (3) no payment without prior approval; (4) funding availability subject to Legislature; (5) termination of contract under certain conditions; (6) indemnification of the State; (7) approval by the State of any subcontractors; (8) national labor relations board, drug-free workplace, nondiscrimination, and ADA requirements; and (9) minimum appropriate insurance requirements for professional liability, general comprehensive liability, automobile liability, and workers' compensation/employers liability .

Incorporated in this RFQ, and attached as Attachment A, is a document entitled "Administrative Rules Governing Requests for Proposals. Consultants shall follow these rules in preparation of their proposals.

## **10.0 DISABLED VETERAN BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION GOALS**

The State requires contract participation goals of three percent (3%) for disabled veteran business enterprises (DVBEs). Therefore, your response should demonstrate DVBE compliance; otherwise, if it is impossible for your firm to comply, please use the DVBE participation form attached as Attachment B to explain why, and demonstrate written evidence of a "good faith effort" to achieve participation. Your firm must complete the attached DVBE participation requirement form even if it is only to explain why your firm cannot achieve the participation goal. Completing the attached form to the extent feasible is mandatory to be responsive to this solicitation's requirements. If your firm has any questions regarding the form, you should contact the Contracting Officer, Stephen



Court building Seismic Assessment program – Supervising Structural Engineer

November 7, 2002

Page 8

Saddler, at 415-865-7989. For further information regarding DVBE resources, please contact the Office of Small Business and DVBE Certification, at 916-375-4940.

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES GOVERNING REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS**

**A. General**

1. This solicitation document, the evaluation of proposals, and the award of any contract shall conform with current competitive bidding procedures as they relate to the procurement of goods and services. A vendor's proposal is an irrevocable offer for 30 days following the deadline for its submission.
2. A nondiscrimination clause will be included in any contract that ensues from this solicitation document.
3. In addition to explaining the State's requirements, the solicitation document includes instructions which prescribe the format and content of proposals.

**B. Errors in the solicitation document**

1. If a vendor submitting a proposal discovers any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission, or other error in this solicitation document, the vendor shall immediately provide the State with written notice of the problem and request that the solicitation document be clarified or modified. Without disclosing the source of the request, the State may modify the solicitation document prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals by issuing an addendum to all vendors to whom the solicitation document was sent.
2. If prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals a vendor submitting a proposal knows of or should have known of an error in the solicitation document but fails to notify the State of the error, the vendor shall propose at its own risk, and if the vendor is awarded the contract, it shall not be entitled to additional compensation or time by reason of the error or its later correction.

**C. Questions regarding the solicitation document**

1. If a vendor's question relates to a proprietary aspect of its proposal and the question would expose proprietary information if disclosed to competitors, the vendor may submit the question in writing, conspicuously marking it as "CONFIDENTIAL." With the question, the vendor must submit a statement explaining why the question is sensitive. If the State concurs that the disclosure of the question or answer would expose proprietary information, the question will be answered, and both the question and answer will be kept in confidence. If the State does not concur regarding the proprietary nature of the question, the question will not be answered in this manner and the vendor will be notified.

2. If a vendor submitting a proposal believes that one or more of the solicitation document's requirements is onerous or unfair, or that it unnecessarily precludes less costly or alternative solutions, the vendor may submit a written request that the solicitation document be changed. The request must set forth the recommended change and vendor's reasons for proposing the change. Any such request must be submitted to **Clifford Ham** at the Administrative Office of the Courts by **11:00 AM on November 14, 2002**.

**D. Addenda**

1. The State may modify the solicitation document prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals by faxing an addendum to the vendors to whom the solicitation document was sent. If any vendor determines that an addendum unnecessarily restricts its ability to propose, it must notify **Clifford Ham** at the Administrative Office of the Courts no later than one day following the receipt of the addendum.

**E. Withdrawal and resubmission/modification of proposals**

1. A vendor may withdraw its proposal at any time prior to the deadline for submitting proposals by notifying the State in writing of its withdrawal. The vendor must sign the notice. The vendor may thereafter submit a new or modified proposal, provided that it is received at the Administrative Office of the Courts no later than 5:00 PM and November 25, 2002. Modification offered in any other manner, oral or written, will not be considered. Proposals cannot be changed or withdrawn after 5:00 PM and November 25, 2002.

**F. Evaluation process**

1. An evaluation team will review in detail all proposals that are received to determine the extent to which they comply with solicitation document requirements.
2. If a proposal fails to meet a material solicitation document requirement, the proposal may be rejected. A deviation is material to the extent that a response is not in substantial accord with solicitation document requirements. Material deviations cannot be waived. Immaterial deviations may cause a proposal to be rejected.
3. Proposals that contain false or misleading statements may be rejected if in the State's opinion the information was intended to mislead the state regarding a requirement of the solicitation document.
4. During the evaluation process, the State may require a vendor's representative to answer questions with regard to the vendor's proposal. Failure of a vendor to

demonstrate that the claims made in its proposal are in fact true may be sufficient cause for deeming a proposal non-responsive.

**G. Rejection of proposals**

1. The State may reject any or all proposals and may or may not waive an immaterial deviation or defect in a proposal. The State's waiver of an immaterial deviation or defect shall in no way modify the solicitation document or excuse a vendor from full compliance with solicitation document specifications. The AOC reserves the right to accept or reject any or all of the items in the proposal, to award the contract in whole or in part and/or negotiate any or all items with individual vendors if it is deemed in the AOC's best interest. Moreover, the AOC reserves the right to make no selection if proposals are deemed to be outside the fiscal constraint or against the best interest of the government.

**H. Award of contract**

1. Award of contract, if made, will be in accordance with the solicitation document to a responsible vendor submitting a proposal compliant with all the requirements of the solicitation document and any addenda thereto, except for such immaterial defects as may be waived by the State.
2. The State reserves the right to determine the suitability of proposals for contracts on the basis of a proposal's meeting administrative requirements, technical requirements, its assessment of the quality of service and performance of items proposed.
3. If awarded this project, the proposer will not be eligible for award of any contract let under the RFQ for the Court building Seismic Assessment Program – Consulting Structural Engineer.

**I. Decision**

1. Questions regarding the State's award of any business on the basis of proposals submitted in response to this solicitation document, or on any related matter, should be addressed to Clifford Ham, Administrative Office of the Courts, Office of Capital Planning, Design & Construction, 455 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco, CA 94102-3660.

**J. Execution of contracts**

1. The State will make a reasonable effort to execute any contract based on this solicitation document within 30 days of selecting a proposal that best meets its requirements.

2. A vendor submitting a proposal must be prepared to use a standard state contract form rather than its own contract form.

**K. Protest procedure**

1. The Administrative Office of the Courts intends to be completely open and fair to all vendors in selecting the best possible system within budgetary and other constraints described in the solicitation document. In applying evaluation criteria and making the selection, members of the evaluation team will exercise their best judgment.
2. A vendor submitting a proposal may protest the award if it meets all the following conditions:
  - a. the vendor has submitted a proposal which it believes to be responsive to the solicitation document;
  - b. the vendor believes that its proposal meets the state's administrative requirements and technical requirements, proposes experience of proven quality and performance; and
  - c. the vendor believes that the State has incorrectly selected another vendor submitting a proposal for an award.
3. A vendor submitting a proposal who is qualified to protest should contact the Contract Officer at the Administrative Office of the Courts at the address given below or call him at 415-865-7989.

Stephen Saddler  
Contracts Officer  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

4. If the Contract Officer is unable to resolve the protest to the vendor's satisfaction, the vendor should file a written protest within five working days of the contract award notification. The written protest must state the facts surrounding the issue and the reasons the vendor believes the award to be invalid. The protest must be sent by certified or registered mail or delivered personally to:

Grant Walker  
Business Services Manager  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

A receipt should be requested for hand-delivered material.

**L. News releases**

1. News releases pertaining to the award of a contract may not be made without prior written approval of the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts.

**M. Disposition of materials**

1. All materials submitted in response to this solicitation document will become the property of the State of California and will be returned only at the State's option and at the expense of the vendor submitting the proposal. One copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and become a public record. However, any confidential material submitted by a vendor that was clearly marked as such will be returned upon request.

**N. Payment**

1. Payment terms will be specified in any agreement that may ensue as a result of this solicitation document.
2. **THE STATE DOES NOT MAKE ANY ADVANCE PAYMENT FOR SERVICES, NOR PROGRESS PAYMENTS – EXCEPT AS IDENTIFIED IN THE CONTRACT.** Payment is normally made based upon completion of tasks as provided in the agreement between the State and the selected vendor. The State may withhold ten percent of each invoice until receipt of the final product. The amount of the withhold may depend upon the length of the project and the payment schedule provide in the agreement between the State and the selected vendor.

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

**DISABLED VETERANS BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DVBE)  
COMPLIANCE DOCUMENTATION**

Proposer Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
RFQ Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
RFQ Number: \_\_\_\_\_

The State's goal of awarding of at least three percent (3%) of the total dollar contract amount to Disabled Veterans Business Enterprise (DVBE) has been achieved for this Project. *Check one:*

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (Complete Parts A & C only)  
No \_\_\_\_\_ (Complete Parts B & C only)

*"Contractor's Tier" is referred to several times below; use the following definitions for tier:*

- 0 = Prime or Joint Contractor;
- 1 = Prime subcontractor/supplier;
- 2 = Subcontractor/supplier of level 1 subcontractor/supplier

**PART A – COMPLIANCE WITH DVBE GOALS**

*Fill out this Part ONLY if DVBE goal has been met; otherwise fill out Part B.*

**INCOMPLETE DOCUMENTATION MAY RESULT IN DISQUALIFICATION FROM  
FURTHER PARTICIPATION IN SELECTION PROCESS FOR THIS CONTRACT**

**PRIME CONTRACTOR**

Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Nature of Work \_\_\_\_\_ Tier: \_\_\_\_\_

Claimed Value: DVBE \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
Percentage of Total Contract Cost: DVBE \_\_\_\_\_%

**SUBCONTRACTORS/SUBCONTRACTOR/PROPOSERS/SUPPLIERS**

1. Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Nature of Work: \_\_\_\_\_ Tier: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Claimed Value: DVBE \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of Total Contract Cost: DVBE \_\_\_\_\_%

2. Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Nature of Work: \_\_\_\_\_ Tier: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Claimed Value: DVBE \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of Total Contract Cost DVBE \_\_\_\_\_%

3. Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Nature of Work: \_\_\_\_\_ Tier: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Claimed Value: DVBE \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of Total Contract Cost DVBE \_\_\_\_\_%

GRAND TOTAL: DVBE \_\_\_\_\_%

**PART B – ESTABLISHMENT OF GOOD FAITH EFFORT**

*Fill out this Part ONLY if DVBE goal will not be met but you have made a good faith effort to meet such goal.*

**INCOMPLETE DOCUMENTATION MAY RESULT IN DISQUALIFICATION FROM FURTHER PARTICIPATION IN SELECTION PROCESS FOR THIS CONTRACT**

- List contacts made with personnel from state or federal agencies, and with personnel from DVBEs to identify DVBEs.

<i>Source</i>	<i>Person Contacted</i>	<i>Date</i>



2. List the names of DVBE's identified from contacts made with other state, federal, and local agencies.

<i>Source</i>	<i>Person Contacted</i>	<i>Date</i>

3. If an advertisement was published in trade papers and/or papers focusing on DVBEs, attach proof of publication.

<i>Publication</i>	<i>Date(s) Advertised</i>

4. Solicitations were submitted to potential DVBE contractors (list the company name, person contacted, and date) to be subcontractors. Solicitation must be job specific to plan and/or contract.

<i>Company</i>	<i>Person Contacted</i>	<i>Date Sent</i>

5. List the available DVBEs that were considered as subcontractors or suppliers or both. (Complete each subject line.)

<i>Company Name:</i>	
<i>Contact Name &amp; Title:</i>	
<i>Telephone Number:</i>	

<b><i>Nature of Work:</i></b>	
<b><i>Action or resolution:</i></b>	

<b><i>Company Name:</i></b>	
<b><i>Contact Name &amp; Title:</i></b>	
<b><i>Telephone Number:</i></b>	
<b><i>Nature of Work:</i></b>	
<b><i>Action or resolution:</i></b>	

<b><i>Company Name:</i></b>	
<b><i>Contact Name &amp; Title:</i></b>	
<b><i>Telephone Number:</i></b>	
<b><i>Nature of Work:</i></b>	
<b><i>Action or resolution:</i></b>	

**CERTIFICATION** *(to be completed by Proposer)*

I hereby certify that I have made a diligent effort to ascertain the facts with regard to the representations made herein and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, each firm set forth in this bid as a Disabled Veterans Business Enterprise complies with the relevant definition set forth in section 1896.61 of Title 2, and section 999 of the Military and Veterans Code, California Code of Regulations. In making this certification, I am aware of section 10115 *et seq.* of the Government Code that establishes the following penalties for State Contracts:

Penalties for a person guilty of a first offense are a misdemeanor, civil penalty of \$5,000, and suspension from contracting with the State for a period of not less than thirty (30) days nor more than one (1) year.

Penalties for second and subsequent offenses are a misdemeanor, a civil penalty of \$20,000 and suspension from contracting with the State for up to three (3) years.

IT IS MANDATORY THAT THE FOLLOWING BE COMPLETED ENTIRELY;  
FAILURE TO DO SO WILL RESULT IN IMMEDIATE REJECTION.

<b><i>Firm Name of Proposer:</i></b>	
<b><i>Signature of Person Signing for Proposer</i></b>	
<b><i>Name (printed) of Person Signing for Proposer</i></b>	
<b><i>Title of Above-Named Person</i></b>	
<b><i>Date</i></b>	

**PART C – CONTRACT AMOUNT CERTIFICATION**

*To be filled out by ALL proposers.*

I hereby certify that the “Contract Amount,” as defined herein, is the amount of \$\_\_\_\_\_. I understand that the “Contract Amount” is the total dollar figure against which the DVBE participation requirements will be evaluated.

<b><i>Firm Name of Proposer</i></b>	
<b><i>Signature of Person Signing for Proposer</i></b>	
<b><i>Name (printed) of Person Signing for Proposer</i></b>	
<b><i>Title of Above-Named Person</i></b>	
<b><i>Date</i></b>	