Addendum:

5.1 BUSINESS ACTION ITEMS

n. ACCEPTANCE OF BIDS AND AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR MICROCOMPUTERS, BID #427

On June 3, the District received ten bids for the purchase of computers for 1993-94 fiscal year. Utilizing weighting factors on several criteria, District staff has determined the low bidder also scores highest with a rating score total of 8,570.

The Superintendent/President recommends acceptance of the bids and award of the contract to Gateway 2000 of North Sioux City, South Dakota, at the rates specified in the bids.

Attachment 5.1-n

o. ACCEPTANCE OF BIDS AND AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR CARRIAGE HOUSE MUSEUM ROOF, BID #428

On June 3, five bids were received for re-roofing the Carriage House Museum (District property). The low bidder was Bird Roofing and Water Proofing in the amount of $18,781 as shown in the bid schedule.

The Superintendent/President recommends acceptance of bid #428 and award of contract to Bird Roofing and Water Proofing of Ventura in the amount of $18,781 for re-roofing the Carriage House Museum.

Attachment 5.1-o

5.2 BUSINESS ACTION ITEMS

c. ACCEPTANCE OF BIDS AND AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR WAKE CENTER PARKING LOT, BID #429

On June 9, five bids were received for the construction of the Wake Center parking lot and related work. The apparent low bidder is Felix Construction for an amount of $424,700. However, a letter from the second low bidder, Granite Construction, was received today which raised three questions shown in the attached letter. Due to the extremely short time to review these statements with legal counsel and the architect, staff will review the questions and present a recommendation at the June 30 Board meeting. The bids are good for sixty days; therefore, the project will not have to be re-bid.

Attachment 5.2-c
### Santa Barbara Community College District

**Business Services**

**Bid Tabulation**

**Project:** Microcomputers  
**Bid #:** 427  
**Date:** 6-3-93  
**Time:** 3 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Total Bid</th>
<th>Bid Form</th>
<th>Bidder's Bond</th>
<th>Contractor's Licensing Stmt</th>
<th>Experience Statement</th>
<th>Sub List</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Addendums Acknowledged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northgate Computer Systems</td>
<td>2,705.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compaq</td>
<td>2,832.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>2,826.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zenith Data Systems (14&quot; monitor)</td>
<td>2,083.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sehi/HP</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway 2000 delivered</td>
<td>1,815.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeus International</td>
<td>2,511.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.M.H Computer Services</td>
<td>2,030.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Technology Services</td>
<td>1,854.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2 YR Warranty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Doctor</td>
<td>2,582.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bids Opened by:** Betty Banville  
**BID OPENING ATTENDED BY:** George Gregg, Kent Richards, Mary Griffith

**Copy Sent To:** Purchasing, Accounting, George Gregg

**BIDTAB.XLS**
SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE  
MEMORANDUM  

To: Betty Banville  
From: George Gregg  
Date: June 10, 1993  

Subject: MICROCOMPUTER BULK PURCHASE -- BID NO. 427  

We recommend that Gateway 2000 should be selected as the successful vendor for the purchase of microcomputers for the coming year. The results of the evaluation of the responses to the RFP are attached.

The spreadsheet shows the scores of the three best vendors from among the ten who responded. Two vendors were eliminated for being unresponsive on an essential element of their proposals. These were Zenith Data Systems, eliminated for not offering a 15" monitor, and K.M.H. Computer Services, eliminated for not providing any technical specifications. I have not reported the scores for the other five vendors because their prices put them so far out of the running.

The spreadsheet shows the five evaluation criteria that were used. The first column shows the weights that were assigned to these criteria. Following this are the raw scores and weighted scores for the three best vendors, Digital Technology Services, Gateway, and Northgate. Vendors were given scores from zero to 100 on each criterion. These were multiplied by the weight of that criterion and added to get the total score for each vendor.

The score for the "Overall costs" criterion was obtained by establishing the cost for a standard system, as was specified in the RFP. The score on the 100 point scale achieved by each vendor was calculated by dividing the price quoted by that vendor into the lowest price quoted, and multiplying by 100. The vendor prices are shown on the spreadsheet. (They differ slightly from the prices on the bid tabulation because the latter were calculated using a 170MB hard disk, whereas the standard system specified in the RFP called for a 80MB hard disk.)

The scores on the "Quality of equipment" criterion were obtained from a variety of sources, including independent reviews from trade publications, telephone interviews with the references submitted by the vendors, and direct experience. In the case of the Mitsuba computers proposed by DTS, a sample computer was obtained from DTS for inspection and testing. Its quality of construction is acceptable, although not nearly as good as the Gateway. Its performance is equal to or only slightly lower than the Gateway on all tests except disk access, where it is considerably slower. The results of the performance tests are attached.

The results show Gateway the clear winner with a score of 8570.
### SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
### BUSINESS SERVICES
### BID TABULATION

**PROJECT:**  SBCC Carriage Garage Roof  
**BID #:**  428  
**DATE:**  6-3-93  
**TIME:**  2 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>TOTAL BID</th>
<th>BID FORM</th>
<th>BIDDER'S BOND</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR'S LICENSING STMT</th>
<th>EXPERIENCE STATEMENT</th>
<th>SUB LIST</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDENDUMS ACKNOWLEDGED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craig Roofing Co</td>
<td>25,876.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird Roofing &amp; Water Proofing</td>
<td>18,791.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Instant Roofing Inc.</td>
<td>31,959.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev Crest Roofing &amp; Water Proofing</td>
<td>40,750.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eberhard Roofing</td>
<td>71,580.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BIDS OPENED BY:**  Betty Banville  
**BID OPENING ATTENDED BY:**  Charles Hansen, Rita Harrington, Mary Griffith

**COPY SENT TO:**  Charles Hansen, Gran Knox, Purchasing, Accounting

**BIDTAB.XLS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>TOTAL BID</th>
<th>BID FORM</th>
<th>BIDDER'S BOND</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR'S LICENSING STMT</th>
<th>EXPERIENCE STATEMENT</th>
<th>SUB LIST</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>2 ADDENDUMS ACKNOWLEDGED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banner Construction</td>
<td>498,224.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lash Construction</td>
<td>453,671.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Construction</td>
<td>424,700.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Construction</td>
<td>450,646.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkham Constructors</td>
<td>508,577.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BIDS OPENED BY: Dr. Hanson

BID OPENING ATTENDED BY: Betty Banville, Gran Knox, Alex Pittmon, Sheri Ray Please see attached list

COPY SENT TO: Purchasing, Accounting, Dr. Hanson, Gran Knox
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMPANY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ray L. Felix</td>
<td>Felix Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erbie Daw Jr.</td>
<td>Banner Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W. Girvin</td>
<td>G.W. Girvin &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris E. Lyskin</td>
<td>G.W. Girvin &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis M. Vettel</td>
<td>Lash Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Ploutz</td>
<td>Kirkham Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Navarro</td>
<td>Granite Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Marshall</td>
<td>Banner Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT
June 10, 1993

Santa Barbara City College
721 Cliff Drive
Santa Barbara, CA 93109
FAX (805) 963-7222

ATTN: Dr. Charles Hanson, Business Manager

RE: Wake Center Parking Lot
    Bid date: June 9, 1993

Gentlemen:

Based on our understanding of the Project Specifications, we do not believe Felix Construction should be awarded the above referenced project.

First, Felix Construction is not a qualified bidder as defined in the Project Specifications. Paragraph 13 of the Instruction to Bidders, "Qualification of Bidders," states that, "The class of license shall be applicable to the work specified in the contract. Each bidder shall have no less than three (3) years experience in the magnitude and character of the work bid." We have bid many projects of similar scope and magnitude in the Santa Barbara area and are not aware of any such projects being constructed or even bid by Felix Construction.

Second, Felix Construction does not appear to be doing enough work with its own organization. Paragraph 11.g of the General Conditions states that "All work shall be performed in accordance with the latest editions, including all amendments of the following documents in effect on the date of the Notice to Contractors: ...(8) Standard Specification for Public Works Construction (SSPWC)." Paragraph 6 of Section 2-3.1 of the SSPWC states, "The Contractor shall perform, with its own organization, Contract work amounting to at least 50% of the Contract Price, except that any designated 'Specialty Items' may be performed by subcontract and the amount of any such 'Specialty Items' so performed may be deducted from the Contract Price before computing the amount of work required to be performed by the Contractor with its own organization. 'Specialty Items' will be identified by the Agency in the Bid or Proposal.

Santa Barbara Branch
P.O. Box 6744
Santa Barbara, CA 93150
(805) 964-9951
Santa Barbara City College
Page 2

We do not see how Felix Construction can meet this requirement if they subcontract the earthwork, pipe, concrete, aggregate base, AC paving, landscape, railing and electrical. None of these items of work were labeled "Specialty Items" in the Bid or Proposal documents.

Third, Felix Construction does not meet the criteria for award. Paragraph 9 of the Instruction to Bidders, "Award or Rejection of Bids," states, "The Contract will be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder whose bid meets all of the following requirements:...b. Is responsive to the Contract Documents." We do not believe Felix Construction is a "responsible bidder" for this project as they do not have the required experience. Further, we do not believe they were responsive the Contract Documents as they are not performing enough of the contract work with their own forces.

We will submit a formal protest if the Wake Center Parking Lot project is awarded to Felix Construction. Please provide us with a copy of the Bid Schedule, Subcontractor List, and Experience Statement submitted by Felix Construction.

Very truly yours,
GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY

Robert E. Moolahan
Branch Manager

REM: gb