

**EAST SIDE UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
**Board Meeting of June 21, 2012**  
**AWARD OF BIDS**

**Geotechnical Engineering & Consulting Services**

<b>Bid</b>	<b>Bid Opening</b>	<b>Legal Advertisements</b>	<b>Advertisement Date(s)</b>	<b>Project Description</b>
RFQ-19-11-12	May 14, 2012	San Jose Post – Record and was posted on ESUHSD website	04/19/2012, 04/25/2012	Geotechnical Engineering & Consulting entities to provide as-needed, comprehensive, professional Geotechnical Engineering & Consulting Services.

**RFQ Results:**

<b>Consultant</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
<b>Cleary Consultants, Inc.</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>Primary</b>
<b>Earth Systems Pacific</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>Secondary</b>
<b>Pacific Geotechnical Engineering</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>Tertiary</b>
Treadwell & Rollo	185	
Geocon Consultants	181	
RMA Group	182	
Murray Engineers	174	
Neil O. Anderson	171	

A Request for Qualifications (RFQ) (RFQ-19-11-12) process was conducted by ESUHSD Administration to find qualified Geotechnical Engineering & Consulting Entities to provide as-needed, comprehensive and professional services on a Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary system. It is the intention of the ESUHSD or designee to utilize the Primary entity first on any projects that arise. If the Primary entity cannot perform the services due to scheduling conflicts, ESUHSD or designee will go to the Secondary entity for a proposal. If the Secondary vendor cannot perform the services due to scheduling conflicts, then ESUHSD or designee will go to the Tertiary entity.

Proposals were received from eight (8) entities of the twenty-two (22) direct solicitations. All proposals were considered in the evaluation process.

The evaluations of proposals was conducted by a committee of four (4) in two phases: phase one included the following factors: completeness of the proposal; was the required forms signed and included in the proposal, professional qualifications and experience of the proposed team members; did the proposed team members have the professional qualifications and work on at least five similar projects, demonstrate experience working with public education institutions, current and previous client satisfaction; were previous clients satisfied with performance and would they recommend the entity. Each entity met or exceeded the minimum requirement of scoring 80 out of 100 possible points in phase one for consideration in phase two.

All eight (8) entities advanced to the second phase of evaluation. In phase two, hourly rates for the personnel who would be performing the work was considered and scored on a scale of 1-100. The phase two scores were then added to their scores in phase one. Based on the combined score, the ranking of primary, secondary and tertiary was determined and is now being recommended to the Board.

**FISCAL IMPACT:** To be determined on a per project basis

**FUNDING SOURCE:** Measures G & E; School Facility Fund; Capital Facilities Fund; Maintenance.

**RECOMMENDATION:** It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the above award recommendation and authorize Administration to enter into a Master Agreement with each of the three (3) entity as indicated above for a period of one (1) year, with an option to renew for two (2) additional one (1) year contracts periods based upon performance and funding.