

May 13, 2026

VIA E-MAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

Honorable Mayor and City Council
City of Costa Mesa
77 Fair Drive,
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
cityclerk@costamesaca.gov
citycouncil@costamesaca.gov

Brenda Green
City Clerk
City of Costa Mesa
77 Fair Drive,
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
brenda.green@costamesaca.gov

Re: RFP NO. 26-13 Janitorial Services for City Facilities
Appeal of Denial of Bid Protest

Dear City Clerk & Honorable Mayor and City Council:

This office represents Executive Facilities Services, Inc. (“EFS”), one of the eight responders to the City of Costa Mesa’s (“City”) above-referenced Request for Proposals (“RFP”) for Professional Custodial/Janitorial Services. EFS has been the janitorial service provider for the City since 2021.

On May 7, 2026, EFS received the City’s denial of EFS’s appeal and protest of the notice of intent to award the contract (“Contract”) to CCS Facility Services – Orange County, Inc. The purpose of this letter is to formally appeal the City Manager’s denial of EFS’s appeal and protest of the RFP to the City Council, pursuant to Title 2, Chapter IX of the Costa Mesa Municipal Code (“CMMC”).¹ This letter focuses on of the most significant oversights, however, EFS’s protest letter dated May 4, 2026 is attached hereto as Exhibit A and is incorporated by reference into this letter, as if fully set forth herein.

First, CCS cannot be the lowest responsible bidder because it failed to disclose past violations of federal law in its RFP materials. (CMMC § 2-167(e) [contracts may only be awarded to responsible bidders]; Pub. Contract Code § 1103 [“Responsible bidder,’ as used in this part, means *a bidder who has demonstrated the attribute of trustworthiness*, as well as quality, fitness, capacity, and experience to satisfactorily perform the public works contract.”].) Here, CCS failed to disclose the fact that it was fined over \$6 million by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) in 2025 for willful violations of federal labor laws. As set forth by ICE, CCS knowingly hired at least 87 unauthorized workers.²

¹ The appeal fee of \$3,825 is enclosed with this letter, based on the version of the City’s Master Fee Schedule available online. Please inform this office immediately if there are any other procedural requirements for this appeal.

² The U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement press release is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

Honorable Mayor and City Council
Brenda Green
May 13, 2026
Page 2

In response to these violations coming to light, CCS has taken the position that those violations were specific to its Denver entities and therefore unrelated to its Orange County operations. This position is plainly inconsistent with how CCS holds itself out to the marketplace. As explained on its own website, “CCS Facility Services stands as one of the largest building services contractors in the United States, offering expert janitorial and facility engineering services to thousands of commercial businesses across 13 states with a highly experienced team.”³ CCS clearly holds itself out to the public as an integrated facility services company with thousands of employees across its various offices. Similarly, CCS lists each of its locations under a single tab on its website, making no distinction between its Orange County and Denver offices.⁴ It would be nonsensical to allow CCS to tout its nationwide experience and capacities to improve its standing in the competitive bidding process, yet hide behind corporate form when faced with wrongdoing.

Additionally, in 2022, the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”) found reasonable cause to believe that CCS failed in its obligation to provide a workplace free from unlawful harassment and discrimination and, in so doing, violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.⁵ There, CCS entered into a pre-litigation settlement with the EEOC to resolve claims made by a Latina janitor that she suffered sexual comments, unwelcome touching and other unwanted sexual conduct by her direct supervisor for well over a year, despite making multiple complaints. In connection with this settlement, CCS agreed “to update its policies and procedures for the future: provide an alternative, anonymous complaint reporting process for employees; promptly respond to and investigate complaints of harassment and discrimination; and provide training for employees in the state of Washington.”

Both of these material omissions are violations of both the RFP Rules and the requirements in the CMMC, and therefore, CCS cannot be awarded the Contract.

Finally, in denying EFS’s initial protest, the City appears to have overlooked the significant scoring discrepancies identified in EFS’s May 4, 2026 protest and appeal. Despite routinely receiving top scores from Evaluators 2 and 3, EFS placed third overall, largely the result of Evaluator 1’s scores.⁶ For example, in the Qualifications & Experience of the Firm category, Evaluator 1 scored EFS as a 3 while the other two Evaluators scored EFS as a 5 and 4 respectively. The same trend held in the Staffing and Communication Skills categories where Evaluator 1 scored EFS a full two points lower than Evaluator 2 and 3. Ultimately, Evaluator 1 scored EFS lower than Evaluator 2 or 3 on five of the eight categories, only having the same score as another Evaluator on the remaining three categories. Notably, Evaluator 1 also scored the other two finalists significant higher than Evaluators 2 and 3 did. This indicates potential irregularities in

³ <https://ccsbts.com/about-us/>

⁴ <https://ccsbts.com/locations/>

⁵ A copy of the EEOC’s press release is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

⁶ The bid results for the RFP provided to EFS are attached hereto as Exhibit D.

Honorable Mayor and City Council
Brenda Green
May 13, 2026
Page 3

the process, whether inexperience on the part of Evaluator 1 or bias against EFS. Had EFS been graded consistently by all scorers—and with CCS’s disqualification—it would have easily placed first, given that its average scores from Evaluators 2 and 3 are both higher than the remaining bidder’s overall score. The equitable solution here would be to reject all bids, and re-issue the RFP with different evaluators.

EFS has successfully provided the precise types of services called for in the RFP to public agencies all over the State of California for twenty years, including the City specifically for 5 years. There have been no negative experiences, feedback, or reviews during EFS’s tenure at the City. Clearly, this is not a situation where the lowest cost provider is a small or inexperienced company, but in fact the opposite – EFS’s response to the RFP provides the lowest cost from a provider with robust experience that can stand easily behind its proposal. As a result, there is no reason to discount EFS when it provides the City and its taxpayers with the best financial value. Given the paramount concern of protecting the public fisc, EFS should be awarded the Contract.

EFS is not submitting this protest to ask that the City award EFS the Contract, but instead, respectfully requests that the City rebid the Contract, or at least rescore the proposals submitted with the foregoing in mind. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP



Alan B. Fenstermacher

Submitted on behalf, and as a representative of, protestor:

Jim Ferraro, Executive Facilities Services, Inc.
6865 Weaver Street
Riverside, CA 92504
(844) 780-2626

Exhibit A

May 4, 2026

Ms. Stephanie Urueta
City of Costa Mesa
77 Fair Drive
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Dear Ms. Urueta:

Please be advised that Executive Facilities Services, Inc via this document is submitting for consideration a formal protest to awarding of RFP 26-13 for Janitorial Services for City Facilities.

The following is the language from RFP 26-13 regarding the submission of a Protest:

II. General Instructions and Provisions:

5. Protests: Failure to comply with the rules set forth herein may result in rejection of the protest. Any proposals accepted pursuant to the formal procurement procedure set forth in the Proposal procedure may be appealed in accordance with the following procedure:

- The Proposer shall file the written notice of appeal with the Purchasing Officer at least ten (10) working days prior to proposal award date specified in the notice of recommendation to award.
 - The written notice of appeal must include specifics as to the nature of the appeal.
 - The Proposer must provide any and all documentation to support the appeal.
 - The purchasing officer will respond in writing to the Proposer within five (5) working days.
 - In the event the appeal is denied by the purchasing officer, the Proposer may appeal the purchasing officer's ruling to the City Council at the next available council meeting.
1. This written notice of appeal is being submitted on May 4, 2026, which is at least ten (10) working days prior to the proposal award date of May 19, 2026.
 2. The following pages will include specifics as to the nature of each protest point
 3. Additional documentation is also being supplied to support our appeal.

As stated in section 5. In the fourth bullet point, the purchasing officer will respond in writing to the Proposer within five (5) working days.

- The following are Protest points that Executive Facilities Services, Inc. are submitting for consideration
- The following table presents each RFP requirement and CCS's compliance status. Requirements are grouped by section as presented in the RFP.

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS		
Requirement	Status	Finding / Notes
<p>PAGE #3 OF RFP</p> <p>PROPOSERS MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>A. Similar facility experience & evidence of current licensing/permits</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>CCS provides extensive municipal experience and lists a DIR Registration (JS-LR-1001235067) and Costa Mesa Business License (HDL-29911). However, the DIR registration shown has an EXPIRATION DATE OF 3/21/2026 — predating the proposal submission deadline of 3/11/2026 by only 10 days, with no renewed certificate provided. No California CSLB license is listed in the Company Profile form despite it being a required field.</p>
<p>Page #3 of RFP</p> <p>PROPOSERS MINIMUM REQUIREMENT:</p> <p>B. Disclose pending/past claims, labor law violations, formal notices to cure within last 5 years</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>No section addressing pending or past claims, labor law violations, or formal notices to cure appears anywhere in the proposal. The RFP states failure to identify these may be grounds for rejection. CCS's proposal is completely silent on this required disclosure.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT RELATING TO FINE BY ICE UPON CCS FOR EMPLOYMENT VIOLATIONS DATED APRIL 28, 2025</p>
<p>Page #4 of RFP</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT</p>	<p>DIR Registration No. JS-LR-1001235067 is included. However, the certificate shows</p>

<p>PROPOSERS MINIMUM REQUIREMENT:</p> <p>D. Registered with DIR (Department of Industrial Relations)</p>	<p>NOT MET</p>	<p>an expiration date of 3/21/2026 — only 10 days after the proposal due date of 3/11/2026. No evidence of renewal for the contract period is provided.</p>
<p>Page # 4 RFP PROPOSERS MINIMUM REQUIREMENT</p> <p>E. Abide by prevailing wage laws (Appendix D)</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>No acknowledgment, certification, or statement of compliance with prevailing wage laws (Appendix D) is included anywhere in the CCS proposal.</p>

<p>PROPOSAL FORMAT</p>		
<p>Requirement</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Finding / Notes</p>
<p>Page #4 of RFP</p> <p>II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:</p> <p>PROPOSAL FORMAT GUIDELINES:</p> <p>25-page limit (excluding resumes and pricing forms)</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>The CCS proposal narrative section alone spans 25 pages (pages 1–25) before addenda, forms, and supporting documents. Including the Table of Contents, cover letter, and all narrative sections, the core proposal clearly exceeds the 25-page limit set by the RFP.</p>
<p>Page #4 of RFP</p> <p>PROPOSAL FORMAT GUIDELINES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12-point font size 	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>The proposal uses varying font sizes throughout. Many section headers and body text elements appear smaller than 12-point, particularly in tables on pages 8–9 and staffing tables on page 19. Full compliance with the 12-point minimum is unclear.</p>
<p>Page #4 of RFP</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>The cover letter is signed by Maryll Betzold, Director of Government Services. It is not clear she has binding authority. The individuals listed with written</p>

**PROPOSAL FORMAT
GUIDELINES**

- **COVER LETTER**

Cover letter signed by individual authorized to bind the Contractor

Page #4 of RFP

**PROPOSAL FORMAT
GUIDELINES**

- **COVER LETTER**

Include proposed working relationship among agency and subcontractors

**REQUIREMENT
NOT MET**

authorization to sign contracts on the Vendor Application are Cameron Hall (RVP), Bill King (COO), and Troy Coker (CEO) — Maryll Betzold is not among them. The cover letter signature does not constitute binding authority.

The cover letter does not mention subcontractors. Subcontractors (West Coast Property Maintenance) are only addressed later in the Staffing section, not in the cover letter as required.

Requirement	Status	Finding / Notes
<p>Page #4 of RFP</p> <p>II. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>SCOPE OF WORK APPENDIX A</p> <p>Detailed project schedule with all tasks, deliverables, durations, and completion timeframes</p> <p>Page #4 of RFP</p> <p>II. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>SCOPE OF WORK APPENDIX A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PROJECT APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY <p>1. Describes familiarity of project and demonstrates understanding of work and project objectives moving forward.</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>Pages 8–11 provide monthly hour estimates and a weekly schedule grid. However, no specific project start date, mobilization timeline, or phased completion schedule is provided. The schedule lacks defined milestones and durations for transition activities.</p>
<p>2. Detailed description of efforts your firm will undertake to achieve client satisfaction and to satisfy the requirements of the "Scope of Work" section.</p> <p>3. Detailed project schedule, identifying all tasks and deliverables to be performed, durations for each task, and overall time of completion.</p> <p>4. A proposed schedule indicating stages of work, time frames, and ability to perform the required services in a timely manner shall be included in the proposal</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>Ongoing service schedules are mentioned, but a formal mobilization/transition timeline is absent.</p>

--	--	--

QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE		
Requirement	Status	Finding / Notes
<p>Page #5 of RFP</p> <p>II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF FIRM: <p>Corporation info: name, corporate address, state of incorporation, date of incorporation, officer names</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>CCS provides the legal name (CCS Facility Services - Orange County, Inc.), corporate address (990 S Broadway, Denver, CO 80209), founding year (1988), and officer names (Cameron Hall, Troy Coker, Bill King). However, the STATE OF INCORPORATION is never stated, and the exact DATE OF INCORPORATION (month/day/year) is not provided — only 'opened in 1988.'</p>
<p>Page # 5 of RFP</p> <p>II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> QUALIFICATIONS OF FIRM: <p>List of current/previous contracts similar to Costa Mesa scope, including public agencies, scope description, length of service, and contact name/title/phone for each</p>	<p>REQUIERMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>CCS provides client lists on pages 12, 15, and 16. However, phone numbers are missing for several references in the main client table (pages 12 and 15). The Company Profile & References form (page 32) lists five references with contact info, but the 16-agency table on page 15 lacks individual contact phone numbers and scope descriptions as required.</p>

STAFFING		
Requirement	Status	Finding / Notes
<p>PAGE #5 OF RFP</p> <p>II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> STAFFING 	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>Pages 19–24 list key management staff (Cameron Hall, Sebastian Pedreira, Erryn Moreno) with roles and estimated monthly hours. However, frontline staffing (the approximately 10 cleaners/supervisors assigned to City facilities) is not</p>

<p>List of individuals working on project with functions and anticipated hours of service</p> <p>Page # 5 of RFP</p> <p>II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> STAFFING <p>Resume for each designated individual</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>individually listed with names, functions, and hours as required. The RFP requires a list of individuals who will be working on this project.</p> <p>Resumes are provided for Cameron Hall (p.22), Sebastian Pedreira (p.23), and Erryn Moreno (p.24). No resume is provided for Ernesto Flores, the assigned Supervisor, despite being a named key contact. The RFP requires resumes for all designated individuals.</p>
<p>Page #5 of RFP</p> <p>II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> STAFFING <p>Named Assigned Supervisor with phone and email</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>Ernesto Flores is listed as Supervisor (eflores@ccsbts.com, 949-239-5606). However, no resume for Flores is provided as required, and his qualifications are not described anywhere in the proposal.</p>

FINANCIAL CAPACITY		
Requirement	Status	Finding / Notes
<p>Page #6 of RFP</p> <p>II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FINANCIAL CAPACITY <p>Copies of audited financials from the past three years</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>No audited financial statements for any year are included in the proposal. This is an explicit RFP requirement: 'The City is concerned about the proposers' financial capability to perform and therefore is requesting copies of audited financials from the past three years.' This is a complete omission.</p>

COST PROPOSAL		
Requirement	Status	Finding / Notes
<p>PAGE #6 of RFP</p> <p>II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>No statement that the proposal is valid for 180 days appears anywhere in the CCS</p>

- **COST PROPOSAL**
Proposal valid for minimum 180
days following submission

proposal. The RFP explicitly requires this statement.

GROUNDS FOR REJECTION OF AWARD TO CCS

We have clearly identified 15 Protest Points which certainly disqualify the proposal submitted by CCS and the award of the Janitorial Services contract to CCS must then be ruled null and void.

The last and final Protest Point I would like to raise is the scoring completed by Evaluator #1 as recorded in the CCS Evaluator Book (copy attached) As you can see there are three tabs for this file.

The first tab is labeled PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The second tab is labeled INTERVIEW EVALUATION

The third tab is labeled TOTAL SCORES

I would ask that you please review and compare the scoring of Evaluator #1 to both Evaluator #2 and #3 on both the Proposal Evaluation and Interview Evaluation tabs.

You will clearly see the blatant prejudice that Evaluator #1 had towards Executive Facilities Services, Inc. in ALL 4 categories in which the service providers were evaluated on both the Proposal Evaluation and Interview Evaluation tabs

Upon review of the Interview Evaluation sheet, you will see that in each of the 4 evaluation categories, Evaluator #1 gave Executive Facilities Inc, the lowest score which is not consistent with the scores posted by both Evaluator #2 and #3.

By removing the prejudicial scoring by Evaluator #1 from both the Proposal Evaluation and Interview Evaluation tabs, and the disqualification of CSS, Executive Facilities Services, Inc. should thus receive the recommendation of award for RFP 26-13 the Janitorial Services for City facilities for the City of Costa Mesa.

Respectfully,

Jim Ferraro

Owner

Executive Facilities Services, Inc.

Exhibit B

 An official website of the United States government




Official websites use .gov

A **.gov** website belongs to an official government organization in the United States.



Secure .gov websites use HTTPS

A **lock** () or **https://** means you've safely connected to the .gov website. Share sensitive information only on official, secure websites.

[En Español](#) [Contact Us](#) [Quick Links](#)



U.S. Immigration
and Customs
Enforcement

Call [1-866-DHS-2-ICE](tel:1-866-DHS-2-ICE)

[Report Crime](#)

ICE NEWSROOM

APRIL 28, 2025 • DENVER, CO • WORKSITE ENFORCEMENT

ICE Denver levies over \$8 million in fines on local businesses for employment violations

DENVER — U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement issued a notice of intent to fine three local businesses over \$8 million following worksite audits that uncovered widespread employment eligibility violations.

The companies fined include:

- CCS Denver, Inc. – Fined \$6,186,171 after a 100% substantive violation rate and evidence of knowingly hiring and employing at least 87 unauthorized workers.
- PBC Commercial Cleaning Systems, Inc. – Fined \$1,599,510 for a 74% violation rate and a pattern of knowingly employing at least 12 unauthorized workers.
- Green Management Denver – Fined \$270,195 after a 100% violation rate and identification of 44 unauthorized employees.

ICE Homeland Security Investigations' worksite enforcement efforts focus on ensuring businesses comply with federal employment laws, primarily through I-9 audits, civil penalties, and criminal prosecution where applicable.



“The employment of unauthorized workers undermines the integrity of our immigration system and puts law-abiding employers at a disadvantage,” said Special Agent in Charge Steve Cagen. “These penalties reinforce our commitment to uphold the law and promote a culture of compliance.”

HSI uses a three-prong approach to worksite enforcement:

1. Compliance – through I-9 inspections, civil fines, and debarment referrals.
2. Enforcement – through the criminal arrest of employers and administrative arrest of unauthorized workers.
3. Outreach – through the HSI Mutual Agreement between Government and Employers (IMAGE) program to foster accountability and legal hiring practices.

Updated: 04/29/2025

MEDIA INQUIRIES

For media inquiries about ICE activities, operations, or policies, contact the ICE Office of Public Affairs at ICEMedia@ice.dhs.gov.

About Us

Enforcement and Removal Operations

Homeland Security Investigations

Newsroom



U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement



[ICE Contact Center](#)

Report suspicious activity: 1-866-DHS-2-ICE



ICE.gov

An official website of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security

[About ICE](#)

[Archive](#)

[Inspector General](#)

[Accessibility](#)

[No FEAR Act Data](#)

[The White House](#)

[FOIA Requests](#)

[Site Links](#)

[DHS Components](#)

[Privacy Policy](#)

[Performance](#)

[USA.gov](#)

[DHS.gov](#)

[Reports](#)

NTAS
NATIONAL TERRORISM
ADVISORY SYSTEM

**NO CURRENT
ADVISORIES**

The NTAS logo features the U.S. Department of Homeland Security seal on the left. To its right, the letters "NTAS" are in a large, bold, white font. Below "NTAS", the words "NATIONAL TERRORISM" and "ADVISORY SYSTEM" are stacked in a smaller, white, sans-serif font. The entire logo is set against a dark blue background. Below the logo, a white box with a dark blue border contains the text "NO CURRENT ADVISORIES" in a bold, dark blue, sans-serif font.

Exhibit C



Press Release

12-22-2022

EEOC and CCS Facility Services Conciliate Sexual Harassment Finding

Latina Janitor Suffered Physical and Verbal Abuse by Supervisor, Federal Agency Charges

RENTON, Wash. – CCS Facility Services, Inc. has agreed to provide payment and furnish other relief to resolve a sexual harassment complaint filed with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the agency announced today.

The Latina janitor who filed the charge with the EEOC alleged that she suffered sexual comments, unwelcome touching and other unwanted sexual conduct by her direct supervisor for well over a year, despite making multiple complaints.

Following an extensive investigation, the EEOC found reasonable cause to believe the company failed in its obligation to provide a workplace free from unlawful harassment and discrimination and, in so doing, violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Through the EEOC's conciliation process, CCS Facility Services has voluntarily entered into a pre-litigation settlement. As part of this settlement, the company agreed to pay a monetary sum to the janitorial worker and to update its policies and procedures for the future: provide an alternative, anonymous complaint reporting process for employees; promptly respond to and investigate complaints of

harassment and discrimination; and provide training for employees in the state of Washington. In addition, CCS Facility Services will provide periodic updates and reports to EEOC for a term of four years.

“There is no justification for failing to take action once a company becomes aware of allegations of sexual harassment, particularly when the alleged harasser is a supervisor,” said Elizabeth Cannon, director of the EEOC’s Seattle Field Office. “We commend CSS Facility Services for participating in the conciliation process and taking these initial steps to protect employees in the state of Washington from unlawful harassment and discrimination.”

According to <https://ccsbts.com> (<https://ccsbts.com>), CCS Facility Services, Inc., is an integrated facility services company headquartered in Denver, with thousands of cleaning and building engineering professionals across the United States, including in the state of Washington.

More information about sexual harassment can be found at <https://www.eeoc.gov/sexual-harassment> (<https://www.eeoc.gov/sexual-harassment>).

The EEOC’s Seattle Field Office has jurisdiction over Western Washington.

The EEOC advances opportunity in the workplace by enforcing federal laws prohibiting employment discrimination. More information is available at www.eeoc.gov (<http://www.eeoc.gov>). Stay connected with the latest EEOC news by subscribing to our [email updates](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/USEEOC/subscriber/new) (<https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/USEEOC/subscriber/new>).

Recent Press Releases from the Seattle Field Office

[Builders FirstSource to Pay \\$26,000 to Settle EEOC Disability and Age Discrimination Lawsuit](https://www.eeoc.gov/newsroom/builders-firstsource-pay-26000-settle-eeoc-disability-and-age-discrimination-lawsuit) (<https://www.eeoc.gov/newsroom/builders-firstsource-pay-26000-settle-eeoc-disability-and-age-discrimination-lawsuit>)

[EEOC Sues Little Caesars Franchise for Racial Harassment and Retaliation](https://www.eeoc.gov/newsroom/eeoc-sues-little-caesars-franchise-racial-harassment-and-retaliation) (<https://www.eeoc.gov/newsroom/eeoc-sues-little-caesars-franchise-racial-harassment-and-retaliation>)

Logic Staffing to Pay \$217,500 in EEOC Religious Discrimination, Retaliation Lawsuit (<https://www.eeoc.gov/newsroom/logic-staffing-pay-217500-eeoc-religious-discrimination-retaliation-lawsuit>)

Recent Press Releases on the Subject of Sexual Harassment, Retaliation

Sofidel to Pay \$80,000 in EEOC Sex Discrimination, Retaliation Lawsuit (<https://www.eeoc.gov/newsroom/sofidel-pay-80000-eeoc-sex-discrimination-retaliation-lawsuit>)

EEOC Sues Cannabis Company for Sexual Harassment (<https://www.eeoc.gov/newsroom/eeoc-sues-cannabis-company-sexual-harassment>)

Justin Vineyards & Winery and The Wonderful Company to Pay \$1.49 Million in EEOC Sexual Harassment Suit (<https://www.eeoc.gov/newsroom/justin-vineyards-winery-and-wonderful-company-pay-149-million-eeoc-sexual-harassment-suit>)

Exhibit D

City of Costa Mesa

Bid Results for Project Janitorial Services For City Facilities (RFP No. 26-13)

Issued on 02/10/2026

Bid Due on March 11, 2026 2:00 PM (PDT)

Exported on 03/11/2026

	EVALUATOR 1	EVALUATOR 2	EVALUATOR 3	TOTAL	RFP FACILITATOR	TOTALS	
35	PROJECT APPROACH & METHODOLOGY						
Base Hill	4	3	3	10		350	
CCS Facility Services	5	4	3	12		420	
Coast 2 Coast Preservations	4	2	3	9		315	
Executive Facilities Services	3	4	3	10		350	
MasterCorp Commercial Services	5	4	3	12		420	
Omni Enterprise	4	2	3	9		315	
Santa Fe Janitorial Maintenance	4	2	3	9		315	
Uniserve Facilities Services	4	3	4	11		385	
30	QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE OF THE FIRM						
Base Hill	4	3	2	9		270	
CCS Facility Services	4	4	4	12		360	
Coast 2 Coast Preservations	2	1	3	6		180	
Executive Facilities Services	3	5	4	12		360	
MasterCorp Commercial Services	4	3	3	10		300	
Omni Enterprise	4	3	3	10		300	
Santa Fe Janitorial Maintenance	4	3	2	9		270	
Uniserve Facilities Services	3	2	4	9		270	
25	STAFFING						
Base Hill	4	3	3	10		250	
CCS Facility Services	5	5	3	13		325	
Coast 2 Coast Preservations	3	3	3	9		225	
Executive Facilities Services	2	4	4	10		250	
MasterCorp Commercial Services	5	3	3	11		275	

Omni Enterprise	3	1	3	7		175
Santa Fe Janitorial Maintenance	4	3	3	10		250
Uniserve Facilities Services	3	2	3	8		200

10	COST			
-----------	-------------	--	--	--

Base Hill					4	40
CCS Facility Services					5	50
Coast 2 Coast Preservations					5	50
Executive Facilities Services					5	50
MasterCorp Commercial Services					5	50
Omni Enterprise					5	50
Santa Fe Janitorial Maintenance					5	50
Uniserve Facilities Services					3	30

PROPOSERS	SCORES	RANK
Base Hill	910	
CCS Facility Services	1155	1
Coast 2 Coast Preservations	770	
Executive Facilities Services	1010	3
MasterCorp Commercial Services	1045	2
Omni Enterprise	840	
Santa Fe Janitorial Maintenance	885	
Uniserve Facilities Services	885	

City of Costa Mesa

Bid Results for Project Janitorial Services For City Facilities (RFP No. 26-13)

Issued on 02/10/2026

Bid Due on March 11, 2026 2:00 PM (PDT)

Exported on 03/11/2026

	EVALUATOR 1	EVALUATOR 2	EVALUATOR 3	TOTAL	TOTALS	
30	GRASP OF THE PROJECT					
CCS Facility Services	4	5	4	13	390	30
Executive Facilities Services	3	5	4	12	360	30
MasterCorp Commercial Services	4	3	4	11	330	30
40	APPROACH					
CCS Facility Services	5	4	4	13	520	40
Executive Facilities Services	3	4	3	10	400	40
MasterCorp Commercial Services	5	3	4	12	480	40
20	COMMUNICATION SKILLS					
CCS Facility Services	5	3	4	12	240	20
Executive Facilities Services	2	4	4	10	200	20
MasterCorp Commercial Services	5	3	4	12	240	20
10	QUALITY OF OVERALL INTERVIEW					
CCS Facility Services	5	4	4	13	130	10
Executive Facilities Services	3	4	5	12	120	10
MasterCorp Commercial Services	5	3	4	12	120	10

PROPOSERS	SCORES	RANK
CCS Facility Services	1280	1
Executive Facilities Services	1080	3
MasterCorp Commercial Services	1170	2

City of Costa Mesa

Bid Results for Project Janitorial Services For City Facilities (RFP No. 26-13)

Issued on 02/10/2026

Bid Due on March 11, 2026 2:00 PM (PDT)

Exported on 03/11/2026

PROPOSERS	ROPOSAL SCORE	INTERVIEW SCORE	TOTALS
CCS Facility Services	1155	1280	2435
Executive Facilities Se	1010	1080	2090
MasterCorp Commerci	1045	1170	2215