



# CITY OF COSTA MESA

77 FAIR DRIVE, P.O. BOX 1200, COSTA MESA, CA 92628-1200

---

FINANCE DEPARTMENT  
PURCHASING

May 7, 2026

**Via US Mail and Email [jferraro@execservices.biz](mailto:jferraro@execservices.biz)**

Executive Facilities Services, Inc.  
Attn: Mr. Jim Ferraro, Owner  
2201 E Winston Drive  
Anaheim, CA 92806

**Subject: Appeal of Bid Award - RFP No. 26-13 Janitorial Services for City Facilities**

Dear Mr. Ferraro:

Please accept this letter in response to Executive Facilities Services, Inc.'s ("EFS") May 4, 2026, appeal and protest of the City's intent to award RFP No. 26-13 to CCS Facility Services – Orange County, Inc. ("CCS"). The Finance Department responds to each of your contentions as follows:

**Executive Facilities Services Protest:**

*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.*

**City Summary Response:**

The City confirmed on the Department of Industrial Relation (DIR) website that CCS is currently registered with the DIR through June 30, 2026. The requested janitorial services are considered a service trade and not construction related. Therefore, a CSLB license is not required under California law.

**Executive Facilities Services Protest:**

*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. PLEASE SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT RELATING TO FINE BY ICE UPON CCS FOR EMPLOYMENT VIOLATIONS DATED APRIL 28, 2025*

**City Response:**

The City received clarification from CCS Facility Services-Orange County, Inc. regarding the ICE notice of intent to fine dated April 28, 2025. Please see the attached email exchange dated May 6, 2026. In summary of that exchange, the notice that was posted on the ICE website was related to a notice of intent to fine the separate CCS entities listed in Denver regarding a routine I-9 audit that was conducted in 2019. The audit and settlement were specific to the Denver entities identified in the notice and were not affiliated with CCS Facility Services – Orange County, Inc. The clarification is acceptable in the sole discretion of the Finance Department. Please note that the “proposer” on this RFP is “CCS Facility Services – Orange County, Inc.” not “CCS Denver, Inc.”

**Executive Facilities Services Protest:**

*DIR Registration No. JS-LR-1001235067 is included. However, the certificate shows 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. No acknowledgment, certification, or statement of compliance with prevailing wage laws (Appendix D) is included anywhere in the CCS proposal.*

**City Response:**

CCS is registered with the DIR. Because CCS is registered, they must follow prevailing wage requirements. The sample Maintenance Services Agreement included in the RFP contains prevailing wage language and no modification requests to the section of the sample agreement were submitted in CCS' proposal.

**Executive Facilities Services Protest:**

*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. The proposal uses various in 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.*

**City Response:**

As stated in the RFP, Section General Instructions & Provisions, No. 1 Proposal Format Guidelines: "Interested entities or contractors are to provide the City of Costa Mesa with a thorough Proposal using the following guidelines." The 25 typed pages and 12-point font size are guidelines and not specific requirements, and any deviations therefrom are non-substantive.

**Executive Facilities Services Protest:**

*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 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.*

**City Response:**

The individual who prepares the proposal and signs the cover letter is at the discretion of the company submitting a proposal. The individuals identified in the Vendor Application form are those who are authorized to sign an agreement if awarded. CCS did not include sub-contractors in the cover sheet but referenced them in the staffing section and project approach section of their proposal.

**Executive Facilities Services Protest:**

*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. Ongoing service schedules are mentioned, but a formal mobilization/transition timeline is absent.*

**City Response:**

The Evaluation Team are given a copy of the RFP and evaluation sheets referencing each evaluation criteria section with the page numbers found in the RFP. This section is reviewed and evaluated by the Evaluation Team independently. The team submits scores and comments to support their scores.

**Executive Facilities Services Protest:**

*Ongoing service schedules are mentioned, but a formal mobilization/transition timeline is absent.*

**City Response:**

Based on the RFP, Appendix A, Scope of Work the City did not request a formal mobilization/transition timeline.

**Executive Facilities Services Protest:**

*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.' 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.*

**City Response:**

The City verified that CCS Facility Services – Orange County, Inc. date of incorporation in California was April 22, 2013, and remains active. CCS completed and submitted the Company Profile & References Form. Any additional information relating to references is at the discretion of the Proposer.

**Executive Facilities Services Protest:**

*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) are not individually listed with names, functions, and hours as required. The RFP requires a list of individuals who will be working on this project. 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. 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.*

**City Response:**

Based on the RFP, Section General Instructions & Provisions, No. 1 Proposal Format Guidelines, Staffing, provide a list of individuals who will be working on this project and indicate the functions that each will perform and anticipate hours of service of each individual.' Include a resume for each designated individual. This language is standard in all City RFP(s) and would not be applicable to the janitorial services. CCS submitted the

primary contacts for all aspects of the work and identified the management staff and included their resumes. The assigned supervisor's name, phone number, and email address were submitted in the proposal as stated in the section referenced at the beginning of this paragraph.

**Executive Facilities Services Protest:**

*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.*

**City Response:**

CCS did include copies of audit financials from the past three years in their proposal. The financials were stamped confidential and therefore have been redacted/removed pursuant to Government Code section 7927.605 (a) (corporate financial records, corporate proprietary information including trade secrets) consistent with the directions of the RFP.

**Executive Facilities Services Protest:**

*No statement that the proposal is valid for 180 days appears anywhere in the CCS proposal. The RFP explicitly requires this statement.*

**City Response:**

Based on the RFP, Section General Instructions & Provisions, No. 1 Proposal Format Guidelines, Cost Proposal, Valid cost for a minimum of 180 days is standard language. The City does not require the statement to be included in the cost proposal.

**Executive Facilities Services Protest:**

*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.*

**City Response:**

The top three ranked proposers based on the evaluation of the proposals were: 1. CCS Facility Services-Orange Count, Inc.; 2. MasterCorp Commercial Services; and 3. Executive Facilities Services. Executive Facilities Services received Average, Above Average and Exceptional scores in the proposal and interview evaluations. However, Below Average scores were received for staffing in the evaluation phase and for communication skills in the interview. The evaluator provided comments to support the scores. If Average scores were received for staffing and communication skills, Executive Facilities would still be ranked at number three.

**PROPOSAL SCORES**

PROPOSERS	SCORES	RANK
CCS Facility Services	1155	1
MasterCorp Commercial Services	1045	2
Executive Facilities Services	1035	3

**INTERVIEW SCORES**

PROPOSERS	SCORES	RANK
CCS Facility Services	1280	1
MasterCorp Commercial Services	1170	2
Executive Facilities Services	1100	3

**TOTAL SCORES**

PROPOSERS	PROPOSAL SCORES	INTERVIEW SCORES	TOTALS
CCS Facility Services	1155	1280	2435
MasterCorp Commercial Services	1045	1170	2215
Executive Facilities Services	1010	1080	2090

## CONCLUSION

Thank you for bringing these items to the City's attention. However, for each of the reasons stated above, the appeal and protest filed by EFS is denied. This decision may be appealed to the City Council. Any appeal must be filed with the City Clerk within **seven (7) days** from the date of this letter, and must conform to the requirements of Title 2, Chapter IX of the Costa Mesa Municipal Code. Please be advised that the proposed contract award will be considered by the City Council at its meeting on **May 19, 2026**. Therefore, for purposes of scheduling, we request that you notify the Finance Department immediately if you intend to appeal this decision to the City Council.

Sincerely,



Cecilia Gallardo-Daly  
City Manager, Costa Mesa

cc: Raja Sethuraman, City of Costa Mesa, Public Works Director  
Patrick Bauer, City of Costa Mesa, Deputy Director of Public Works  
Maryll Betzold, CSS Facility Services, Director, Government Services  
Cecilia Gallardo-Daly, City of Costa Mesa, City Manager  
Kimberly Hall Barlow, Jones & Mayor, City of Costa Mesa, City Attorney  
Mark Khou, City of Costa Mesa, Budget & Purchasing Manager  
Cathleen Serrano, City of Costa Mesa, Finance Officer

Attachments: May 6, 2026, emails between S Urueta and R Bunn

## URUETA, STEPHANIE

---

**From:** Ryan Bunn <rbunn@ccsbts.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 6, 2026 12:54 PM  
**To:** URUETA, STEPHANIE; SERRANO, CATHLEEN  
**Cc:** Maryll Betzold; Cameron Hall  
**Subject:** RE: RFP NO. 26-13 JANITORIAL SERVICES - FINDING

Stephanie,

Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We appreciate the opportunity to provide clarification regarding the posting referenced in the ICE notice of intent to fine notice dated April 28, 2025.

The notice referenced relates to a historical ICE I-9 audit involving CCS entities in Denver, Colorado, stemming from a routine audit initiated in 2019. The matter has since been resolved and settled with ICE under mutually agreeable terms. The findings primarily involved historical I-9 paperwork and administrative documentation errors associated with legacy paper-based processes and third-party electronic audit log issues. All of the penalties involved in this settlement are for paperwork errors, essentially errors or omissions on the I-9 form itself. Importantly, there were no allegations or findings that CCS knowingly employed individuals lacking work authorization.

The I-9 audit was initiated over seven years ago and involved the I-9 forms for employees at that time, many of which had been completed years before that when those employees were hired and is not a reflection of CCS current I-9 compliance program. The company did have some I-9 paperwork errors, particularly because a significant number of the I-9s audited at that time had been completed on paper. Many of the errors while subject to fine were very minor. For example, [www.fragomen.com](http://www.fragomen.com) writing down the wrong issuing authority for a particular document, such as writing the Department of Justice rather than the Department of Homeland Security for particular documents, was the basis for alleged violations in several cases. Additionally, a significant number of the alleged violations were because the electronic I-9 system provided by a well-known third-party vendor, used by CCS at the time the audit was initiated, provided incorrect audit logs that mistakenly appeared to show that CCS HR representatives had taken certain actions on the employee portion of the I-9 form.

Additionally, the audit and settlement were specific to the Denver entities identified in the notice and were not affiliated with CCS Facility Services – Orange County, Inc. or our Orange County operations.

Since the time of the initial audit, CCS has significantly enhanced its compliance processes and implemented robust I-9 compliance procedures and systems to ensure ongoing adherence with all applicable employment verification requirements. This includes the implementation of a new best-in-class Human Capital Management (HCM) platform, Workday, to support standardized onboarding, electronic I-9 administration, audit tracking, and ongoing compliance management across the organization.

Please let me know if you require any additional information or supporting documentation. I would also be happy to discuss further by phone at your convenience.

Best regards,

**RYAN BUNN**

VICE PRESIDENT, BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Cell 310.299.6698

[rbunn@ccsbts.com](mailto:rbunn@ccsbts.com)



---

**From:** Ryan Bunn  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 6, 2026 12:29 PM  
**To:** STEPHANIE.URUETA@costamesaca.gov; CSERRANO@costamesaca.gov  
**Cc:** Maryll Betzold <[mbetzold@ccsbts.com](mailto:mbetzold@ccsbts.com)>; Cameron Hall <[chall@ccsbts.com](mailto:chall@ccsbts.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: RFP NO. 26-13 JANITORIAL SERVICES - FINDING

Stephanie,

Hope you are doing well. I just tried to call your phone number to discuss the attachment that you provided along with getting a better understanding of the information you need regarding clarification.

The notice that was posted on the ICE website was related to a notice of intent to fine the CCS entities listed in Denver regarding a routine I-9 audit that was conducted in 2019. I am happy to provide any additional information and context as this has been settled. Please note that this was not affiliated to Orange County business – CCS Facility Services – Orange County, Inc.

Please call me at 310-299-6698 so that I may provide the specific clarification related posting.

Best regards,

---

**From:** URUETA, STEPHANIE <[STEPHANIE.URUETA@costamesaca.gov](mailto:STEPHANIE.URUETA@costamesaca.gov)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 6, 2026 12:12 PM  
**To:** Maryll Betzold <[mbetzold@ccsbts.com](mailto:mbetzold@ccsbts.com)>  
**Cc:** SERRANO, CATHLEEN <[CSERRANO@costamesaca.gov](mailto:CSERRANO@costamesaca.gov)>  
**Subject:** RFP NO. 26-13 JANITORIAL SERVICES - FINDING  
**Importance:** High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of CCS Facility Services. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning,

The attached finding was not disclosed in CCS Facility Services proposal. Please provide immediate clarification.

The city is requesting a response no later than 1pm today.

Your immediate response is appreciated.

Thank you,



**Stephanie Urueta**

Buyer (714) 754-5305

[stephanie.urueta@costamesaca.gov](mailto:stephanie.urueta@costamesaca.gov)

77 Fair Drive | Costa Mesa | CA 92626



PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT BEFORE PRINTING THIS EMAIL. THANK YOU!

This e-mail transmission, as well as any attached documents, is intended for the exclusive use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential information that is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (18 USC Sections 2510-2521). If you are not the intended recipient (or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any copying, disclosure or distribution of this information is strictly prohibited.

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

---