

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. is 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 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 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 PROPOSERS MINIMUM REQUIREMENT:</p> <p>D. Registered with DIR (Department of Industrial Relations)</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>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.</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>

PROPOSAL FORMAT		
Requirement	Status	Finding / Notes
<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>PROPOSAL FORMAT GUIDELINES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COVER LETTER <p>Cover letter signed by individual authorized to bind the Contractor</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 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.</p>
<p>Page #4 of RFP</p> <p>PROPOSAL FORMAT GUIDELINES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COVER LETTER <p>Include proposed working relationship among agency and subcontractors</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>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.</p>

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>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>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 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describes familiarity of project and demonstrates understanding of work and project objectives moving forward. 2. Detailed description of efforts your firm will undertake to achieve client satisfaction and to satisfy the requirements of the "Scope of Work" section. 3. Detailed project schedule, identifying all tasks and deliverables to be performed, durations for each task, and overall time of completion. 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>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>List of individuals working on project with functions and anticipated hours of service</p>	<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 individually listed with names, functions, and hours as required. The RFP requires a list of individuals who will be working on this project.</p>

Page # 5 of RFP

II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

- STAFFING

Resume for each designated individual

REQUIREMENT NOT MET

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.

Page #5 of RFP

II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- STAFFING

Named Assigned Supervisor with phone and email

REQUIREMENT NOT MET

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.

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• COST PROPOSAL <p>Proposal valid for minimum 180 days following submission</p>	<p>REQUIREMENT NOT MET</p>	<p>No statement that the proposal is valid for 180 days appears anywhere in the CCS proposal. The RFP explicitly requires this statement.</p>

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.



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.



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

PROPOSERS	PROPOSAL SCORE	INTERVIEW SCORE	TOTALS
CCS Facility Services	1155	1280	2435
Executive Facilities Ser	1010	1080	2090
MasterCorp Commercia	1045	1170	2215