

ROGERS JOSEPH O'DONNELL

415.956.2828 (t)  
415.956.6457 (f)

Robert Dollar Building  
311 California Street, 10th Flr.  
San Francisco CA 94104

202.777.8950 (t)  
202.347.8429 (f)

Victor Building  
750 9th Street, NW, Suite 710  
Washington DC 20001

www.rjo.com

December 16, 2014

**Via Facsimile – (916) 227-6782**

**Via Overnight Delivery**

**Via E-mail john.mcmillan@dot.ca.gov**

John C. McMillan  
Deputy Division Chief  
Department of Transportation  
Division of Engineering Services  
Office Engineer, MS 43  
1727 30th Street  
P.O. Box 168041  
Sacramento, CA 95816-8041

Re: Protest of Intent to Award Contract 10-0W1904, For Construction of State Highway in San Joaquin County in and Near Lodi From Hammer Lane Overcrossing to Sacramento County Line

Dear Mr. McMillan:

This office represents Chester Bross Construction Company in its ongoing protest of Department of Transportation's ("Caltrans") intent to award contract 10-0W1904 to A. Teichert & Son, Inc. dba Teichert Construction ("Teichert"). There is some confusion as to whether Caltrans has issued a final decision on this protest. I am writing to clarify that Chester Bross continues to protest any award to Teichert, for the reasons previously stated and expounded upon below, and to request a hearing and final decision on this protest.

**CALTRANS' INITIAL DECISION TO REJECT ALL BIDS WAS CORRECT AND SHOULD BE REINSTATED**

On September 19, 2015, Chester Bross filed a protest of the intended award of the contract to Teichert. The basis for the protest was, among other grounds, that Teichert's bid was mathematically unbalanced because it clearly overpriced Item No. 45, Tack Coat, and materially unbalanced because this would result in a higher contract price than Chester

John C. McMillan  
December 16, 2014  
Page 2

Bross' bid. Teichert's counsel responded to this protest on September 29, 2014, and Chester Bross filed its reply on October 2, 2014.<sup>1</sup>

Over a month later, on November 6, 2014, Caltrans sent a letter to Chester Bross stating that it is rejecting all bids and re-advertising the project because "[a] quantity error was discovered." This letter appeared to be Caltrans' final decision on the protest. Chester Bross' protest had demonstrated that, because Caltrans had significantly underestimated the quantity for the tack coat, Teichert was able to inflate the unit price for this item and still produce a total bid amount that was ostensibly the lowest. Thus, it appears that Caltrans had granted Chester Bross' protest on the grounds that this "quantity error" had resulted in a mathematically and materially unbalanced low bid.

However, rather than re-bid the contract as promised, Caltrans' next step was highly unusual. On November 24, 2014, Caltrans issued a letter purporting to rescind its decision to reject all bids. It states without explanation, and without any further communication with Chester Bross, that "[u]pon further evaluation of item number 45 Tack Coat, the Department [Caltrans] concluded that it cannot validate that there is a reasonable doubt that the low bid would result in the lowest overall cost to the State." As explained below, there is indeed reasonable doubt that Teichert's bid is the lowest. Furthermore, Caltrans' attempt to rescind its rejection is highly irregular, apparently without precedent, and appears to be an abuse of discretion.

California Public Contract Code section 10185 provides the director of a California agency, such as Caltrans, with the authority to reject all bids if it is determined that "acceptance of the lowest responsible bid or bids is not for the best interests of the state." This statute "confers on the Director the *duty* of exercising his judgment as to whether it is in the best interests of the state to award the contract to the lowest bidder." *Judson Pac.-Murphy Corp. v. Durkee*, 144 Cal. App. 2d 377, 382 (1956) (citing Public Contract Code section 14355, which is the predecessor to section 10185) (emphasis added). Thus, in the instant protest, Caltrans was fulfilling its *duty* to protect the best interests of the state when it first decided to reject all bids. Meanwhile, there appears to be no authority that would allow Caltrans to rescind a rejection of all bids.

Caltrans' attempt to rescind its decision to reject all bids indicates that it is not fulfilling its duty to protect the best interests of the state. Chester Bross has amply demonstrated that Teichert's bid was not actually the lowest. Moreover, the timing of Caltrans' conflicting decisions on the protest is particularly curious. Caltrans had more than

---

<sup>1</sup> We understand that Caltrans has copies of all of these protest letters, and have therefore not included them with this letter.

John C. McMillan  
December 16, 2014  
Page 3

enough time to carefully consider all of the protest arguments, as it took over a month to issue the initial decision that rejected all bids. There was no rational basis for rescinding this decision less than three weeks later. It is also unusual that Caltrans did not post either of these decisions to its website, when this is its normal practice for bid protest decisions. These circumstances raise questions as to whether Teichert had any undue influence on the rescission. At the very least, these circumstances indicate that there was an abuse of discretion that occurred in Caltrans' decision-making process on this contract.

Accordingly, Chester Bross respectfully requests that Caltrans reinstate its decision to reject all bids and re-issue the request for bids. Alternatively, Caltrans could issue a new decision that awards the contract to Chester Bross. The arguments in Chester Bross' prior protest letters, as expounded upon below, establish that Chester Bross submitted the lowest responsive bid; while Teichert's apparent low bid was in fact neither the lowest nor responsive. Caltrans' letter rescinding the rejection of bids incorrectly notes that "all eight bids were materially unbalanced for item number 45, Tack Coat." In fact, Chester Bross provided the lowest bid for Item No. 45, so a comparison of the bids shows that Chester Bross was the only bidder that did not unbalance this item. If Caltrans had any concerns, it should have asked Chester Bross to justify its cost. Thus, while Caltrans has the option to reject all bids, it also has the option to award this contract to Chester Bross as the lowest responsive bidder.

**THERE IS AT LEAST A "REASONABLE DOUBT" THAT TEICHERT'S BID WILL NOT RESULT IN THE LOWEST OVERALL COST TO THE STATE**

As this project is receiving federal aid, the federal rules requiring mathematically and materially balanced bids are applicable. See *Tip Top Constr. Corp. v. Gov't of Virgin Islands*, No. CV 2014-0006, 2014 WL 1466470, at \*6 (V.I. Apr. 11, 2014); see also U.S. Dept. of Trans. memo to Regional Federal Highway Administrators, May 16, 1988, <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/programadmin/contracts/051688.cfm> ("U.S. DOT Memo") (copy attached as Exhibit ("Exh.") 1).

A bid is mathematically unbalanced if it "contain[s] lump sum or unit bid items which do not reflect reasonable actual costs plus a reasonable proportionate share of the bidder's anticipated profit, overhead costs, and other indirect costs," while a bid is materially unbalanced if it creates "a reasonable doubt that award to the bidder submitting a mathematically unbalanced bid will result in the lowest ultimate cost to the Federal Government." 23 C.F.R. § 635.102.

Chester Bross' prior protest letters have fully explained why Teichert's bid is mathematically and materially unbalanced for Item No. 45, Tack Coat. These prior letters

John C. McMillan  
December 16, 2014  
Page 4

include calculations that establish that, based on the corrected estimate of quantities for Item No. 45, Teichert's bid exceeds the cost of Chester Bross' bid. While Teichert has argued that its bid is not mathematically unbalanced because it based Item No. 45 on its subcontractor's bid, the evidence it submitted does not support that argument. In fact, Teichert admits that it took the unusual step of including the labor cost of spreading the tack coat along with the material cost. Chester Bross, on the other hand, included all of the spreading labor with Item Nos. 37 and 38, as this cost was more easily absorbed by the much higher estimated quantities (e.g., 149,000 tons for Item No. 8 versus 150 tons for Item No. 45). Hence, Teichert intentionally loaded this item with additional costs with the knowledge that the actual quantities would be more than double the estimate. Moreover, Teichert provides no evidence to show that its estimate for the delivery and spread charges are accurate, which is significant because the total spread charge included in Item No. 45 is double the material charge for the tack oil.

Most importantly, Caltrans' inquiry is not whether it is more likely than not that Teichert's bid will result in a more expensive contract for the state. Chester Bross needs only show that there is some "reasonable doubt" that it will be more expensive. Chester Bross' protest establishes this reasonable doubt, and Teichert has failed to rebut it. Teichert has provided no explanation for the excessive labor and delivery charges associated with Item No. 45, and no explanation for why its total unit price for this item is almost twice as much as Chester Bross' total unit price.

Furthermore, the U.S. Department of Transportation, in its cautionary memo to Regional Federal Highway Administrators, expressly noted that a bidder will materially unbalance its bid "by overpricing bid items he/she believes will be used in greater quantities than estimated in the proposal," in order to maximize its profits. See Exh. 1, U.S. DOT Memo, p. 2. Thus, the U.S. Department of Transportation has already found that conduct such as Teichert's overpricing of Item No. 45, an item that it must have known had underestimated quantities, provides a reasonable doubt that its bid will result in the lowest overall cost.

Accordingly, Caltrans should comply with the U.S. Department of Transportation's directive and reject Teichert's bid.

**TEICHERT'S BID IS NON-RESPONSIVE AND ILLEGAL BECAUSE IT  
CHANGED THE SCOPE OF WORK IN ITS SUBCONTRACTOR LISTING**

It is true that pursuant to applicable law and the Notice to Bidders, Teichert was entitled to provide the bid item numbers and percentages of work for its subcontractors within 24 hours of bid opening. The problem with Teichert's bid is not that it provided this

John C. McMillan  
December 16, 2014  
Page 5

information after its initial bid, but rather that it changed this information and therefore improperly altered its listed subcontractors' scopes of work.

When it first submitted its bid, Teichert opted to provide the bid item numbers that its subcontractors would perform. However, it did not state that any of these bid items were partial, thus indicating that its subcontractors would perform 100% of the work for these bid items. In a prior decision, Caltrans has established as precedent that this is the proper interpretation of listing bid items in this manner. Caltrans issued a decision on October 30, 2014, to reject a Gordon N. Ball's bid on a different project because Gordon Ball first listed a subcontractor as performing "partial" bid items and within 24-hours later revised it to state that they were performing 100% of these bid items.<sup>2</sup> If initially listing a bid item as "partial" means that the sub will do less than 100% of the work, then listing the bid item without stating it is partial necessarily means the sub will be doing 100% of that bid item.

Accordingly, when Teichert revised its subcontractor listing within 24-hours to show that certain subs would be performing less than 100% of their listed bid items, it changed the scope of work. This made Teichert's bid non-responsive, and also violated Public Contract Code section 4107, which requires notice to the subcontractor and agency approval before a listed sub's scope of work can be changed. Caltrans has not yet addressed this argument in its two decisions on this protest. For the sake of clarity on this protest and on future bids, Chester Bross respectfully requests that Caltrans issue a written decision indicating whether it deems this conduct as legal and responsive.

**CALTRANS SHOULD REJECT TEICHERT'S BID AS NON-RESPONSIVE  
BECAUSE ITS CONTRACTORS LICENSE IS INVALID**

There is an additional ground for rejecting Teichert's bid as non-responsive, beyond those outlined in Chester Bross' prior protest letters. The project's Notice to Bidders and Special Provisions expressly requires that the contractor have either a Class A or C-12 license. While Teichert ostensibly has a Class A license, this license is invalid because Teichert's Responsible Managing Officer ("RMO") has exceeded the statutory limit on the number of firms he may qualify.

A qualifying individual for a contractor's license "may act as the qualifier for no more than three firms in any one year period." Bus. & Prof. Code §7068.1(d). Additionally, a person may not act as the qualifying individual for any additional firm, even within the three-firm limit, unless: (a) there is common ownership of at least 20 percent;

---

<sup>2</sup> A copy of this Caltrans' decision is attached hereto as Exh. 2.

John C. McMillan  
December 16, 2014  
Page 6

(b) the additional firm is a subsidiary or joint venture of the first; or (c) the majority of partners, officers or managers are the same. Bus. & Prof. Code §7068.1(a)-(c).

Here, Teichert's Class A license is qualified by Judson Riggs Teichert, as of July 22, 2014. See Exh. 3, A. Teichert & Son, Inc.'s Contractor's License Personnel Detail. However, Mr. Teichert is also currently qualifying *five* other firms with his Class A license: (1) Teichert Readymix; (2) Teichert Aggregates; (3) Teichert Inc.; (4) Renew Energy, Inc.; and (5) Teichert Pipelines, Inc. See Exh. 4, Personnel License List for Riggs, Judson Teichert.

Mr. Teichert is therefore qualifying a total of six firms at the same time. This is three more than are permitted within a one-year period. Accordingly, Mr. Teichert is prohibited from qualifying Teichert's license, thereby necessarily automatically suspending this license.

Because Teichert's required license is invalid, its bid is non-responsive and must be rejected. Furthermore, as Teichert lacks the license to perform the work, Caltrans is statutorily obligated to reject its bid. Bus. & Prof. Code §7028.15(e).

### CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above and in Chester Bross' prior protest letters, Teichert's bid is non-responsive and does not result in the lowest ultimate cost. Accordingly, Chester Bross respectfully requests that Caltrans either award the contract to Chester Bross as the lowest responsive bidder, or reject all bids and re-advertise the project as originally promised. Chester Bross also requests a hearing and a final written decision on this protest.

Sincerely,



Tyson Arbuthnot

TA:sci  
cc: Shawn Simmons (via U.S. mail)

**EXHIBIT 1**

## Construction



U.S. Department of  
Transportation  
**Federal Highway  
Administration**

**MEMORANDUM**

**Subject:** Bid Analysis and Unbalanced Bids

**Date:** May 16, 1988

**From:** Associate Administrator for Engineering and Program  
Development      **Refer To:** HHO-32

**To:** Regional Federal Highway Administrators  
Direct Federal Program Administrator

As a result of a recent Office of Inspector General field audit in Region 6, we have been requested to issue additional guidance on the subject of bid analysis and unbalanced bidding. We offer the following for your information and use in administering the Federal-aid highway program.

### Policy:

The FHWA policy on analysis of contract bids is found in FHPM 6-4-1-6, paragraph 11.c. It requires the evaluation of the unit bid prices for reasonable conformance with the engineer's estimate. Bids with extreme variations from the engineer's estimate, or where obvious unbalancing of unit prices has occurred, should be thoroughly evaluated by the State highway agency (SHA) and FHWA. If the award of the contract would result in an advantage to the contractor with a corresponding disadvantage to the SHA and FHWA or if the competitive bidding process is jeopardized, then appropriate steps must be taken by the SHA or Division Administrator to protect the public interest.

### Accuracy of Estimated Quantities:

When items are bid unusually high or low in relationship to the engineer's estimate, the accuracy of the estimated quantities should be checked. If, after examination, the estimated quantities are determined to be a reasonably accurate representation of actual anticipated needs, then the low bid should be further evaluated for unbalancing.

On the other hand, in cases where it is concluded, after examination, that the estimated quantities are not a reasonably accurate representation of actual anticipated needs, the SHA and division office should consider rejecting all bids, correcting the quantities, and re-advertising. However, an error in estimated quantities should not cause an automatic rejection of bids. Two factors need to be considered: (1) whether the public interest would be best served by making the award and (2) whether any bidder would be treated in an unfair manner if the award were made.

The bids should be rejected if: (1) the public interest would be best served in cancelling the defectively estimated proposal or (2) awarding the contract to the apparent low bidder using a corrected quantity estimate would be unfair to the other bidders who had relied on the original quantity estimate to develop their bid. (Attached is an example.)

## Unbalanced Bids:

In discussing unbalanced bids, it is best to define two terms: mathematically unbalanced and materially unbalanced. An unbalanced bid may be only mathematically unbalanced or the bid may be mathematically and materially unbalanced.

A mathematically unbalanced bid is one containing lump sum or unit bid items which do not reflect reasonable actual costs plus a reasonable proportionate share of the bidder's anticipated profit, overhead costs, and other indirect costs, which he/she anticipates for the performance of the items in question.

A Comptroller General's opinion further defined a mathematically unbalanced bid as follows:

"A bid is mathematically unbalanced if the bid is structured on the basis of nominal prices for some work and inflated prices for other work; that is, each element of the bid must carry its proportionate share of the total cost of the work plus profits." Matter of: Howell Construction, Comp. Gen. B-225766 (1987)

There is no prohibition per se against a contractor submitting a mathematically unbalanced bid unless an SHA has adopted a specific contract requirement precluding such submittal.

While mathematically unbalanced bids are not prohibited per se, evidence of a mathematically unbalanced bid is the first step in proving a bid to be materially unbalanced. A materially unbalanced bid has been defined as:

"A bid is materially unbalanced if there is a reasonable doubt that award to the bidder submitting the mathematically unbalanced bid will result in the lowest ultimate cost to the Government. Consequently, a materially unbalanced bid may not be accepted." Matter of: Crown Laundry and Dry Cleaners, Comp. Gen. B-208795.2, April 22, 1983.

To determine whether a bid is unbalanced, it needs to be evaluated for reasonable conformance with the engineer's estimate. There are no specific parameters, such as amount or percent of variance from the engineer's estimate, that constitute an unbalanced bid. However, any evaluation process should undertake to determine why the bid is unbalanced, what effect the unbalancing will have on the contract, and if there is an effect, will it be to the detriment of the SHA and/or FHWA. When evaluating for detrimental effects, contract administration and competitive issues should be included along with cost.

There are numerous reasons why a bidder may want to unbalance his/her bid on a contract. One reason is to get more money at the beginning of the project. The bidder does this by overpricing the work done early in the project. This is called "front loading" the contract. The leading case in the "front loading" area is Matter of: Riverport Industries, 64 Comp. Gen. 441 (1985). Here the Comptroller General held that if the bid is front loaded, regardless if it is the lowest bid, it "should be viewed as materially unbalanced since acceptance of the bid would result in the same evils as an advance payment. An advance payment is prohibited by law." The "front loading" may also be materially unbalanced due to the cost of money that must be paid out early versus over the normal construction of the project.

Another reason is to maximize profits. The bidder does this by overpricing bid items he/she believes will be used in greater quantities than estimated in the proposal and underpricing items he/she thinks will be used in significantly lesser quantities. Care should be exercised to ensure that mobilization bids do not mask unbalancing. If bidders are bidding too high on mobilization, the SHA should be encouraged to alter its specifications to reduce any accelerated payment for mobilization or to limit mobilization to a fixed percentage of the contract.

An unbalanced bid may be an attempt by the bidder to simplify the bidding. The SHA may have created bid items that lend themselves to unbalancing. As an example, a specification may call for specific items to be paid for by the hour, such as a roller for compacting embankment and water to aid compaction to be paid for by the gallon. In this case, it may be better to set up the bid item as "Embankment, Compacted," paid by the cubic yard. The roller and water usage would be necessary but incidental to the bid item. Another example which may encourage unbalancing is the establishment of bid items for equipment hours or activity hours which in all likelihood will not be needed. When unbalancing on these types of bid items occurs, agreement should be reached with the SHA to rewrite the specifications to provide bid items which will cover likely work activities. Only items for work and equipment that are expected to be used on the project should be included in the proposal.

One method which an SHA may want to consider to avoid the problems of unbalanced bids is to insert into its contract specifications a specific clause prohibiting unbalanced bidding. Bids subsequently shown to be mathematically unbalanced would be rejected as nonresponsive. It is important that such a clause contain clear and explicit language as courts have noted that "contractors are entitled to know how their bids will be evaluated; they cannot effectively compete when the standards for judgment exist only in the contracting officer's head," *North Virginia Van Company v. U.S.*, 3 C1. Ct. 237 (1983).

All SHA's, as a minimum, should be encouraged to adopt the AASHTO *Guide Specifications for Highway Construction* provision found in Section 102.07(e) or similar language:

"102.07 Irregular Proposals. Proposals will be considered irregular and may be rejected for any of the following reasons:...

(E) If the Department determines that any of the unit bid prices are significantly unbalanced to the potential detriment of the Department."

Use of the AASHTO Guide Specifications or similar provisions will facilitate the rejection of bids which are deemed to be materially unbalanced. States implementing unbalancing provisions should advise the bidders in the bid proposal that, when bid prices are not commensurate with the work involved, justification may be required and may involve delay in the award of the contract or possible rejection of the bid.

When a low bid contains token bid prices (i.e., penny unit bids), front loadings, or bid prices with large variations from the engineer's estimate, it should be considered a mathematically unbalanced bid and further evaluated. Engineers performing bid analysis should be aware that signs of apparent unbalancing in bidding may be an indication of more serious criminal activities such as collusion and bid rigging. Studies of collusion and bid rigging show that such activities are often accompanied by suspicious bidding patterns such as bids: "token bids," "front loading," "identical bidding," "complimentary bidding."

## Bid Analysis:

An analysis of unbalanced bids may be aided by the use of one of several computer software packages now available in many SHA's such as the Bid Analysis and Management System (BAMS) or Highway Collusion Detection System (HCDS) programs. However, the final analysis should not preclude the use of engineering judgment.

In analyzing bids, the following should be considered:

1. Is the bid mathematically unbalanced? Are the unit bid prices in reasonable conformance with the engineer's estimate and other bids?

2. If awarded, what effect will unbalanced bid items have on the total contract amount?
3. If quantities are incorrect, will the contract cost be increased when the quantities are corrected?
4. On items where the quantities may vary, will the lower bidder remain as low bidder?
5. If the bid is unbalanced, will the unbalance have a potential detrimental effect upon the competitive process or cause contract administration problems after award?

Where obvious unbalanced bid items exist, the SHA's recommendation to award or reject a bid needs to be supported by written justification. The justification should include the detrimental effect or lack of detrimental effect. A bid found to be mathematically unbalanced to some degree but not found to be materially unbalanced may be awarded if the SHA's specifications permit. However, prior to concurrence in the award of any mathematically unbalanced bid which is not materially unbalanced, the Division Administrator should determine the reason for the unbalancing and, when warranted, take appropriate steps to protect the Federal interest such as conditioning Federal participation.

When a low bid is determined to be mathematically and materially unbalanced, the Division Administrator must take appropriate steps to protect the Federal interest. This action may take the form of concurrence in an SHA's decision not to award the contract to the submitter of the unbalanced low bid. If on the other hand, the SHA decides to proceed with the award and requests FHWA concurrence, the Division Administrator's action could range from nonconcurrence to concurrence with contingency conditions limiting Federal participation.

Finally, if unbalancing is found to be caused in part by questionable SHA specifications or procedures, the division office should work with the SHA to facilitate appropriate and timely revisions.

*/s/ original signed by*  
Ronald E. Heinz

Attachment

---

Federal Highway Administration | 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE | Washington, DC 20590 |  
202-366-4000

**EXHIBIT 2**

Received

Nov 13 2014 05:53pm

From: chester gross construction

209 263 0123

11/13/2014 18:55

#299 P.004/004

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

EDMUND G. BROWN Jr., Governor

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**  
**DIVISION OF ENGINEERING SERVICES**  
**OFFICE ENGINEER**  
1727 30<sup>th</sup> STREET, MS-43  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-8041  
PHONE (916) 227-6299  
FAX (916) 227-6282  
www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe



*Serious drought.  
Help save water!!*

October 30, 2014

Facsimile: (925) 838-5915

Hal Stober, President  
Gordon N. Ball, Inc.  
333 Camille Avenue  
Alamo, CA 94507

04-2G8604  
04-Ala-580-R33.4  
B.O 10/16/2014

Dear Mr. Stober:

The Department of Transportation (Caltrans) received a bid submitted by Gordon N. Ball, Inc. (Gordon Ball) for Contract No. 04-2G8604 on October 16, 2014. By this letter, Caltrans notifies Gordon Ball that its bid is nonresponsive.

The Subcontractor List form states in part, "...Complete columns 1 and 4 and submit with the bid. Complete columns 2 and 3 and submit with the bid or fax to (916) 227-6282 within 24 hours after the bid opening. Failure to provide complete information in columns 1 through 4 within the time specified will result in a nonresponsive bid."

On the Subcontractor List form submitted with the bid, Gordon Ball identified Selby's Soil Erosion Control (Selby) to perform work listed as partial. However, on the 24-hour Subcontractor List form, Gordon Ball changed the percentage of work to be performed from partial to 100 percent. The change from partial to 100 percent expands the scope of work to be performed by Selby, and constitutes an improper change to the Subcontractor's List form.

Based on the above, Caltrans will proceed to award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder.

Your attention is directed to Section 3-1.04 of the Amendments to the 2010 Standard Specifications. Caltrans is not obligated to offer an extension of the award period for a nonresponsive bid. Should you wish to extend your bid while resolving a nonresponsive finding, you must send your request to the Office Engineer no later than 4:00 p.m., two business days prior to the expiration of your bid.

If you have any questions, please contact Irene Beckham, Contract Award Analyst, at (916) 227-6284.

Sincerely,

**JOHN C. McMILLAN**  
Deputy Division Chief  
Office Engineer  
Division of Engineering Services

**EXHIBIT 3**

[Home](#) | [Online Services](#) | [License Detail](#) | [Personnel List](#) | [Personnel Detail](#)

## Contractor's License Personnel Detail

**Contractor License #** 8

**Contractor Name** A TEICHERT & SON INC

**Name** JUDSON TEICHERT RIGGS

### Title and Class History

<b>Title</b>	OFFICER
<b>Classification</b>	
<b>Association Date</b>	08/20/1990
<b>Disassociation Date</b>	03/26/2001
<b>Title</b>	RMO/CEO/PRES
<b>Classification</b>	A GENERAL ENGINEERING CONTRACTOR
<b>Association Date</b>	03/26/2001
<b>Disassociation Date</b>	02/17/2005
<b>Title</b>	RMO/CEO/PRES
<b>Classification</b>	B GENERAL BUILDING CONTRACTOR
<b>Association Date</b>	03/26/2001
<b>Title</b>	RMO/CEO/PRES
<b>Classification</b>	C16 FIRE PROTECTION CONTRACTOR
<b>Association Date</b>	03/26/2001
<b>Title</b>	RMO/CEO/PRES
<b>Classification</b>	C27 LANDSCAPING
<b>Association Date</b>	03/26/2001
<b>Title</b>	RMO/CEO/PRES
<b>Classification</b>	A GENERAL ENGINEERING CONTRACTOR
<b>Association Date</b>	07/22/2014

### Bonding History

**EXHIBIT 4**

[Home](#) | [Online Services](#) | [Personnel Search Results](#) | [Personnel License List](#)

## Personnel License List for RIGGS, JUDSON TEICHERT

Click on the license number to see a more detailed page of information on that person.

### Licenses Currently Associated With

<b>License #</b>	<a href="#">8</a>
<b>Business Name</b>	TEICHERT CONSTRUCTION
<b>City</b>	SACRAMENTO
<b>Association Date</b>	08/20/1990
<b>Status</b>	ACTIVE
<b>License #</b>	<a href="#">582399</a>
<b>Business Name</b>	TEICHERT READYMIX
<b>City</b>	SACRAMENTO
<b>Association Date</b>	08/20/1990
<b>Status</b>	ACTIVE
<b>License #</b>	<a href="#">563440</a>
<b>Business Name</b>	TEICHERT AGGREGATES
<b>City</b>	SACRAMENTO
<b>Association Date</b>	08/20/1990
<b>Status</b>	ACTIVE
<b>License #</b>	<a href="#">567156</a>
<b>Business Name</b>	TEICHERT INC
<b>City</b>	SACRAMENTO
<b>Association Date</b>	04/28/1999
<b>Status</b>	ACTIVE
<b>License #</b>	<a href="#">815129</a>
<b>Business Name</b>	TEICHERT PRECAST PRODUCTS
<b>City</b>	SACRAMENTO
<b>Association Date</b>	11/20/2002
<b>Status</b>	EXPIRED

**License #** 828411  
**Business Name** ANGELO UTILITIES  
**City** SACRAMENTO  
**Association Date** 12/15/2003  
**Status** EXPIRED

**License #** 965558  
**Business Name** RENEW ENERGY INC  
**City** SACRAMENTO  
**Association Date** 09/14/2011  
**Status** ACTIVE

**License #** 985344  
**Business Name** TEICHERT PIPELINES INC  
**City** SACRAMENTO  
**Association Date** 07/22/2013  
**Status** ACTIVE

Licenses No Longer Associated With

**License #** 967732  
**Business Name** PRIDE INDUSTRIES ONE INC  
**City** ROSEVILLE  
**Association Date** 11/16/2011  
**Disassociation Date** 11/26/2013  
**Status** ACTIVE

---

Copyright © 2013 State of California

Contractors State License Board