

Safety Prequalification Scoring Rubrics:

The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) wants to work with firms that value safe working environments for their employees, CCSF employees, and the general public.

On July 7, 2020, the Board of Supervisors passed Ordinance No. 113-20 (file No. 200443) (Ordinance), which amended the definition of the term "Responsible" in Chapter 6 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (Chapter 6) to include substantiation of a record of safe performance on construction projects. It further amended the San Francisco Administrative Code to require Chapter 6 departments to award construction contracts for all project delivery methods only to Responsible construction contractors. On July 17, 2020, the Mayor signed the Ordinance. On August 17, 2020, the Ordinance became effective.

The amended definition of the term Responsible (Responsibility) at Section 6.1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code provides that a bidder or proposer for a construction contract must "substantiate its record of safe performance on construction projects, including but not limited to consideration of federal or state Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) violations and work place fatalities, including OSHA citations under appeal, in accordance with regulations issued by the City Administrator, in order for the City to find the entity to be Responsible and eligible for contract award.

Chapter 6 Departments (Airport, Municipal Transit Authority, Recreation and Parks, Port, Public Utilities Commission, and Public Works) will require a new submission with every procurement. Chapter 6 Departments may require bidders or proposers to complete the safety evaluation procedures at any point in the procurement process prior to contract award.

Chapter 6 Departments shall not award construction contracts with a safety responsibility requirement to any firm that has not demonstrated its Responsibility by passing at Step 1 or Step 2 or achieving a passing score at Step 3.

For as-needed construction contracts and job order contracts, the Responsibility determination will be done at the master contract level.

In the spring of 2023, the CCSF adopted an online Safety Prequalification Form (Form) to collect bidder and proposer documented and verifiable safety information. The Form asks for information and requests additional information conditionally, based on the bidder/proposer's responses.

A firm may pass based on a previously passing Step 1 or Step 2 submission, subject to verification. When a firm's submission goes to Step 3, the Departments shall utilize independent third-party safety expert consultants to evaluate any contractor-submitted Step 3 safety documents. The safety expert will provide the Chapter 6 Department head with their Step 3 scoring recommendations and rationale, while the department head or their designee

will make a final pass/fail determination regarding the applicant's Step 3 safety document submissions. If the department head or designee does not follow the expert's recommendation, they shall provide their rationale in writing.

For a firm to pass the Safety Prequalification at Step 3, their evaluated safety document submissions must achieve a score of at least 150 points. The results of the evaluation, pass or fail, will be provided upon completion of the evaluation and concurrence by the Department. The detailed evaluation of a firm's documents by the Third-Party Safety Expert will be provided to the firm after the bid opening date for the specific procurement.

At Step 3, your firm may earn up to 300 points in the following categories:

1. Document Submission, up to 50 points
2. Document Content Evaluation, up to 160 points
3. Injury and Lost Work Rates compared to Industry Standard, up to 90 points

Document Submission Score: The Third-Party Safety Expert will verify that the correct documents are submitted. The CCSF may adjust the submission score if it is determined that the document the firm submitted is not the required document. The Document Submission Score is based on the following scoring rubric:

	Maximum Submission Score
Injury and Illness Prevention Program	10
Drug and Alcohol-Free Workplace Policy	10
Job Hazard Analysis (JHA) Procedure	5
Corporate Safety Manual	5
Injury and Incident Investigation Process	5
Employee Safety Training Programs	5
Safety Field Audit Process	5
Daily Safety Pre-Task Planning Process	5

Document Content Score: The Third-Party Safety Expert will grade the content of each document and provide a score using the following rubric:

Scoring Rubric - Document Content Evaluation:

	Below standard - Requires Extensive Improvements	Below standard - Requires Improvements	Below standard - Requires Minor Improvements	Meets Minimum Standard	Exceeds Minimum Standard
Evaluation Score	0	5	10	15	20

Criteria	Contents of the document do not include most of the critical elements as detailed in document-specific guide.	Contents of the document do not include many of the critical elements as detailed in document-specific guide.	Contents of the document do not include some of the critical elements as detailed in document-specific guide.	Document contains all of the critical elements as detailed in the document-specific guide with minimal details.	Document contains all of the critical elements as detailed in the document-specific guide and embodies a commitment to a culture of safety.
----------	---	---	---	---	---

Injury and Lost Work Rates compared to Industry Standard Score: Calculated based on how the firm’s OSHA 300A rates compare to industry for each Reference Year using the following rubric:

Scoring Rubric - Injury and Lost Work Rates:

	Recordable Score	Lost Workday Score
Better than Industry	10.00	20.00
Equal to Industry	5.00	10.00
Worse than Industry	0.00	0.00

There is no limit on the number of negative points a firm may be given by the Third-Party Safety Expert. The Third-Party Safety Expert will assign negative points based on review of OSHA violations and the following scoring rubric:

Scoring Rubric - OSHA Serious Violations:

Serious Violation was associated with or could have led to this Injury Type; scale of seriousness of violation	Corrective Action Ineffective or Non-Enforceable	Corrective Action Adequate	Corrective Action Clear, Enforceable, Implemented, Measured Results
Sprains/Strain injuries, Contusion/Bruising, Dermatitis	-10	-5	0
Laceration < 5 stiches, 1st degree burn, Minor eye injury, Back injuries	-10	-5	0
Laceration 5 to 15 stiches, Corrosive chemical exposure, Chemical inhalation, 2nd degree burn	-15	-10	-5
Fractures, Hospitalization (overnight or longer), Electrical shock, Severe laceration > 15 stiches, 3rd degree burn	-20	-15	-10
Work-related Fatality, Amputation, High potential for fatality (Elec shock w/o PPE, Fall w/o fall protection)	-25	-20	-15

Scoring Rubric - Willful and Repeat Violations:

OSHA Citation	Regulatory Violation	General Violation	Serious Violation	Willful Violation
Repeat	-10	-25	-100	-200
Willful	-30	-50	-200	N/A
Negative Score - Potentially mitigated by evaluation of explanation				

Scoring Rubric - Workplace Fatalities:

No Citation: Personal Medical or Employee at fault	Serious Citation Issued	Willful Citation Issued
0	-100	-200

Fatality Citation Response Scoring Matrix				
Zero responsibility taken towards incident or citation. Challenge made to OSHA citation with no practical defense given. No improvements made, no additional training of employees, no changes to safety program to prevent recurrence.	Challenge made to OSHA citation with marginal defense provided. No root cause determined or corrective actions taken.	Challenge made to citation with detailed response. Good safety systems in place that, had they been followed, would have prevented incident. Basic measures taken including investigation that describes cause and actions taken to prevent recurrence.	Company presents case for reasonable "Independent Employee Act" defense. Citation contested with reasonable explanation of cause, with applicable training in place before incident. Post-incident training of all employees to prevent recurrence.	OSHA dismisses case or downgrades citation from serious. Company proves or has substantial evidence to show Independent Employee Act was cause. Company responds with training/retraining employees, updates IIPP to include methods for preventing recurrence. Company presents records of pre-incident training that would have prevented incident if followed.
Appears company is more worried about legal ramifications than understanding cause and preventing recurrence.	Some positive response/accountability to incident but not sufficient to prevent recurrence. No training records provided.	No changes to safety manual or IIPP. Minimal efforts made to enact corrective actions (training/program or policy updates). Some training records provided.	Solid safety program and training records exist but no evidence given of pre-incident training in safety policy that would have prevented incident if followed.	Company has excellent IIPP and Safety Manual with processes already present that will prevent recurrence, if followed. Company embraces gaps identified in incident investigation and implements improvements immediately after incident. Company assumes responsibility and is dedicated to prevent recurrence.
0% Reduction	25% Reduction	50% Reduction	75% Reduction	100% Reduction
Negative Score - Potentially mitigated by evaluation of explanation				