



**Report Title:** CMD 14B Sub Intake Details  
**Run Date and Time:** 2025-10-23 11:31:36 Pacific Daylight Time  
**Run by:** Grant Ly  
**Table name:** u\_cmd14b\_intake

**CMD 14B Sub Intake**

Number:	14BSUB0002783	Request Status:	Completed
Requester:	Grant Ly	State:	Closed Complete
Requester Phone:	+16282712723	Awaiting Info From:	
Requestor Email:	grant.ly@sfdpw.org	Awaiting info reason:	
Submitting Department:	DPW	Opened:	2025-10-16 12:16:35
Project Manager / Contract Manager:	Grant Ly	Opened by:	Mu Aung
		Submitted for Review On:	2025-10-16 15:57:07
		Completed On:	2025-10-23 09:53:17
		Cancelled On:	
		Watch list:	

Title of Project or Solicitation:

PW Contract No. 35 Traffic Signal Upgrades

Reason for Cancellation:

PeopleSoft Contract ID (if created):	Micro LBE %:	
	Small LBE %:	
	SBA LBE %:	
	Overall LBE subcontractor participation requirement %:	25
	Supervisor Review Required:	true

**Applicability Check**

Estimated amount for the contract is:	Above or equal to 50% of threshold	Will you solicit as a Micro Set-Aside?:
Do all funding sources allow the application of a local preference program?:	Yes	Engineer's Estimate for contract:
Contract Type :	Construction	Why is Micro-LBE Set-Aside program not appropriate for this contract?:
How will you proceed with this contract?:	LBE Sub-Requirement	SF First – Will you outreach to LBEs and request multiple bids/proposals?:
		Please describe department's outreach efforts to LBEs if multiple bids/proposal:
		Rationale for omitting LBE outreach required by 14B.7(L):

**Project Details**

Project Description:

Project work includes installation of new traffic signal and streetlight poles, conduits, wiring, controller cabinets, pull boxes, ADA compliant curb ramps where existing ramps are deficient per current standards, and associated hydraulics work such as catch basin installation, relocations, and adjustments. Two locations, 30th Avenue & Fulton Street and 36th Ave & Fulton Street require coordination with SF Recreation & Parks Department as sidewalk improvements encroach into the park right of way.

**Traffic Signal Upgrades:**

The project is proposing to modify traffic signals at the following 17 locations. All traffic signal locations will have pedestrian countdown signals (PCS), accessible pedestrian signals (APS), controllers, conduit, wiring, poles, and associated curb ramps for pedestrian push buttons.

**Curb Ramps:**

There will be approximately 76 confirmed curb ramps per collaboration with ADA and Street Highways. There will also be median island refuges and partial reconstruction of wings, sidewalk, curb and gutter work where deemed necessary. Curb ramp impact and excavation scope were determined by MTA in collaboration with DAC and Street Highways.

**Hydraulics:**

The project drainage scope includes the installation of thirteen (13) new catch basins and new culverts connecting the catch basins to the city's main sewer system. The installation of catch basins and culverts generally includes removing pavement, excavating a trench to a depth of no more than eight (8) feet, installing new culvert pipe and catch basin, backfilling the trench, and restoring pavement. Drainage work will occur at the following locations: 25th Avenue & Clement Street, 30th Street & San Jose Avenue, Post Street & Larkin Street, 25th Avenue & Anza Street, 30th Avenue & Fulton Street.

How many contracts do you intend to award with the same LBE sub requirement?:	1	Estimated Contract/Order Amount (per contract/order if awarding multiple):	\$9,000,000.00
Department Contract ID:	10033346	Estimated Contract Term (Months):	19
Is contract arising from an RFQ/pool?:	No	Is this a PUC Regional Project?:	
Sourcing Event ID:	0000002270	PUC Regional Project Types:	
Is this an As-Needed contract?:	No		
Requesting LBE sub requirement for entire contract or each task/service order?:			

**LBE Details**

Address or relevant cross streets for this project:	1) 6thAve/ Irving, (2) 16th St/ Sanchez, (3) 25th Ave/ Anza, (4) 25th Ave/ Clement, (5) 29th St/ San Jose, (6) 30th St/ San Jose, (7) 30th Ave/ Fulton, (8) 36th Ave/ Fulton, (9) Alemany/ Sickles, (10)	Will the work be let out in trade bid packages?:	No
Choose all the Zip Code(s) in which the project is located:	94122, 94121, 94118, 94131, 94117, 94124, 94114, 94110, 94112, 94109, 94127	Dollar estimate for the trucking work:	\$0.00
Other Zip Code(s) not listed:		License or Experience requirement for the prime contractor:	Class "A" or C-10 License
Work available for LBEs :	PUBLIC WORKS only: Department accepts a 20% or 25% sub requirement; Engineer's Estimate is attached.	Additional special licensing requirements (other than requirement for the prime):	No
Explain why LBE subcontractor work may be limited:		License or Experience requirement for the sub-contractors:	
Scope of Work Breakdown:		If any, what are the highly specialized services or deliverables? :	No
Previous contracts with similar scope of work (list Title and Contract ID):	Contract 36 Traffic Signal Modifications, SEID: 0000007829	ODCs or reimbursable costs included in estimate?:	

Summary of the Work:

A. The work to be done under this contract consists of upgrading the signal infrastructure at 17 intersections, with new curb ramps at most intersections, some small amount of sewer work, and a streetlight foundation to be constructed in a sub-sidewalk basement. The work includes new wiring, new Pedestrian Countdown Signals (PCS), new Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS) pushbuttons, new larger vehicular signal heads, new poles and mast-arms, and new signal controllers.

Gasoline: Skidsteer, Auger, Generator

Diesel: Utility Truck, Bucket Truck, Bulldozer, Dump Trucks, Front Loader, Backhoes, Crane lift

Section 01 60 00:	01-60-00-Product-Requirements.docx
Specially manufactured items required:	
CMD Work Breakdown:	
Engineer's Estimate :	00 41 00 Engineers Estimate_CT 35 95%_PRJ_10152025.xls

**CMD Admin**

CMD Admin:	Ivan Oldenkamp	CMD Admin Decision:	LBE Sub-requirement set
Did you set separate sub contractor participation requirements?:	No	CMD Admin Decision Date:	2025-10-23 08:26:22

CMD Admin Comments:  
The LBE subcontracting requirement is 25% and can only be met with San Francisco CMD Certified Micro and/or Small LBEs.

To be exempt from the CMD Form 2B "Good Faith Efforts" requirements, bidder must commit LBE sub participation in the percentage that equals or exceeds 33.75%.

Bidders may not discriminate in the selection of subcontractors on the basis of race, gender, or any other basis prohibited by law. Formal complaints of discrimination will be investigated.

Please use CMD Attachment 1.

Contract Compliance Officer contact info:

Email: ivan.oldenkamp@sfgov.org

Phone: (415) 554-0639

**CMD Supervisor**

CMD Supervisor:	Vivian Liu	CMD Supervisor Decision:	Reviewed and Approved
		CMD Supervisor Decision Date:	2025-10-23 09:53:17

CMD Supervisor Comments:

**Activities**

**Related List Title:** History List  
**Table name:** sys\_history\_line  
**Query Condition:** Set = 14BSUB0002783 AND Field NOT IN u\_group\_work\_notes\_list,delivery\_plan,work\_notes\_list,approval\_set,wf\_activity,delivery\_task,service\_offering,comments\_and\_work\_notes,work\_notes,company  
**Sort Order:** None

Label	Old	New	Type	Update number	Update time	User name
Estimated Contract/Order Amount (per contract/order if awarding multiple)		\$8,937,186.00		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Upon reject		Cancel all future Tasks		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Number		14BSUB0002783		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Requester Phone		+16282712706		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Contract Type		Construction		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
State		Open		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Requester		Mu Aung		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Knowledge		false		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Impact		3 - Low		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Active		true		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Priority		4 - Low		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Project Manager / Contract Manager		Grant Ly		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Sourcing Event ID		0000002270		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Task type		CMD 14B Sub Intake		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Reassignment count		0		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Estimated amount for the contract is		Above or equal to 50% of threshold		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Requestor Email		mu.aung@sfdpw.org		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Upon approval		Proceed to Next Task		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Escalation		Normal		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Is contract arising from an RFQ/pool?		No		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Made SLA		true		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Submitting Department		DPW		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Effective number		14BSUB0002783		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Opened by		Mu Aung		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Domain		global		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Do all funding sources allow the application of a local preference program?		Yes		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Opened		2025-10-16 12:16:35		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Title of Project or Solicitation		PW Contract No. 35 Traffic Signal Upgrades		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung

Label	Old	New	Type	Update number	Update time	User name
Request Status Explanation		Set to draft because the request has not been submitted for review yet.		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung

Label	Old	New	Type	Update number	Update time	User name
Project Description		<p>Project work includes installation of new traffic signal and streetlight poles, conduits, wiring, controller cabinets, pull boxes, ADA compliant curb ramps where existing ramps are deficient per current standards, and associated hydraulics work such as catch basin installation, relocations, and adjustments. Two locations, 30th Avenue &amp; Fulton Street and 36th Ave &amp; Fulton Street require coordination with SF Recreation &amp; Parks Department as sidewalk improvements encroach into the park right of way.</p> <p><b>Traffic Signal Upgrades:</b> The project is proposing to modify traffic signals at the following 17 locations. All traffic signal locations will have pedestrian countdown signals (PCS), accessible pedestrian signals (APS), controllers, conduit, wiring, poles, and associated curb ramps for pedestrian push buttons.</p> <p><b>Curb Ramps:</b> There will be approximately 76 confirmed curb ramps per collaboration with ADA and Street</p>		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung

Label	Old	New	Type	Update number	Update time	User name
		<p>Highways. There will also be median island refuges and partial reconstruction of wings, sidewalk, curb and gutter work where deemed necessary. Curb ramp impact and excavation scope were determined by MTA in collaboration with DAC and Street Highways.</p> <p>Hydraulics: The project drainage scope includes the installation of thirteen (13) new catch basins and new culverts connecting the catch basins to the city's main sewer system. The installation of catch basins and culverts generally includes removing pavement, excavating a trench to a depth of no more than eight (8) feet, installing new culvert pipe and catch basin, backfilling the trench, and restoring pavement. Drainage work will occur at the following locations: 25th Avenue &amp; Clement Street, 30th Street &amp; San Jose Avenue, Post Street &amp; Larkin Street, 25th Avenue &amp; Anza Street, 30th Avenue &amp; Fulton Street.</p>				
Is this an As-Needed contract?		No		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Contact type		Phone		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Urgency		3 - Low		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung

Label	Old	New	Type	Update number	Update time	User name
Request Status		Draft		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
How will you proceed with this contract?		LBE Sub-Requirement		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Approval		Not Yet Requested		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Dollar estimate for the trucking work		\$0.00		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Supervisor Review Required		false		0	2025-10-16 12:25:51	Mu Aung
Department Contract ID		10033346	Audit	1	2025-10-16 14:46:49	Mu Aung
How many contracts do you intend to award with the same LBE sub requirement?		1	Audit	1	2025-10-16 14:46:49	Mu Aung
Estimated Contract/Order Amount (per contract/order if awarding multiple)	\$8,937,186.00	\$9,000,000.00	Audit	2	2025-10-16 15:51:42	Mu Aung
If any, what are the highly specialized services or deliverables?		No	Audit	2	2025-10-16 15:51:42	Mu Aung
Requester Phone	+16282712706	+16282712723	Audit	4	2025-10-16 15:54:36	Mu Aung
Address or relevant cross streets for this project		1) 6thAve/ Irving, (2) 16th St/ Sanchez, (3) 25th Ave/ Anza, (4) 25th Ave/ Clement, (5) 29th St/ San Jose, (6) 30th St/ San Jose, (7) 30th Ave/ Fulton, (8) 36th Ave/ Fulton, (9) Alemany/ Sickles, (10)	Audit	2	2025-10-16 15:51:42	Mu Aung
Choose all the Zip Code(s) in which the project is located - String		94122, 94121, 94118, 94131, 94117, 94124, 94114, 94110, 94112, 94109, 94127	Audit	2	2025-10-16 15:51:42	Mu Aung
Additional special licensing requirements (other than requirement for the prime)		No	Audit	2	2025-10-16 15:51:42	Mu Aung

Label	Old	New	Type	Update number	Update time	User name
Will the work be let out in trade bid packages?		No	Audit	2	2025-10-16 15:51:42	Mu Aung
Estimated Contract Term (Months)		19	Audit	2	2025-10-16 15:51:42	Mu Aung
License or Experience requirement for the prime contractor		Class "A" or C-10 License	Audit	2	2025-10-16 15:51:42	Mu Aung
Choose all the Zip Code(s) in which the project is located		94122, 94121, 94118, 94131, 94117, 94124, 94114, 94110, 94112, 94109, 94127	Audit	2	2025-10-16 15:51:42	Mu Aung
Summary of the Work		A. The work to be done under this contract consists of upgrading the signal infrastructure at 17 intersections, with new curb ramps at most intersections, some small amount of sewer work, and a streetlight foundation to be constructed in a sub-sidewalk basement. The work includes new wiring, new Pedestrian Countdown Signals (PCS), new Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS) pushbuttons, new larger vehicular signal heads, new poles and mast-arms, and new signal controllers. Gasoline: Skidsteer, Auger, Generator Diesel: Utility Truck, Bucket Truck, Bulldozer, Dump Trucks, Front Loader, Backhoes, Crane lift	Audit	2	2025-10-16 15:51:42	Mu Aung

Label	Old	New	Type	Update number	Update time	User name
Previous contracts with similar scope of work (list Title and Contract ID)		Contract 36 Traffic Signal Modifications, SEID: 0000007829	Audit	2	2025-10-16 15:51:42	Mu Aung
Supervisor Review Required	false	true	Audit	2	2025-10-16 15:51:42	Mu Aung
Work available for LBEs		PUBLIC WORKS only: Department accepts a 20% or 25% sub requirement; Engineer's Estimate is attached.	Audit	2	2025-10-16 15:51:42	Mu Aung
Engineer's Estimate		00 41 00 Engineers Estimate_CT 35 95%_PRJ_1015202 5.xls	Audit	3	2025-10-16 15:53:19	Mu Aung
Requester	Mu Aung	Grant Ly	Audit	4	2025-10-16 15:54:36	Mu Aung
Requestor Email	mu.aung@sfdpw.org	grant.ly@sfdpw.org	Audit	4	2025-10-16 15:54:36	Mu Aung
Section 01 60 00		01-60-00-Product-Requirements.docx	Audit	5	2025-10-16 15:56:58	Mu Aung
State	Open	Work in Progress	Audit	6	2025-10-16 15:57:07	Mu Aung
Submitted for Review On		2025-10-16 15:57:07	Audit	6	2025-10-16 15:57:07	Mu Aung
Request Status Explanation	Set to draft because the request has not been submitted for review yet.	Set to admin review because the request was submitted for review, but no admin decision has been made yet.	Audit	6	2025-10-16 15:57:07	Mu Aung
Request Status	Draft	CMD Admin Review	Audit	6	2025-10-16 15:57:07	Mu Aung
email	399790032be8ba106469ff10de91bf10		Email	6	2025-10-16 15:57:22	grant.ly@sfdpw.org
email	f19750032be8ba106469ff10de91bf9a		Email	6	2025-10-16 15:57:22	Katherine.Mundhenk@sfgov.org, Stepha...
email	618bd4833be876d07b464b9aa4e45ae6		Email	7	2025-10-16 16:14:33	ivan.oldenkamp@sfgov.org, grant.ly@s...
CMD Admin		Ivan Oldenkamp	Audit	7	2025-10-16 16:14:21	Vivian Liu
CMD Admin Decision		LBE Sub-requirement set	Audit	8	2025-10-23 08:26:22	Ivan Oldenkamp
Did you set separate sub contractor participation requirements?		No	Audit	8	2025-10-23 08:26:22	Ivan Oldenkamp
CMD Admin Decision Date		2025-10-23 08:26:22	Audit	8	2025-10-23 08:26:22	Ivan Oldenkamp

Label	Old	New	Type	Update number	Update time	User name
Request Status Explanation	Set to admin review because the request was submitted for review, but no admin decision has been made yet.	Set to supervisor review because the admin decision was to set to Sub Req Set and supervisor review is required.	Audit	8	2025-10-23 08:26:22	Ivan Oldenkamp
Overall LBE subcontractor participation requirement %		25	Audit	8	2025-10-23 08:26:22	Ivan Oldenkamp
CMD Admin Comments		<p>The LBE subcontracting requirement is 25% and can only be met with San Francisco CMD Certified Micro and/or Small LBEs.</p> <p>To be exempt from the CMD Form 2B "Good Faith Efforts" requirements, bidder must commit LBE sub participation in the percentage that equals or exceeds 33.75%.</p> <p>Bidders may not discriminate in the selection of subcontractors on the basis of race, gender, or any other basis prohibited by law. Formal complaints of discrimination will be investigated.</p> <p>Please use CMD Attachment 1.</p> <p>Contract Compliance Officer contact info: Email: ivan.oldenkamp@sfgov.org Phone: (415) 554-0639</p>	Audit	8	2025-10-23 08:26:22	Ivan Oldenkamp
Request Status	CMD Admin Review	CMD Supervisor Review	Audit	8	2025-10-23 08:26:22	Ivan Oldenkamp

Label	Old	New	Type	Update number	Update time	User name
email	84833e412b707a10 6469ff10de91bf59		Email	8	2025-10-23 08:26:24	Katherine.Mundhenk@sfgov.org, Stepha...
State	Work in Progress	Closed Complete	Audit	9	2025-10-23 09:53:17	Vivian Liu
Active	true	false	Audit	9	2025-10-23 09:53:17	Vivian Liu
CMD Supervisor Decision		Reviewed and Approved	Audit	9	2025-10-23 09:53:17	Vivian Liu
Closed by		Vivian Liu	Audit	9	2025-10-23 09:53:17	Vivian Liu
Completed On		2025-10-23 09:53:17	Audit	9	2025-10-23 09:53:17	Vivian Liu
CMD Supervisor Decision Date		2025-10-23 09:53:17	Audit	9	2025-10-23 09:53:17	Vivian Liu
Closed		2025-10-23 09:53:17	Audit	9	2025-10-23 09:53:17	Vivian Liu
Request Status Explanation	Set to supervisor review because the admin decision was to set to Sub Req Set and supervisor review is required.	Set to completed because the supervisor decision was approved.	Audit	9	2025-10-23 09:53:17	Vivian Liu
CMD Supervisor		Vivian Liu	Audit	9	2025-10-23 09:53:17	Vivian Liu
Request Status	CMD Supervisor Review	Completed	Audit	9	2025-10-23 09:53:17	Vivian Liu
email	0c770b053b387a107 b464b9aa4e45ac2		Email	9	2025-10-23 09:53:32	ivan.oldenkamp@sfgov.org, grant.ly@s...

**Lam, Pansy (DPW)**

---

**To:** Liu, Anna (ADM); Aung, Mu (DPW)  
**Cc:** Gaffud, Earl (DPW); Ly, Grant (DPW); Kwong, Nate (DPW); Lee, Jacob (DPW)  
**Subject:** RE: 1044I Contract 35 Traffic Signal Upgrades\_SEID-0000002270\_OLSE Project Funding Source

Construction Manager/General Contractor       Other: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Project Name:</b>	PW CONTRACT 35 TRAFFIC SIGNAL UPGRADES
<b>Project Number:</b>	1044I
<b>PeopleSoft Event ID:</b>	10033346
<b>Bid Advertisement Date:</b>	11/2025
<b>Estimated Contract Amount:</b>	\$9M

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Funding Amount (\$)</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>City Funds</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Revenue Bond	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Obligation Bond	2024 Healthy, Safe, and Vibrant San Francisco Bond (\$5M)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other:	Prop L (\$4M)
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>State Funds</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Federal Funds</b>	

**Project Manager Contact Information**

---

**From:** Liu, Anna (ADM) <anna.liu@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, November 14, 2025 7:53 AM  
**To:** Aung, Mu (DPW) <mu.aung@sfdpw.org>; Lam, Pansy (DPW) <Pansy.Lam@sfdpw.org>  
**Cc:** Gaffud, Earl (DPW) <Earl.Gaffud@sfdpw.org>; Ly, Grant (DPW) <grant.ly@sfdpw.org>; Kwong, Nate (DPW) <nathan.kwong@sfdpw.org>; Lee, Jacob (DPW) <jacob.lee@sfdpw.org>  
**Subject:** RE: 1044I Contract 35 Traffic Signal Upgrades\_SEID-0000002270\_OLSE Project Funding Source

Hi Mu,

Thanks for the updated Funding Source form. Based on the information provided, this project is still subject to the Citywide PLA.

Thanks,  
Anna

Anna Liu

Compliance Officer  
Office of Labor Standards Enforcement  
City and County of San Francisco  
Phone: (415) 554-5404  
Email: [anna.liu@sfgov.org](mailto:anna.liu@sfgov.org)

---

**From:** Aung, Mu (DPW) <[mu.aung@sfdpw.org](mailto:mu.aung@sfdpw.org)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:17 PM  
**To:** Liu, Anna (ADM) <[anna.liu@sfgov.org](mailto:anna.liu@sfgov.org)>; Lam, Pansy (DPW) <[Pansy.Lam@sfdpw.org](mailto:Pansy.Lam@sfdpw.org)>  
**Cc:** Gaffud, Earl (DPW) <[Earl.Gaffud@sfdpw.org](mailto:Earl.Gaffud@sfdpw.org)>; Ly, Grant (DPW) <[grant.ly@sfdpw.org](mailto:grant.ly@sfdpw.org)>; Kwong, Nate (DPW) <[nathan.kwong@sfdpw.org](mailto:nathan.kwong@sfdpw.org)>; Lee, Jacob (DPW) <[jacob.lee@sfdpw.org](mailto:jacob.lee@sfdpw.org)>  
**Subject:** Re: 1044I Contract 35 Traffic Signal Upgrades\_SEID-000002270\_OLSE Project Funding Source

Hi Anna,

Attached is the updated Project Funding Source form for your review. Let me know if you have any questions.  
Thanks.

Best regards,



**Mu Aung**

Assistant Engineer

Bureau of Engineering | San Francisco Public Works | City and County of San Francisco

49 South Van Ness – Suite 900 | San Francisco, CA 94103 | (628) 271-2706 | [sfpublicworks.org](http://sfpublicworks.org) · [twitter.com/sfpublicworks](https://twitter.com/sfpublicworks)

---

**From:** Liu, Anna (ADM) <[anna.liu@sfgov.org](mailto:anna.liu@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:57 PM  
**To:** Aung, Mu (DPW) <[mu.aung@sfdpw.org](mailto:mu.aung@sfdpw.org)>; Lam, Pansy (DPW) <[Pansy.Lam@sfdpw.org](mailto:Pansy.Lam@sfdpw.org)>  
**Cc:** Gaffud, Earl (DPW) <[Earl.Gaffud@sfdpw.org](mailto:Earl.Gaffud@sfdpw.org)>; Ly, Grant (DPW) <[grant.ly@sfdpw.org](mailto:grant.ly@sfdpw.org)>; Kwong, Nate (DPW) <[nathan.kwong@sfdpw.org](mailto:nathan.kwong@sfdpw.org)>; Lee, Jacob (DPW) <[jacob.lee@sfdpw.org](mailto:jacob.lee@sfdpw.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: 1044I Contract 35 Traffic Signal Upgrades\_SEID-000002270\_OLSE Project Funding Source

Hi Mu,

Based on the information provided, this project will be subject to the Citywide PLA.

Thanks,  
Anna

Anna Liu

Compliance Officer  
Office of Labor Standards Enforcement  
City and County of San Francisco  
Phone: (415) 554-5404  
Email: [anna.liu@sfgov.org](mailto:anna.liu@sfgov.org)

---

**From:** Aung, Mu (DPW) <[mu.aung@sfdpw.org](mailto:mu.aung@sfdpw.org)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 1:56 PM  
**To:** Liu, Anna (ADM) <[anna.liu@sfgov.org](mailto:anna.liu@sfgov.org)>; Lam, Pansy (DPW) <[Pansy.Lam@sfdpw.org](mailto:Pansy.Lam@sfdpw.org)>  
**Cc:** Gaffud, Earl (DPW) <[Earl.Gaffud@sfdpw.org](mailto:Earl.Gaffud@sfdpw.org)>; Ly, Grant (DPW) <[grant.ly@sfdpw.org](mailto:grant.ly@sfdpw.org)>; Kwong, Nate (DPW) <[nathan.kwong@sfdpw.org](mailto:nathan.kwong@sfdpw.org)>; Lee, Jacob (DPW) <[jacob.lee@sfdpw.org](mailto:jacob.lee@sfdpw.org)>  
**Subject:** 1044I Contract 35 Traffic Signal Upgrades\_SEID-0000002270\_OLSE Project Funding Source

Hi Anna,

I'm sending out the OLSE project funding source form for your review. We're expecting to advertise the project end of next month. Please confirm whether the project is subject to the Citywide PLA. Thanks.

I'll be out of office from 10/20 to 11/07.

Best regards,



**Mu Aung**

Assistant Engineer

Bureau of Engineering | San Francisco Public Works | City and County of San Francisco

49 South Van Ness – Suite 900 | San Francisco, CA 94103 | (628) 271-2706 | [sfpublicworks.org](http://sfpublicworks.org) · [twitter.com/sfpublicworks](https://twitter.com/sfpublicworks)



## CEQA Exemption Determination

### PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<b>Project Address</b>		<b>Block/Lot(s)</b>
SFMTA - Contract 35 – Traffic Signal Upgrade Project		
<b>Case No.</b>		<b>Permit No.</b>
2018-016451ENV		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Addition/ Alteration</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>New Construction</b>
<p><b>Project description for Planning Department approval.</b></p> <p>The scope of work includes new signal timing and the installation of new vehicular signals, pedestrian countdown signals, underground conduit, pull boxes, signal poles, mast arm poles, controller cabinets, accessible pedestrian signals, and ADA compliant curb ramps at intersections controlled by existing traffic signals.</p> <p>The maximum excavation is twelve (12) feet for the signal pole foundations, sixteen (16) inches for the cabinet foundations, twenty-four (24) inches for the underground conduits and pull boxes, and twelve (12) inches for curb ramps.</p> <p>Proposed locations include: (1) 6th Ave/ Irving, (2) 16th St/ Sanchez, (3) 19th St/Folsom, (4) 21st St/ Folsom, (5) 22nd St/ Folsom, (6) 23rd St/ Folsom, (7) 25th Ave/ Anza, (8) 25th Ave/ Clement, (9) 29th St/ San Jose, (10) 30th St/ San Jose, (11) 30th Ave/ Fulton, (12) 36th Ave/ Fulton, (13) Alemany/ Sickles, (14) Anza/ Stanyan, (15) Baker/ Hayes, (16) California/ Larkin, (17) Evans/Phelps, (18) Haight/Steiner, (19) Holloway/Junipero Serra, (20) Larkin/ Post, (21) Portola/Twin Peaks Blvd, (22) Gough/Market</p>		

### STEP 1: EXEMPTION TYPE

<b>The project has been determined to be exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Class 1 - Existing Facilities.</b> Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Class 3 - New Construction.</b> Up to three new single-family residences or six dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Class 32 - In-Fill Development.</b> New Construction of seven or more units or additions greater than 10,000 sq. ft. and meets the conditions described below:</p> <p>(a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.</p> <p>(b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.</p> <p>(c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species.</p> <p>(d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.</p> <p>(e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.</p> <p><b>FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY</b></p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Common Sense Exemption (CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3)).</b> It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility of a significant effect on the environment . <b>FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY</b>

## STEP 2: ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING ASSESSMENT

### TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Air Quality:</b> Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g. use of diesel construction equipment, backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks, etc.)? <i>(refer to The Environmental Information tab on the San Francisco Property Information Map)</i></p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Hazardous Materials:</b> If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential?</p> <p><b>Note that a categorical exemption shall not be issued for a project located on the Cortese List if box is checked, note below whether the applicant has enrolled in or received a waiver from the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, or if Environmental Planning staff has determined that hazardous material effects would be less than significant. (refer to The Environmental Information tab on the San Francisco Property Information Map)</b></p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Transportation:</b> Does the project involve a child care facility or school with 30 or more students, or a location 1,500 sq. ft. or greater? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities?</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Archeological Resources:</b> Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? If yes, archeology review is required.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment:</b> Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? <i>(refer to The Environmental Information tab on the San Francisco Property Information Map)</i> <b>If box is checked, Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</b></p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Average Slope of Parcel = or &gt; 25%, or site is in Edgehill Slope Protection Area or Northwest Mt. Sutro Slope Protection Area:</b> Does the project involve any of the following: (1) New building construction, except one-story storage or utility occupancy, (2) horizontal additions, if the footprint area increases more than 50%, or (3) horizontal and vertical additions increase more than 500 square feet of new projected roof area? <i>(refer to The Environmental Planning tab on the San Francisco Property Information Map)</i> <b>If box is checked, a geotechnical report is likely required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</b></p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Seismic Hazard:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Landslide or</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Liquefaction Hazard Zone:</b></p> <p>Does the project involve any of the following: (1) New building construction, except one-story storage or utility occupancy, (2) horizontal additions, if the footprint area increases more than 50%, (3) horizontal and vertical additions increase more than 500 square feet of new projected roof area, or (4) grading performed at a site in the landslide hazard zone? <i>(refer to The Environmental tab on the San Francisco Property Information Map)</i> <b>If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</b></p>
<p><b>Comments and Planner Signature (optional):</b> Laura Lynch</p> <p>Preliminary Archeological Checklist (PAC) issued 12/17/2018 and update on 10/21/2020. See case file 2018-016451ENV. Implementation of Public Works Standard Archeological Measure I (Discovery during Construction) is required at all locations with implementation. Through implementation of this measure, four locations would require out Alert training for shell midden - 19th/Folsom, Baker/ Hayes, Haight/Steiner and Alert training for mortuary furniture, bones: Anza/ Stanyan. Standard Archeological Measures II (Monitoring) and/or III (Testing/ Data Recovery) in the event of a discovery during construction recommended.</p>	

**STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE**  
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

<b>PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:</b> <i>(refer to Property Information Map)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Category A:</b> Known Historical Resource. <b>GO TO STEP 5.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Category B:</b> Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). <b>GO TO STEP 4.</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Category C:</b> Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). <b>GO TO STEP 6.</b>

**STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST**  
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

<b>Check all that apply to the project.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. <b>Change of use and new construction.</b> Tenant improvements not included.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. <b>Regular maintenance or repair</b> to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. <b>Window replacement</b> that meets the Department's <i>Window Replacement Standards</i> . Does not include storefront window alterations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. <b>Garage work.</b> A new opening that meets the <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</i> , and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. <b>Deck, terrace construction, or fences</b> not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. <b>Mechanical equipment installation</b> that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. <b>Dormer installation</b> that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	8. <b>Addition(s)</b> that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features.
<b>Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project is not listed. <b>GO TO STEP 5.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project <b>does not conform</b> to the scopes of work. <b>GO TO STEP 5.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves <b>four or more</b> work descriptions. <b>GO TO STEP 5.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves <b>less than four</b> work descriptions. <b>GO TO STEP 6.</b>

**STEP 5: ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW**  
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PRESERVATION PLANNER**

<b>Check all that apply to the project.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. <b>Reclassification of property status.</b> <i>(Attach HRER Part I)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category A a. Per HRER b. Other <i>(specify):</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category C <i>(No further historic review)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Project involves a <b>known historical resource (CEQA Category A)</b> as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. <b>Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces that do not remove, alter, or obscure character defining features.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. <b>Window replacement</b> of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. <b>Façade/storefront alterations</b> that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.

<input type="checkbox"/>	6. <b>Raising the building</b> in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. <b>Restoration</b> based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
<input type="checkbox"/>	8. <b>Work consistent</b> with the <i>Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Analysis required)</i> :
<input type="checkbox"/>	9. <b>Work compatible</b> with a historic district (Analysis required):
<input type="checkbox"/>	10. <b>Work that would not materially impair</b> a historic resource (Attach HRER Part II).
<b>Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST sign below.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Project can proceed with exemption review.</b> The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with exemption review. <b>GO TO STEP 6.</b>
<b>Comments (optional):</b>	
<b>Preservation Planner Signature:</b>	

**STEP 6: EXEMPTION DETERMINATION**  
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No further environmental review is required. The project is exempt under CEQA. There are no unusual circumstances that would result in a reasonable possibility of a significant effect.</b>	
	<b>Project Approval Action:</b> Public Works Director Contract Award	<b>Signature:</b> Lauren Bihl
		03/04/2021
<p>Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a n exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31of the Administrative Code.          In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination to the Board of Supervisors can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the approval action.          Please note that other approval actions may be required for the project. Please contact the assigned planner for these approvals.</p>		

## STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT

### TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a "substantial modification" and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

### MODIFIED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Modified Project Description:

### DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:

- |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption? |

**If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required.**

### DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

- |                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes. |
|--------------------------|---|

If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice. In accordance with Chapter 31, Sec 31.08j of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of this determination can be filed to the Environmental Review Officer within 10 days of posting of this determination.

**Planner Name:**

**Date:**



### Contract 35 – Traffic Signal Modifications

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) is proposing to update existing traffic signals at 22 intersections to improve traffic, pedestrian, and bicycle safety and traffic operations. The intersections are listed in the table below.

	Street 1	Street 2	Deepest Excavation		Street 1	Street 2	Deepest Excavation
1	6 <sup>th</sup> Ave	Irving St	7 feet	12	36 <sup>th</sup> Ave	Fulton St	9 feet
2	16 <sup>th</sup> St	Sanchez St	7 feet	13	Alemany Blvd	Sickles Ave	11 feet
3	19 <sup>th</sup> St	Folsom St	7 feet	14	Anza St	Stanyan St	7 feet
4	21 <sup>st</sup> St	Folsom St	7 feet	15	Baker St	Hayes St	7 feet
5	22 <sup>nd</sup> St	Folsom St	7 feet	16	California St	Larkin St	9 feet
6	23 <sup>rd</sup> St	Folsom St	7 feet	17	Evans Ave	Phelps St	9 feet
7	25 <sup>th</sup> Ave	Anza St	7 feet	18	Haight St	Steiner St	7 feet
8	25 <sup>th</sup> Ave	Clement St	7 feet	19	Holloway Ave	Junipero Serra Blvd	11 feet
9	29 <sup>th</sup> St	San Jose Ave	9.5 feet	20	Larkin St	Post St	9.5 feet
10	30 <sup>th</sup> St	San Jose Ave	9.5 feet	21	Portola Dr	Twin Peaks Blvd	12 feet
11	30 <sup>th</sup> Ave	Fulton St	9 feet	22	Gough St	Market St	12 feet

The scope of work includes new signal timing and the installation of new vehicular signals, pedestrian countdown signals, underground conduit, pull boxes, signal poles, mast arm poles, controller cabinets, accessible pedestrian signals, and ADA compliant curb ramps at intersections controlled by existing traffic signals. The maximum excavation is twelve (12) feet for the signal pole foundations, sixteen (16) inches for the cabinet foundations, twenty-four (24) inches for the underground conduits and pull boxes, and twelve (12) inches for curb ramps.

**Approval Action:** Public Works Director Contract Award

# SCORE RESULTS

Minimum score to pass is	150
Which is	50%

Bay Area Lightworks, Inc.  
 0000002270 - Contract No. 35 Traffic Signal Upgrades  
 of the maximum score of

300

	Applicant Score	Max Positive Score	Notes to Analysts:
<b>P. Safety Document Submittals - Submission Score:</b>	50	50	
<b>P. Safety Document Submittals - Content Evaluation Score:</b>	115	160	
<b>Q. OSHA Serious Violations:</b>	0		Duplicate the Tab for each Serious Violation. Be sure to add the new tab summary score into the calculation.
<b>R. OSHA Willful and Repeat Violations:</b>	0		Duplicate the Tab for each Willful and Repeat Violation. Be sure to add the new tab summary score into the calculation.
<b>S. Workplace Fatality:</b>	0		Duplicate the Tab for each Fatality Violation. Be sure to add the new tab summary score into the calculation.
<b>T. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) For 300A Summary of Work-Related Injuries and Illness:</b>	30	90	Score transferred from Submission Email
<b>Total</b>	195	150	

Weighting of positive score		
OSHA 300A Question Q	90	30%
Documents Question M	210	70%
Maximum Possible Score	300	100%

SFPW Safety Document Submittal Evaluation Criteria

000002270 - Contract No. 35 Traffic Signal Upgrades

Firm: Bay Area Lightworks, Inc.

Evaluation Date: 4/10/2026

Evaluator: PRO-TEC Safety Consultants

Signature: Ralph Morales

Evaluator: Please print, sign, scan and return electronically.

**P.1. Does your firm have an Injury and Illness Prevention Program?**

**Was the correct Document Submitted?**

Evaluation (check appropriate column):	No (0 points)	Yes (10 points)			Yes
P.1. Injury and Illness Prevention Program Document Submission Score	10				

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and if a "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does IIPP contain the minimum requirements of Title 8, Section §3203. Injury and Illness Prevention Program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsibility</li> <li>Compliance</li> <li>Communication</li> <li>Hazard Assessment</li> <li>Accident/Exposure Investigation</li> <li>Hazard Correction</li> <li>Training and Instruction</li> <li>Recordkeeping</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards

	Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
Evaluation (check appropriate column):				x		
P.1. Injury and Illness Prevention Program Document Content Score	15					

**P.2. Does your firm have a Drug and Alcohol Free Workplace Policy?**

**Was the correct Document Submitted?**

Evaluation (check appropriate column):	No (0 points)	Yes (10 points)			Yes
P.2. Drug and Alcohol Free Workplace Policy Submission Score	10				

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and if a "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the program contain the minimum requirements of an effective program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program Goals</li> <li>Definitions, expectations, and prohibitions</li> <li>Dissemination strategies</li> <li>Benefits and assurances</li> <li>Consequences and appeals</li> <li>Key Components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drug-free workplace policy</li> <li>Employee education</li> <li>Supervisor training</li> <li>Employee Assistance Program (EAP)</li> <li>Drug testing procedures</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>						
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
			x			Policy does not outline the procedures for appeal
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards

	Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
Evaluation (check appropriate column):			x			
P.2. Drug and Alcohol Free Workplace Policy Content Score	10					

**P.3. Does your firm have a Job Hazard Analysis (JHA or JSA) Procedure?**

**Was the correct Document Submitted?**

Evaluation (check appropriate column):	No (0 points)	Yes (5 points)			Yes
P.3. Job Hazard Analysis (JHA or JSA) Procedure Submission Score	5				

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and if an "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

JHA meets industry standards for criteria:						
JHA layout contains minimum requirements of Scope/Hazards/Mitigations				x		Meets Minimum Standards
Includes known/expected workplace hazards and mitigations				x		Meets Minimum Standards
Mid and High Risk Activities				x		Meets Minimum Standards
Broken out into critical components				x		Meets Minimum Standards
Expected hazards listed for each task				x		Meets Minimum Standards
Preventive measures listed for each hazard				x		Meets Minimum Standards

	Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
Evaluation (check appropriate column):				x		
P.3. Job Hazard Analysis (JHA or JSA) Procedure Content Score	15					

**P.4. Does your firm have a Corporate Safety Manual?**

**Was the correct Document Submitted?**

Evaluation (check appropriate column):	No (0 points)	Yes (5 points)			Yes
P.4. Corporate Safety Manual Submission Score	5				

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and if a "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the Safety Manual contain policies required based on project scope: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compliant with latest OSHA regulations, SFPW requirements and consensus standards</li> <li>Contains key policies based on contractor scope of work activities</li> <li>Management, supervision and employee roles/responsibilities</li> <li>Industry specific policies and procedures</li> <li>Critical Fatality Prevention Programs</li> <li>Training requirements</li> <li>Recordkeeping requirements and process</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards

<input type="checkbox"/> Health and Safety testing methods and procedures.				x	Meets Minimum Standards
<input type="checkbox"/> Injury/Incident/Near Miss reporting and investigation process				x	Meets Minimum Standards
<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency procedures.				x	Meets Minimum Standards
<input type="checkbox"/> Health and Environmental Policies				x	Meets Minimum Standards

	Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
Evaluation (check appropriate column):				x		
<b>P.4. Corporate Safety Manual Content Score</b>	<b>15</b>					

**P.5. Does your firm have a Injury and Incident Investigation Process?**

	No (0 points)	Yes (5 points)	Was the correct Document Submitted?
Evaluation (check appropriate column):		x	Yes
<b>P.5. Injury and Incident Investigation Process Submission Score</b>	<b>5</b>		

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and if a "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the Safety Manual and/or IIPP contain an Injury &amp; Incident Investigation process that utilizes:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Procedure for collecting critical information</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Process for reviewing and analyzing established facts</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Process for establishing key contributing factors</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Process for identifying Root Cause(s)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Process to identifying corrective actions</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Process to ensure implementation of corrective actions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards

	Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
Evaluation (check appropriate column):				x		
<b>P.5. Injury and Incident Investigation Process Content Score</b>	<b>15</b>					

**P.6. Does your firm have an Employee Safety Training Program and Records?**

	No (0 points)	Yes (5 points)	Was the correct Document Submitted?
Evaluation (check appropriate column):		x	Yes
<b>P.6. Employee Safety Training Program and Records Submission Score</b>	<b>5</b>		

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and if a "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the company submit an employee safety training program/records that:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Identifies minimum training requirements</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Includes job descriptions</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Documents training and training content</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Documents retraining</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards

	Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
Evaluation (check appropriate column):				x		
<b>P.6. Employee Safety Training Program and Records Content Score</b>	<b>15</b>					

**P.7. Does your firm have a Safety Field Audit Process?**

	No (0 points)	Yes (5 points)	Was the correct Document Submitted?
Evaluation (check appropriate column):		x	Yes
<b>P.7. Safety Field Audit Process Submission Score</b>	<b>5</b>		

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and if a "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the safety field audit process document:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Date</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Time</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Auditor</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Location</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Criteria audited</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Safe, unsafe conditions and/or behaviors noted</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Corrective actions taken</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Issue close out</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards

	Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
Evaluation (check appropriate column):				x		
<b>P.7. Safety Field Audit Process Content Score</b>	<b>15</b>					

**P.8. Does your firm have a Daily Safety Pre-Task Planning Process?**

	No (0 points)	Yes (5 points)	Was the correct Document Submitted?
Evaluation (check appropriate column):		x	Yes
<b>P.8. Daily Safety Pre-Task Planning Process Submission Score</b>	<b>5</b>		

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and, if an "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document if the daily safety planning process contains key elements:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Date</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Time</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Work Scope</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Expected, identified and possible hazards listed</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Hazard mitigations listed/effective</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Process is to be completed and reviewed as a team</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Work crew acknowledgement of hazards with names and signatures of all personnel involved in task(s).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards

Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
			x		

Evaluation (check appropriate column):

P.8. Daily Safety Pre-Task Planning Process Content Score

15

**SFPW OSHA Serious Citation Evaluation Criteria**

Firm: Bay Area Lightworks, Inc.

Evaluation Date: 4/10/2026

Evaluator: PRO-TEC Safety Consultants

Signature: *Ralph Morales*

**CAB Analyst: Create a separate score sheet for each Citation included in Question Q of the Applicant's submittal.**

Citation Number:

Citation Date:

Brief Description of the Violation:

N/A
-----

**Evaluator: List all Information Considered (e.g. copies of Applicant's appeal information submitted to OSHA, written explanations submitted with application, relevant corporate documents submitted under Question P, Documents)**

Documents Reviewed

Add comments and observations for each listed document

(list all documents reviewed associated with this citation, add rows as necessary)


**Question Q Scoring Rubric - OSHA Serious Violations:**

When an employer knows of or should know of a situation that has a definite chance of causing serious injury or death, but does not remedy it, OSHA issues a serious violation.

Inspectors must assess a penalty but they can adjust penalties based upon the seriousness of each particular violation, as well as the employer's previous history, the size of the business, and the good faith of the employer.

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

Citation Score:

Analysis and conclusion - Basis of Score:

--	--

**SFPW OSHA Repeat and Willful Citation Evaluation Criteria**

Firm: Bay Area Lightworks, Inc.

Evaluation Date: 4/10/2026

Evaluator: PRO-TEC Safety Consultants

Signature: *Ralph Morales*

**CAB Analyst: Create a separate score sheet for each Citation included in Question R of the Applicant's submittal.**

Citation Number:

Citation Date:

Type of Citation (check all that apply):

<b>General:</b>	
<b>Willful:</b>	
<b>Serious:</b>	
<b>Repeat:</b>	

Brief Description of the Violation:

<b>N/A</b>
------------

**Evaluator: List all Information Considered (e.g. copies of Applicant's appeal information submitted to OSHA, written explanations submitted with application, relevent corporate documents submitted under Question P, Documents)**

Documents Reviewed (list all documents reviewed associated with this citation, add rows as necessary)	Add comments and observations for each listed document
--	--


**Question R Scoring Rubric - Willful and Repeat Violations:**

OSHA Citation	Negative Score - Po
Repeat	-10
Willful	-30

Citation Score:

Analysis and conclusion - Basis of Score:

--	--

**SFPW Fatality Evaluation Criteria**

Firm: Bay Area Lightworks, Inc.

Evaluation Date: 4/10/2026

Evaluator: PRO-TEC Safety Consultants

Signature: *Ralph Morales*

**CAB Analyst: Create a separate score sheet for each fatality-related Citation included in Question 5 of the Applicant's submittal.**

Citation Number:

Citation Date:

Type of Citation (check all that apply):

General:	
Willful:	
Serious:	
Repeat:	

Brief Description of the Violation:

N/A
-----

**Evaluator: List all Information Considered (e.g. copies of Applicant's appeal information submitted to OSHA, written explanations submitted with application, relevent corporate documents submitted under Question P, Documents)**

Documents Reviewed      Add comments and observations for each listed document  
(list all documents reviewed associated with this citation, add rows as necessary)


**Negative Score - Potentially mitigated by evaluation of explanation**

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 that 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

Citation Score:

Analysis and conclusion - Basis of Score:

--	--

**Evaluator: Please print, sign, scan and return electronically.**

# SCORE RESULTS

Minimum score to pass is	150
Which is	50%

Bay Area Lightworks, Inc.  
 0000002270 - Contract No. 35 Traffic Signal Upgrades  
 of the maximum score of

300

	Applicant Score	Max Positive Score
<b>P. Safety Document Submittals - Submission Score:</b>	50	50
<b>P. Safety Document Submittals - Content Evaluation Score:</b>	115	160
<b>Q. OSHA Serious Violations:</b>	0	
<b>R. OSHA Willful and Repeat Violations:</b>	0	
<b>S. Workplace Fatality:</b>	0	
<b>T. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) For 300A Summary of Work-Related Injuries and Illness:</b>	30	90
<b>Total</b>	195	150

Notes to Analysts:

Duplicate the Tab for each Serious Violation. Be sure to add the new tab summary score into the calculation.

Duplicate the Tab for each Willful and Repeat Violation. Be sure to add the new tab summary score into the calculation.

Duplicate the Tab for each Fatality Violation. Be sure to add the new tab summary score into the calculation.

Score transferred from Submission Email

### Weighting of positive score

OSHA 300A Question Q	90	30%
Documents Question M	210	70%
Maximum Possible Score	300	100%

SFPW Safety Document Submittal Evaluation Criteria

000002270 - Contract No. 35 Traffic Signal Upgrades

Firm: Bay Area Lightworks, Inc.

Evaluation Date: 4/10/2026

Evaluator: PRO-TEC Safety Consultants

Signature: Ralph Morales

Evaluator: Please print, sign, scan and return electronically.

**P.1. Does your firm have an Injury and Illness Prevention Program?**

**Was the correct Document Submitted?**

Evaluation (check appropriate column):	No (0 points)	Yes (10 points)				Yes
P.1. Injury and Illness Prevention Program Document Submission Score	10					

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and if a "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

• Does IIPP contain the minimum requirements of Title 8, Section §3203. Injury and Illness Prevention Program:						
○ Responsibility				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Compliance				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Communication				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Hazard Assessment				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Accident/Exposure Investigation				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Hazard Correction				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Training and Instruction				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Recordkeeping				x		Meets Minimum Standards

	Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
Evaluation (check appropriate column):				x		
P.1. Injury and Illness Prevention Program Document Content Score	15					

**P.2. Does your firm have a Drug and Alcohol Free Workplace Policy?**

**Was the correct Document Submitted?**

Evaluation (check appropriate column):	No (0 points)	Yes (10 points)				Yes
P.2. Drug and Alcohol Free Workplace Policy Submission Score	10					

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and if a "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

• Does the program contain the minimum requirements of an effective program:						
○ Program Goals				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Definitions, expectations, and prohibitions				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Dissemination strategies				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Benefits and assurances				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Consequences and appeals			x			Policy does not outline the procedures for appeal
○ Key Components:						
▪ Drug-free workplace policy				x		Meets Minimum Standards
▪ Employee education				x		Meets Minimum Standards
▪ Supervisor training				x		Meets Minimum Standards
▪ Employee Assistance Program (EAP)				x		Meets Minimum Standards
▪ Drug testing procedures				x		Meets Minimum Standards

	Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
Evaluation (check appropriate column):			x			
P.2. Drug and Alcohol Free Workplace Policy Content Score	10					

**P.3. Does your firm have a Job Hazard Analysis (JHA or JSA) Procedure?**

**Was the correct Document Submitted?**

Evaluation (check appropriate column):	No (0 points)	Yes (5 points)				Yes
P.3. Job Hazard Analysis (JHA or JSA) Procedure Submission Score	5					

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and if an "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

JHA meets industry standards for criteria:						
○ JHA layout contains minimum requirements of Scope/Hazards/Mitigations				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Includes known/expected workplace hazards and mitigations				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Mid and High Risk Activities				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Broken out into critical components				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Expected hazards listed for each task				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Preventive measures listed for each hazard				x		Meets Minimum Standards

	Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
Evaluation (check appropriate column):				x		
P.3. Job Hazard Analysis (JHA or JSA) Procedure Content Score	15					

**P.4. Does your firm have a Corporate Safety Manual?**

**Was the correct Document Submitted?**

Evaluation (check appropriate column):	No (0 points)	Yes (5 points)				Yes
P.4. Corporate Safety Manual Submission Score	5					

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and if a "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

• Does the Safety Manual contain policies required based on project scope:						
○ Compliant with latest OSHA regulations, SFPW requirements and consensus standards				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Contains key policies based on contractor scope of work activities				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Management, supervision and employee roles/responsibilities				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Industry specific policies and procedures				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Critical Fatality Prevention Programs				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Training requirements				x		Meets Minimum Standards
○ Recordkeeping requirements and process				x		Meets Minimum Standards

<input type="checkbox"/> Health and Safety testing methods and procedures.				x	Meets Minimum Standards
<input type="checkbox"/> Injury/Incident/Near Miss reporting and investigation process				x	Meets Minimum Standards
<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency procedures.				x	Meets Minimum Standards
<input type="checkbox"/> Health and Environmental Policies				x	Meets Minimum Standards

	Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
Evaluation (check appropriate column):				x		
<b>P.4. Corporate Safety Manual Content Score</b>	<b>15</b>					

**P.5. Does your firm have a Injury and Incident Investigation Process?**

	No (0 points)	Yes (5 points)	Was the correct Document Submitted?
Evaluation (check appropriate column):		x	Yes
<b>P.5. Injury and Incident Investigation Process Submission Score</b>	<b>5</b>		

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and if a "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the Safety Manual and/or IIPP contain an Injury &amp; Incident Investigation process that utilizes:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Procedure for collecting critical information</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Process for reviewing and analyzing established facts</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Process for establishing key contributing factors</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Process for identifying Root Cause(s)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Process to identifying corrective actions</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Process to ensure implementation of corrective actions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards

	Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
Evaluation (check appropriate column):				x		
<b>P.5. Injury and Incident Investigation Process Content Score</b>	<b>15</b>					

**P.6. Does your firm have an Employee Safety Training Program and Records?**

	No (0 points)	Yes (5 points)	Was the correct Document Submitted?
Evaluation (check appropriate column):		x	Yes
<b>P.6. Employee Safety Training Program and Records Submission Score</b>	<b>5</b>		

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and if a "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the company submit an employee safety training program/records that:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Identifies minimum training requirements</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Includes job descriptions</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Documents training and training content</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Documents retraining</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards

	Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
Evaluation (check appropriate column):				x		
<b>P.6. Employee Safety Training Program and Records Content Score</b>	<b>15</b>					

**P.7. Does your firm have a Safety Field Audit Process?**

	No (0 points)	Yes (5 points)	Was the correct Document Submitted?
Evaluation (check appropriate column):		x	Yes
<b>P.7. Safety Field Audit Process Submission Score</b>	<b>5</b>		

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and if a "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the safety field audit process document:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Date</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Time</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Auditor</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Location</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Criteria audited</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Safe, unsafe conditions and/or behaviors noted</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Corrective actions taken</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Issue close out</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards

	Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
Evaluation (check appropriate column):				x		
<b>P.7. Safety Field Audit Process Content Score</b>	<b>15</b>					

**P.8. Does your firm have a Daily Safety Pre-Task Planning Process?**

	No (0 points)	Yes (5 points)	Was the correct Document Submitted?
Evaluation (check appropriate column):		x	Yes
<b>P.8. Daily Safety Pre-Task Planning Process Submission Score</b>	<b>5</b>		

Explain what is missing to achieve a "Meets" criteria and, if an "Exceeds" determination, what is included above the minimum to achieve an "Exceeds"

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document if the daily safety planning process contains key elements:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Date</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Time</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Work Scope</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Expected, identified and possible hazards listed</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Hazard mitigations listed/effective</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Process is to be completed and reviewed as a team</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Work crew acknowledgement of hazards with names and signatures of all personnel involved in task(s).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards
				x		Meets Minimum Standards

Below Standard - Requires Extensive Improvements (0 points)	Below Standard - Requires Improvements (5 points)	Below Standard - Requires Minor Improvements (10 points)	Meets Minimum Standards (15 points)	Exceeds Minimum Standards (20 points)	Explanation of score (required by evaluator)
			x		
					<b>15</b>

Evaluation (check appropriate column):

P.8. Daily Safety Pre-Task Planning Process Content Score

**SFPW OSHA Serious Citation Evaluation Criteria**

Firm: Bay Area Lightworks, Inc.

Evaluation Date: 4/10/2026

Evaluator: PRO-TEC Safety Consultants

Signature: *Ralph Morales*

**CAB Analyst: Create a separate score sheet for each Citation included in Question Q of the Applicant's submittal.**

Citation Number:

Citation Date:

Brief Description of the Violation:

N/A
-----

**Evaluator: List all Information Considered (e.g. copies of Applicant's appeal information submitted to OSHA, written explanations submitted with application, relevant corporate documents submitted under Question P, Documents)**

Documents Reviewed

Add comments and observations for each listed document

(list all documents reviewed associated with this citation, add rows as necessary)


**Question Q Scoring Rubric - OSHA Serious Violations:**

When an employer knows of or should know of a situation that has a definite chance of causing serious injury or death, but does not remedy it, OSHA issues a serious violation.

Inspectors must assess a penalty but they can adjust penalties based upon the seriousness of each particular violation, as well as the employer's previous history, the size of the business, and the good faith of the employer.

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

Citation Score:

Analysis and conclusion - Basis of Score:

--	--

**SFPW OSHA Repeat and Willful Citation Evaluation Criteria**

Firm: Bay Area Lightworks, Inc.

Evaluation Date: 4/10/2026

Evaluator: PRO-TEC Safety Consultants

Signature: *Ralph Morales*

**CAB Analyst: Create a separate score sheet for each Citation included in Question R of the Applicant's submittal.**

Citation Number:

Citation Date:

Type of Citation (check all that apply):

General:	
Willful:	
Serious:	
Repeat:	

Brief Description of the Violation:

<b>N/A</b>
------------

**Evaluator: List all Information Considered (e.g. copies of Applicant's appeal information submitted to OSHA, written explanations submitted with application, relevent corporate documents submitted under Question P, Documents)**

Documents Reviewed (list all documents reviewed associated with this citation, add rows as necessary)	Add comments and observations for each listed document
--	--


**Question R Scoring Rubric - Willful and Repeat Violations:**

OSHA Citation	Negative Score - Po
Repeat	-10
Willful	-30

Citation Score:

Analysis and conclusion - Basis of Score:

--	--

**SFPW Fatality Evaluation Criteria**

Firm: Bay Area Lightworks, Inc.

Evaluation Date: 4/10/2026

Evaluator: PRO-TEC Safety Consultants

Signature: *Ralph Morales*

**CAB Analyst: Create a separate score sheet for each fatality-related Citation included in Question 5 of the Applicant's submittal.**

Citation Number:

Citation Date:

Type of Citation (check all that apply):

General:	
Willful:	
Serious:	
Repeat:	

Brief Description of the Violation:

N/A
-----

**Evaluator: List all Information Considered (e.g. copies of Applicant's appeal information submitted to OSHA, written explanations submitted with application, relevent corporate documents submitted under Question P, Documents)**

Documents Reviewed                      Add comments and observations for each listed document  
(list all documents reviewed associated with this citation, add rows as necessary)


**Negative Score - Potentially mitigated by evaluation of explanation**

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 that 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

Citation Score:

Analysis and conclusion - Basis of Score:

--	--

**Evaluator: Please print, sign, scan and return electronically.**