STATE OF CALIFORNIA GAVIN NEWSOM., *Governor*

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
COMMISSION ON HEALTH AND SAFETY AND WORKERS' COMPENSATION
1515 Clay Street, Suite 1540
Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone: (510) 622-3959
Fax: (510) 286-0499
Email: CHSWC@dir.ca.gov
Website: www.dir.ca.gov/chswc

DATE: August 7, 2025

TO: CHSWC Commissioners

Mitch Steiger, Chair
Jen Hamelin
Shelley Kessler
Kristi Montoya
Chris Pedroza
Nicholas Roxborough
Meagan Subers
Sidharth Voorakkara

FROM: Melissa Flores, Executive Officer, CHSWC

SUBJECT: Deficiencies of the Request For Proposal (RFP) S23CHSWC001 titled *Identifying, Characterizing and Mitigating Cancer and other Occupational Health Risks Among Mechanics and Cleaners of Firefighting Vehicles* dated September 12, 2024

The purpose of this memo is to provide an explanation for CHSWC withdrawing RFP S23CHSWC001.

Background

RFP S23CHSWC001 was based on the requirements specified in Labor Code Section 1, Section 77.7 and its scope of work was "to conduct a study to assess the risk of exposure to carcinogenic and toxic materials, and to assess the incidence of occupational cancer among mechanics and cleaners of firefighting vehicles". The scope of work was broken into five tasks. Although the five tasks were stated clearly in this RFP, the RFP neither highlighted nor emphasized the significance of Tasks 2 and 3.

Task 2 titled *Conduct Site Visits, Interviews and Surveys and Report Results* did not specify the time or percentage of the budget that would be allocated towards Task 2. Task 2 was critical to the success of the project as it noted "The Contractor shall conduct site visits to a representative sample of facilities, located throughout the State of California and including facilities in Northern and Southern California". Without

specifying the percentage of time allocated towards this task, nor specifying the percentage of the budget for it, the contractor could not have completed Task 2 as needed.

Task 3 titled *Conduct Qualitative and Quantitative Observations and Analysis and Summarize Findings* was the most important task in the RFP and was critical to this study. The RFP should have clearly stated the minimum sample size that would have made this task valid to support the proposed modeling exercise that was also required in Task 3. Additionally, the RFP should have specified the percentage of the total budget that would have been allocated to this task.

Conclusion

For both critical tasks, Task 2 and Task 3, the RFP did not give clear directions to meet expectations nor specify how the $350,000 budget should have been allocated. Therefore, it was withdrawn.