



CITY OF OAKLAND
Office of the City Auditor

INVESTIGATION

DATE: January 6, 2021

TO: Mayor Schaaf, Council President Bas, Members of the City Council, City Administrator Reiskin, City Attorney Parker, and Oakland Residents

FROM: City Auditor Courtney Ruby, CPA, CFE

SUBJECT: **Flawed Contracting Process: Biohazard Clean-up Services**

Background

The City of Oakland's contracting services

The City's contracting process begins when a City department identifies the need to purchase goods or services. Next the City must determine the type of contracting procedures to use. The City has different contracting procedures depending on the nature of the goods or services it is soliciting:

1. For **construction**, bids are coordinated by the Department of Public Works and the City Administrator's Contract Compliance Division. Contracts are awarded to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder.
2. For **professional services**, individual departments work with the Contract Compliance Division, which awards contracts based on a review of bidders' qualifications.
3. For **procurement bids**, the Purchasing Section of the Controller's Bureau awards procurement contracts to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder.

In November 2019, on behalf of the Oakland Police Department, the Controller's Bureau Purchasing Section solicited bids for biohazard clean-ups of crime scenes, City vehicles, police property, and public rights-of-way throughout the City.

The requested biohazard clean-up services are outlined in Exhibit 1 below.

Exhibit 1: Details of the City's requested biohazard clean-up services

The City of Oakland Police Department is requesting a quote for the following item(s) listed below:

1. Service Provider shall respond on scene to all service requests within one (1) hour of request from authorized City staff. The service provider will provide this service twenty-four (24) hours a day, seven (7) days a week, and 365 days per year. Constant communication shall be mandatory. Constant communication requires that the Contractor shall maintain open lines of communication with the Department dispatch center on arrival, and prior departure from the scene.
2. **BIO HAZARD AND CONTAMINANT REMOVAL FROM CITY POLICE VEHICLES, POLICE PROPERTY, or PHYSICAL RESTRAINTS.** Contractor shall provide a comprehensive biohazard removal service that eliminates bio hazards and restores police vehicles to the frontline service-ready condition.
 - a. Proper removal and decontamination of blood borne pathogens and other organisms from City vehicles including AIDS, hepatitis, lice, scabies, MRSA, poison oak, and other contagious bacteria and viruses that pose human health risks.
 - b. Proper removal of human bodily fluids from City vehicles, including but not limited to: blood, urine, feces, vomit, saliva, etc.
 - c. Proper removal of odors from City vehicles that are associated with any of the conditions previously cited. The vehicle must be permanently free from the associated odors upon service completion.
 - d. Proper disposal of all bio hazards, contaminants and associated materials listed above shall be responsibility of the service provider and shall occur immediately following each bio hazard service clean up.
3. **PHYSICAL HAZARDS.** Contractor will remove all physical hazards as well as biological hazards and contaminants as a part of one (1) project per dispatch. Physical Hazards include objects that are of sharp or hard nature such as: glass, needles, metal, plastics, stones, pits, wood or even bone. Physical hazards are defined as those which can lead to injuries such as choking, cuts, foreign material in food products, or broken bones.
4. **BIOHAZARD AND CONTAMINANT REMOVAL FROM ANY AREA WHICH MAY RISK THE SAFETY OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC.** Contractor shall provide a comprehensive biohazard removal service that eliminates all hazards and contaminant that may be an eminent danger to the public.

Source: Screenshot of a segment of the Request for Quotes issued by the Purchasing Section in November 2019.

The City awarded the biohazard services contract to Legacy Restoration Services

From the four vendors that submitted bids to the City, Legacy Restoration Services (Legacy) was awarded the bid.

On December 11, 2019, the City and Legacy entered into two-year purchase agreement for \$230,000.

Investigation History

In February 2020, a whistleblower submitted a complaint to the City Auditor’s Office alleging the following:

1. Legacy Restoration Services may not be a qualified contractor.
2. Specific requests for picking up hypodermic needles from the public right-of-way through OAK 311¹ are not being fulfilled.

The Office’s preliminary review of these allegations produced enough evidence to proceed with a full investigation.

Investigation Objectives

The objective of this investigation was to either substantiate or refute the above allegations. Specifically, we sought to answer the following questions:

1. Is Legacy Restoration Services a qualified contractor?
2. Are requests for removing hypodermic needles from the public right-of-way through OAK 311 being fulfilled?

To meet our objective, we completed work summarized in the “Methodology” section of this report on page 17.

Investigation Conclusions

Our investigation identified several concerns with Legacy’s capability to perform hazardous clean-ups even though the company is a registered limited liability company with the California Secretary of State. According to its website, the company provides biohazard remediation and cleaning services for private and commercial clients.

Our investigation also identified several problems with how the City selected the contractor and managed and monitored the contracted services. Specifically, we found:

- ✓ By not obtaining the type and quantities of needed services from City departments, the Purchasing Section’s solicitation was flawed from the outset.
- ✓ By not classifying biohazard clean-up as a professional service, the City did not rigorously review bidders as professional services providers.
- ✓ The City did not identify or act on numerous concerns regarding the selected biohazard contractor.
- ✓ The City does not adequately monitor Legacy’s work and billing.

¹ OAK 311 is the City of Oakland’s customer service hotline through which members of the public can report maintenance and infrastructure issues.

Our findings reveal risks to the City that warrant attention by the Controller’s Bureau and the City Administration. The following sections provide details on our investigation findings and explain the basis for our conclusions.

Investigation Findings

1. By not obtaining the type and quantities of needed services from City departments, the Purchasing Section's solicitation was flawed from the outset

According to the National Association of State Procurement Officials (NASPO),² a well-run procurement is based on a full understanding of user agencies' needs. This calls for team-work, a well-written specification/scope of work, relevant evaluation criteria, and appropriate contract terms, all of which greatly increase the chances that the public entity will receive the best value for its money. A poorly devised procurement increases the risk that commodities or services may not meet the public entity's needs and raises the costs to the public.

Stakeholder needs were not factored into the writing of the solicitation

While the Police Department was initially involved in preparing the biohazard clean-up services solicitation, other City departments (OAK 311 and Public Works) were not, even though these departments are also direct recipients of the biohazard clean-up services and have insight into the performance of previous biohazard contractors, and what customer service attributes would be ideal for biohazard services. Specifically, OAK 311 staff had direct contact with the former biohazard contractor, and members of the public who requested clean-ups.

It is also important to note that established standards of service, if included in the solicitation, assist the prospective bidders in understanding service expectations, and assist the City in evaluating contractors' performance once a contract is awarded.

Usage data was not factored into the writing of the solicitation

Another effect of not including the departments that were direct recipients of the biohazard clean-up services was that the Purchasing Section was not able to quantify the frequency of the needed services. Past data on the various departments' previous use of biohazard clean-up services should have been used to inform the solicitation requirements.

Purchasing used a flawed methodology to determine the lowest responsive, responsible bid

According to NASPO, *"Procurement officers should consider issues such as the information that they will require in order to write the solicitation, the procurement method that will be used to*

²The National Association of State Procurement Officials (NASPO) is a nonprofit association dedicated to advancing public procurement through leadership, excellence, and integrity. It is made up of the directors of the central purchasing offices in each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories of the United States. NASPO is an organization that helps its members achieve success as public procurement leaders through the promotion of best practices, education, professional development, research, and innovative procurement strategies.

conduct the competition, the most appropriate method to evaluate the bids or proposals, the type of contract to be used, and negotiation strategies. The public procurement officer must consider not only the commodity or service being purchased, but also contract terms, payment and performance measures, and risk management.”

Additionally, NASPO states “The evaluation of bids and proposals is a key point in the procurement process. It is where the needs of the using agency, as reflected in the solicitation, are compared side-by-side with the response of vendors heeding the call to meet those needs.”

As stated earlier, the City solicited bids for biohazard clean-ups of crime scenes, City vehicles, police property, and public rights-of-way, and subsequently received four bids. Consistent with the City’s procedures for procurement bids, the Purchasing Section was tasked with awarding the contract to the “lowest responsive, responsible bid.”

Determining the lowest-cost bid requires consideration of each bidder’s base price of delivering each of the aforementioned services, as well as the frequency with which the City would request each of the aforementioned services. Because the solicitation lacked this level of specification, it would be impossible for the Purchasing Section to quantify the bids and compare them against each other. Instead, the Purchasing Section took disparate and incomplete bid information and converted it into a single hourly cost, which was the quoted cost of a single service – providing clean-ups of the public rights-of-way. The Appendix shows each of the individual bidder’s quoted prices and shows the challenge of comparing the bids.

Exhibit 2 below outlines the Purchasing Section’s comparison of the different bids’ pricing.

Exhibit 2: Snapshot of the Purchasing Section’s comparison of biohazard bids

| Item # | Description | Quantity | Legacy Restoration Services | | Bidder No. 2 | | Bidder No. 3 | | Bidder No. 4 | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| | | | Hourly | Total | Hourly | Total | Hourly | Total | Hourly | Total |
| 1 | BIO-HAZARD/CRIME SCENE CLEAN-UP | 1 | \$100 | | \$135 | | \$70 | | \$200 | |
| 2 | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Delivery (Number of Days): | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Snapshot from Purchasing’s “bid recap.” NOTE: The Purchasing Section eliminated Bidder #3, the bidder with the lowest bid, due to recent complaints about the contractor, which resulted in the City cancelling its contract.

We also noted errors in Purchasing’s execution of its methodology. Specifically, the Purchasing Section incorrectly identified Legacy’s hourly rate of biohazard street clean-up as \$100 (when it was \$150 in its quote). Purchasing also incorrectly identified Bidder #2’s hourly rate as \$135 (when it was actually \$130), as reference in the Appendix.

2. By not classifying biohazard clean-up as a professional service, the City did not rigorously review bidders as professional services providers

The City treated the selection of the biohazard contractor as a procurement of goods

The biohazard bids were reviewed as procurement bids, which are used to help departments procure contracts for “goods.” A “good,” as defined by City Administrative Instruction 4323, includes supplies, materials, commodities, and equipment. When we asked why the biohazard bids were reviewed as procurement bids, Purchasing Section staff reported to us that biohazard clean-up does not qualify as a specialized task that warrants a professional service contracting process. We disagree.

In the past, the City solicited biohazard clean-up contractors by requesting procurement bids, and request for qualifications (RFQ) for providing professional services. This shows that the City has been inconsistent in how it procures biohazard clean-up services.

Biohazard clean-up qualifies as a professional service

The City of Oakland’s Administrative Instruction 150 defines “professional services” as follows: *“assistance provided by an outside individual, firm or organization (with some form of certification, degree, or recognized expertise) under contract to implement a decision made by department management or to complete a discrete and specialized task for a project. The project involves clearly identified deliverables for which the outside individual, firm or organization is liable. Payment for such assistance is based on a predetermined fee or a schedule of rates and charges.”* The biohazard clean-up bidders qualified as professional service providers because they perform *a specialized task with clearly identified deliverables* that are paid on a pre-determined schedule of charges.

Using the procurement bid process for selecting the biohazard contractor limited the scale, scope, and rigor of review

For procurement bids, the Purchasing Section and Risk Management Division review application materials to confirm that the lowest bidding contractor meets the City’s requirements for doing business with the City, including having insurance coverage and an active business license.

Professional services providers are subject to more requirements and are reviewed in detail by the Contract Compliance Division. Legacy, the company awarded the contract by the City, did not undergo the thorough evaluation process established for professional service providers, including a review of its alignment with the City of Oakland’s requirements for wages, benefits, and adherence to the Equal Benefits Ordinance, since the City considered the biohazard clean-up services as a procurement of goods.

Stakeholders were not involved in the evaluation of the bidders

Purchasing Section staff told us they did not involve the departments in the evaluation of the bidders because this solicitation was considered a procurement bid and the selection was purely and solely based on price. Evaluating the biohazard contractor as a professional service provider would have facilitated the collaboration of different departments in reviewing the biohazard contractor's qualifications.

3. The City did not identify or act on numerous concerns regarding the biohazard contractor

Since the City considered the biohazard clean-up services as a procurement of goods, the Purchasing Section sought to identify the “lowest responsive, responsible bidder” to determine which prospective contractor would be awarded the contract. In contracting parlance, a bidder is “responsible” if it can perform the solicited services. This investigation found that the review of the biohazard clean-up bids was insufficient to determine if the bidders were responsible.

When we reviewed publicly available information sources, we identified concerns which the City should have identified and considered.

The City did not require bidders to be State-certified trauma waste practitioners

According to the California Department of Public Health, *“a trauma scene waste management practitioner is a person who undertakes as a commercial activity the removal of human blood, human body fluids, and other associated residues from the scene of a serious human injury, illness, or death. A practitioner shall register with the California Department of Public Health.”*

The City did not require bidders to be State Trauma Waste Practitioners, did not check California Department of Public Health records, and awarded the contract to a contractor that was not certified. The contractor performed several crime scene clean-ups before receiving its State Trauma Waste Practitioner certification.

The City did not receive assurance that bidders had the qualifications to perform the required services

The selected bidder’s application materials revealed shortcomings in the City’s review of all the bidders’ qualifications.

- **Experience.** In its application materials, Legacy reported that in the last two years, it had not done the type of work it was contracted to perform and had no previous customers.
- **Website.** A website can introduce a company and present its skills, qualifications, and experience. Legacy’s website was not activated until December 11, 2019, which was the effective date of the company’s contract with the City.
- **Letterhead and phone number.** Despite the City’s requests in the application materials, Legacy did not provide business letterhead or its existing business phone number.

The City did not require bidders to provide assurance that they had the necessary specialized supplies and equipment to provide the required services

The City’s application materials included the following question to Legacy: “In order to perform services under the contract, do you intend to provide your own supplies or equipment? If yes, briefly describe the equipment/supplies.” Legacy answered these questions with “N/A” even though its prospective scope of work as outlined in Exhibit 1, requires supplies and equipment.

For biohazard clean-up services, it would have been critical for the City to know what supplies and equipment that Legacy intended to use. We learned that Legacy formerly arrived to calls for service in a U-Haul truck.

The City did not require bidders to demonstrate they have the capabilities to provide the required services

First and foremost, the biohazard clean-up contractor should be able to adequately clean-up biohazards, but the City's process did not seek or receive assurance that Legacy could do so. Some questions the City should have sought answers to include:

1. What substances does the contractor use?
2. What kind of protective gear will its crew members use?
3. How and where will the contractor dispose of biohazards?

By not asking these important questions, the City cannot provide adequate assurance that the contractor was qualified to perform the work and protect the health and safety of the contractors, City staff, and the general public. In addition to the health, safety, and environmental implications of these situations, we are concerned that ultimately the City would be held legally liable for nonperformance or substandard performance.

The City does not require bidders to disclose the identities of relatives who work for the City

Until our investigation, the Purchasing Section supervisor was not aware the President of the selected biohazard clean-up contractor was related to an employee in the Purchasing Section. While the investigation did not find any evidence that City employees unduly influenced the selection of the biohazard contractor, the lack of a process to determine potential conflicts of interest during the procurement bid process is a concern and undermines the integrity of the procurement process.

Contracting processes must be fair, transparent, and ethical. According to the Institute for Local Government, governments should *"...select vendors and service providers using processes in ways that minimize opportunities for favoritism and that provide for competitive pricing..."* Also, as a government agency, the City of Oakland should be committed to ensuring that procurements appear fair and unbiased, because even the appearance of impropriety undermines the public's trust.

The City should require prospective City contractors to disclose the identities of relatives who work for the City.

4. The City does not adequately monitor Legacy's work and billing

The City does not check whether or not Legacy performs work timely in response to OAK 311 work orders

The following is a chronological account of key events related to biohazard clean-ups in public rights-of-way:

- Members of the public submit requests to various City departments in various forms such as phone calls and emails.
- City departments forward requests to OAK 311 and members of the public submit requests directly to OAK 311.
- OAK 311 creates work orders for biohazard clean-ups.
- OAK 311 forwards work orders to the contractor (prioritizing emergency requests).
- The contractor dispatches its crew to fulfill work orders. The terms of Legacy's contract require Legacy to respond to work orders within 24 hours.

After OAK 311 submits work orders to Legacy, the City does not follow up to make sure work orders have been completed. OAK 311 and Public Works rely on members of the public to contact them to report inaction, rather than internally monitor the completion of work orders. In our opinion, this is not adequate oversight, especially when the contractor is required to respond to work orders within 24 hours, and languishing biohazards in the public right-of-way presents serious risks to the community.

During our investigation, we found numerous examples of unfulfilled work orders, and work orders that were not completed timely. One example is included in Exhibit 3 below.

Exhibit 3: March 2020 work order and associated public comments that remains open as of November 2020

Litter - Street Litter Container - Broken ▶ Open

570 21st St Oakland, CA, 94612, USA • [Show on Map](#)



Issue ID: 7522129

Submitted To: [City of Oakland - Public Property](#)

Category: Litter - Street Litter Container - Broken

Viewed: 35 times

Neighborhood: [San Pablo Gateway](#)

Reported: on 03/08/2020

Service Request ID: 993874

Tagged: [trash](#), [sidewalk](#)

REPORTER

[City of Oakland Call Center Neighbor](#)



DESCRIPTION

Sidewalk in front of Oakland "L" substation of PG&E, across the street from 570 21st Street, Oakland CA 94612

Sidewalk is littered with many used hypodermic needles causing a health hazard for pedestrians and PG&E workers

4 COMMENTS

[Post a New Comment](#)



ACKNOWLEDGED [City of Oakland](#) (Verified Official)

OAK 311 has received this issue. Your service request ID is #993874. Please check back for status updates, or contact us directly at 510-615-5566.

03/08/2020 · [Flag](#)



[\[Redacted\]](#) (Registered User)

Please also contact the OFD/OES hazmat for these dangerous used epidemic needles. These are a very serious public, pet and wildlife health hazard.

03/08/2020 · [Flag](#)



[\[Redacted\]](#) (Registered User)

This is OK in the advent of prop 47

03/08/2020 · [Flag](#)



[City of Oakland](#) (Verified Official)

OAK 311 has referred this issue to Legacy Restoration, Cleanups. Please contact that department to follow-up (see "Other Helpful Links" at

<http://www2.oaklandnet.com/Government/o/PWA/Connect/ReportaProblem/index.htm#Links>).


Source: Auditor screenshot taken in September 2020 from an actual OAK 311 request made March 2020.


<https://see.clickfix.com/issues/7522129>

Work orders may shed light on the effectiveness of the contractor and customer satisfaction

In addition to tracking the status and turnaround times for work orders, the City may benefit from reviewing the work orders and associated comments, which can provide insight into the contractor's performance.

Exhibit 4: Public comments associated with a March 2020 work order

 (Registered User)
I cannot find any company called Legacy Restoration, Cleanups working in Calif let alone Oakland???
Most of this Bio hazard has been washed into the waster shed and out to the bay.
<http://khn.org/news/fecal-bactreria-in-california-waterways-increases-with-homeless-crisis/>
03/16/2020 · Flag

 (Registered User)
Other posts informed OAK311 that Legacy is a non starter. Don't count on Legacy to do anything.
Make a note of that, and tell City Hall to fore Legacy now.
03/16/2020 · Flag

Source: Screenshots taken from an actual OAK 311 request from March 2020.

<https://seeclixfix.com/issues/7553417>, <https://seeclixfix.com/issues/7515827>

Between January and April 2020 Legacy overcharged the City \$3,075

As part of its invoicing to the City, the contractor lists the work order numbers and addresses. However, the invoice does not include the dates and times when they were completed. The City does not have a process in place to ensure that work orders are completed.

Between January 1, 2020 and April 30, 2020, the City was invoiced 33 times (with 2 being nullified by credit memos) for \$46,163. Invoices are sent to the respective departments using the services provided by the contractor. Of the \$46,163 invoiced between January and April, \$35,950 was requested and paid for by OAK 311 (\$30,500 for clean-up of human waste in the public right-of-way and \$5,450 on homeless encampment clean-up). The remaining \$10,213 was requested and paid for OPD crime scene clean-ups (\$7,675), car clean-ups (\$2,525), and late fees (\$13).

On service requests between January and mid-February, Legacy Restoration Services charged a \$25 "service fee." The service fee was not part of the quoted price that Legacy sent to the Purchasing Section. In February 2020, the Police Department's contract administrator noticed the "service fee" and requested that the fee be discontinued. It was discontinued on all requests after February.

The service fees totaled \$2,775 and were assessed on 111 service requests (92 for human waste clean-up in the public right-of-way, four on crime scene clean-up, 13 for car clean-up, two for homeless encampment clean-up).

In addition to the service fee overcharge, the City was also double-charged on two human waste clean-up service requests. The total of those double charges was \$300.

In total, the investigation identified \$3,075 in overcharges on invoices between January and April 2020.

Between January and December 2020, the City paid Legacy \$144,038 for their contracted services.

Recommendations

1. The City should review its procurement practices to ensure its procurements are well run, meet the needs of the public, and are cost effective. This process should be informed by the National Association of State Procurement Officials' (NASPO) best practices and include answering these key questions:
 - Does the Purchasing Section have an adequate process in place? Have they identified:
 - *the information required to write the solicitation,*
 - *the procurement method that will be used to conduct the competition,*
 - *the most appropriate method to evaluate the bids or proposals, and*
 - *the type of contract to be used, and negotiation strategies?*
 - Prior to initiating a procurement, does the Purchasing Section follow a documented process? Have they:
 - identified all user departments,
 - acquired a full understanding of user departments' needs, and
 - gathered past data to estimate the frequency of the City's use of the individual elements outlined in the solicitation (e.g. clean-ups of crime scenes vs. City vehicles vs. police property vs. public rights-of-way)?
2. The evaluation of bids and proposals is a key point in the procurement process and steps must be taken to ensure it is uniform, consistent and fair. The City should ensure the solicitation includes a well-written specification/scope that is clear and can be easily converted into evaluation criteria. Every solicitation should include:
 - a standard basis for costs (e.g. cost per hour or cost per unit)
 - a request for specific cost data for individual elements in the solicitation, when applicable (e.g. clean-ups of crime scenes vs. City vehicles vs. police property vs. public rights-of-way).
3. The City should require the Purchasing Supervisor to review and approve Buyers' evaluations of bids requiring original calculations and analysis.
4. The City should designate biohazard clean-up contractors as professional services providers. This would allow the City to assess contractors' compliance with City policies for professional service providers.
5. The City should require prospective City contractors to disclose the identifies of relatives who work for the City to provide assurance of a fair, transparent, and ethical review process.
6. The City should monitor and track the contractor's timeliness in completing work orders. Accordingly, for work orders, the City should require its contractor to attach real-time "before-and-after" photos of scenes to verify that work orders were completed timely.

7. The City should consider ways to incorporate public feedback in its reviews of contractors providing direct services.
8. The City should seek credit for the contractor's overcharges through April 2020 as identified in this investigation and review all remaining 2020 invoices for discrepancies.

Methodology

The City Auditor's Office performed a preliminary review of the whistleblower report to confirm understanding of the reported allegations, and determine if all the following four investigation criteria were met:

1. The alleged incident(s) involved City of Oakland property, infrastructure, employees, officials, or otherwise falls within the City's jurisdiction.
2. If true, the concern meets the definition of "fraud," "waste," OR "abuse."
3. The alleged incident(s) occurred within 12 months of being reported.
4. The alleged incident(s) are not known to be the subject of current litigation.

After completing the preliminary review, the Office conducted an investigation to arrive at the findings and conclusions in this report. This work included:

- Reviewing memoranda of understanding, contracts, etc.
- Reviewing the City Charter, City Municipal Code, and administrative procedures.
- Interviewing staff members of City Administrator's Office, Oakland Fire Department, Finance Department, Oakland Police Department.
- Reviewing City financial records.
- Reviewing OAK 311 service request and work orders.
- Reviewing documents related to the solicitation and selection of biohazard contractors.
- Reviewing public records related to the contractor.
- Reviewing emails and other records related to the solicitation and selection of biohazard contractors.
- Reviewing best practices for government contracting.

Appendix: Biohazard Bidders' Quotes as Submitted to the Purchasing Section

| Legacy Restoration Services | Bidder No.2 | Bidder No.3 | Bidder No.4 |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>Description: City Vehicles (Deep clean, decontaminate, disinfect, bio hazard removal, etc.) Price: \$100/ea. Qty: 1 Total: \$100</p> <p>Description: Street Bio Hazard Waste Removal (DPW, OPD, 311, etc.) needles, feces, bodily fluids, etc. Price: \$150/hour Qty: 1 Total: \$150</p> <p>OPD Holding Cells (decontaminate, remove bio hazards, sewage, etc.) Price: \$100/hour Qty: 1 Total: \$100</p> <p>OPD Restraints & Uniforms (decontaminate, disinfect, remove bio hazards, etc.) Price: \$75/ea. Qty: 1 Total: \$75</p> | <p>Our flat hourly rate is \$130 for the following services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Suicide cleanup -Homicide cleanup -Blood cleanup -Feces and urine cleanup -Bodily fluids cleanup -Biohazard removal -Odor elimination -Emergency vehicle decontamination <p>We are able to dispose of any body parts except for head and torso. The rate for body tissue disposal is \$250.</p> | <p>PER VEHICLE \$45.00 (includes deodorizer)</p> <p>1. BIOHAZARD AND CONTAMINANT REMOVAL FROM ANY AREA WHICH MAY RISK THE SAFETY OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC. Contractor shall provide a comprehensive biohazard removal service that eliminates all hazards and contaminant that may be an eminent danger to the public.</p> <p>a. Proper removal of human bodily fluids, including but not limited to: blood, urine, feces, vomit, saliva, etc. from streets, sidewalks and other public areas that the public may have access to following clean up. \$70.00 PER CALL</p> <p>Proper disposal of all bio hazards, contaminants and all the aforementioned materials and fluids from areas that may cause and eminent danger to the general public.</p> <p>5 gallon BUCKET OF FECES \$70.00 PER gallon Condom, Drug Paraphernalia, Feces in the Public Right-away \$70.00 per call (includes mileage & disposal)</p> | <p>1. For cleaning, disinfecting and removal of biohazard waste from a street cleanup, lawful disposal of biohazard waste and hold time is \$200.00 per hour.</p> <p>2. Flat rate for cleaning, disinfecting, removal of all bodily fluids and deodorizing of department vehicles is \$100.00.00 (per vehicle) flat rate.</p> <p>3. For cleaning biohazards from holding cells and effected areas including sewage back-up is \$135.00 per hour.</p> <p>4. Flat rate to pick up any contaminated uniform, neutralize/remove the biohazard, have the garment cleaned and returned in 24 hours is \$75.00 each uniform.</p> <p>5. Gym Cleaning is \$150.00 per hour (Includes 2 technicians, cleaning supplies, and disposal) for cleaning of the Police Department gym and personnel areas for all MRSA, etc.</p> <p>6. Flat rate for disinfecting the body wrap. \$75.00.</p> <p>7. There will be a Service Fee of \$25.00, per clean up.</p> <p>8. Bio hazard removal for Public Works - \$200.00 per service request (This includes feces, urine, sharps, sharp objects, and blood. *See page 2 for additional quantities.*</p> <p>PUBLIC WORKS - \$200.00 per service request (Pick up of three (3) - 5-gallon buckets with Biohazard material. Plus, the \$25.00 service fee.</p> <p>\$65.00 for additional bucket (1) each (5 gallon)</p> <p>- SHARPS - \$200.00 plus the service fee \$25.00, per service request.</p> <p>More than 1 hour an additional \$75.00.</p> <p>(NO PER NEEDLE CHARGE)</p> |



WHISTLEBLOWER HOTLINE

To File a Complaint

Call the **WHISTLEBLOWER HOTLINE**
1-888-329-6390 (Interpreter available)

SUBMIT A REPORT ONLINE
www.OaklandAuditor.com/Whistleblower

Office of the City Auditor

1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza • 4th Floor, City Hall • Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 238-3378
CityAuditor@OaklandCA.gov



[OaklandAuditor](https://www.facebook.com/OaklandAuditor)



[@OaklandAuditor](https://twitter.com/OaklandAuditor)

Subscribe for Email Updates

www.OaklandAuditor.com or
Text AUDITOR to 22828

