

**MEASURE Y: VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND  
PUBLIC SAFETY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
"SPECIAL MEETING"**

**DRAFT MINUTES: January 10, 2011**

**Oversight Committee Members**

Qa'id Aqeel, City Council At-Large

Peter Barnett, District 5

Joanne Brown, District 1

Michael Brown, Jr., District 3

Richard Carter, District 2

Jose Dorado, **Chairperson**, District 4

Mark Forte, District 7

Vacant, District 6

Nicole Lee, Office of the Mayor

Brandon Sturdivant, Sr., Office of the Mayor

Nyeisha Dewitt, Office of the Mayor

City Hall

City Council Chambers

1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza

Oakland, California 94612

**Item 1:**      **Roll Call and Determination of Quorum:**

**Present:**      Members Barnett, J. Brown, Carter, Lee, Sturdivant, Chairperson  
Dorado

**Absent:**      Member Aqeel, M. Brown, Dewitt and Forte (excused absences)

**Quorum was achieved for this meeting.**

**Item 2.**      **Open Forum:**

**There was one speaker on this Item:**

**Sandjiv Handa, East Bay News Service:**

It is a day of "Special Meetings" the City Council met earlier today to consider the new Chairs. Deals have been cut to make Mr. Reid Chairperson the Council President, with Jane Brunner going back as Chairperson of the Economic Development, Ignacio De La Fuente will Chair the Finance Committee and by default Pat Kernighan became Chair of the Public Safety Committee. In Oakland, many "special meetings" are simply for show where the work has already been done; decision already made. We are now \$120M plus into Measure Y funds collected. This year is off to a bad start with 5 murders in Oakland. San Jose has the same bad start with 5 murders already and only 20 last year. San Francisco is also off to a bad start.

**Item 4:**        **Discussion and Advisory Recommendation to the Public  
Safety Committee Regarding the Launch of Oakland Police  
Department M-Y Problem-Solving Officer Program, January  
2011**

(This Item was taken out of order at the discretion of the  
Chairperson.)

Deputy Chief Breshears, Oakland Police Department, provided the overview. My expectation for the PSOs is that they strictly follow the guidelines of Measure Y. Last year when I took over, I heard a number of concerns about PSOs, how they were operating, and what type of assignments they had. I turned that around until June when those positions went away. When you look at the evaluation you will see in 2009 the number of projects dropped off and then increase when we placed more emphasis on the program. With the passage of Measure BB it allowed the start of the PSO program again with funding for between 40-50 PSOs. We have 75 officers assigned to the PSO program. In each area there will be a Sergeant with anywhere from 5-8 officers assigned in each district for nine different squads. The Sergeants report to one of three Lieutenants assigned to each area; the Lieutenants report directly to Area Commanders. The Measure BB money did not allow for the re-hiring of laid-off officers. The staffing of the PSO program will begin on Saturday, January 8<sup>th</sup>. We are still in the process of assigning cell telephones and voice mail will be set up. We are looking for ways to get more information out to the public through the website. We hope to post a monthly summary of what occurring on each beat. Some of the areas we plan to work on is building community support through positive customer service. PSOs will work on "hot spots" in their respective beats, the NCPC priorities and determine what the NCPC really wants the PSO to work on. Another area for PSO work is locations that generate large calls for police service. PSOs will support the efforts of ABAT, the Alcohol Beverage Abatement Team. We have combined the Special Events and ABAT Units. PSOs will also assist in burglary investigations. Oftentimes a report will have a good lead; a license plate or a good lead to identify the perpetrator. We plan to forward the lead to the PSO and have the officer follow-up on the lead in their beat. Documentation of efforts, we will have PSOs document their efforts through activity logs and use of the SARA data base. Another important area is attendance to community meetings. I want to have each PSO go over a list of issues in each NCPC meeting. We currently have 656 officers. The data shows we should have a minimum of 925 officers. Our patrol division should have 420

officers at a minimum. The Chief wants to match up the community policing beats with the patrol beats. The PSOs are project managers. If a PSO works on their own its much more difficult. A lot of the support staff the PSOs used in the past are no longer available. For example, the TETF Squads assisted in follow-up investigations and were field units; our foot patrol units are down to 4 or 5; our crime reduction teams were reduced from 6 to 1 team. Two traffic squads were reduced to one squad and there has been a reduction in Neighborhood Services Coordinator staffing. The 35 patrol beats will become our 35 community policing beats. We will have a PSO assigned to each NCPC as before. We are developing an Office of Community Policing. We will have PSO training in February and are developing a manual on problem solving in collaboration with Claudia Albano.

Member J. Brown asked if there is a proposal before City Council to adopt a Resolution that will amend or revise previous community policing resolutions passed by the City Council?

Deputy Chief Breshears answered there is a request for a report to the City Council/Public Safety but unsure when it will be scheduled.

Member J. Brown stated that Measure BB passed by voters two months ago, with the exception of eliminating the police staffing level – did not include any modification of beats or the way officers are assigned. A reasonable voter in Oakland would believe a vote for Measure BB was a vote for a PSO officer in their beat as the configuration presently is implemented. How does collapsing 57 beats in 35 beats honor the reasonable expectation the Initiative made to voters?

Deputy Chief Breshears answered the Measure does not state how many beats or how they are organized. The Measure states that you will have a PSO assigned to each beat – which we plan to do. We plan to strictly follow Measure and Measure BB. We have the 63 positions the Initiative requires.

Member J Brown stated using OPD's interpretation you could designate the entire City of Oakland as "one beat" and assign the 57 officers to the one beat. Such an approach would defeat the purpose of community policing which is to have an officer become familiar with a particular neighborhood and the challenges and folks in that neighborhood – to develop a relationship based on trust. It seems to me that the Police Chief and the persons who have reviewed the plan, (which we have yet to see), have concluded that it doesn't matter what the specifics are of Measure Y as long as a PSO is assigned to what the department defines as a beat.

Deputy Chief Breshears responded that Measure Y does not denote any number or size of beats. It requires officers to be assigned to beats and perform certain functions. OPD's intent is to get to a staffing level where we can go to 57 beats. This is a reasonable effort on OPD's part – we have a significant decrease in officers and we're saying we need more flexibility based on the fact that the officer support staff is no longer there. We are not trying to undercut the Measure – the reality is that the officer staffing level will probably decrease and we've had to make decisions to abide by the Measure.

Member Sturdivant asked what are the negative impacts from going from 57 beats to 35 beats?

Deputy Chief Breshears responded that the PSOs are assigned to a larger geographical area and the smaller amount of support staff.

Member Carter asked is there any update regarding funding Phase II of the data collection system.

Deputy Chief Breshears responded it's not clear that the \$500K allotted for training and equipment actually exists. Since Measure Y does not pay the entire personnel cost for the 63 PSO officer salaries, the \$500K allocated for "training and equipment" may not be actual dollars in the budget. The proposed cost of the system may not be a worthwhile investment if it provides only a summary of projects a specific officer is working on rather than a large picture of all PSO projects throughout the City.

Member J. Brown asked the Department to provide the Community Policing Handbook to the Committee for review.

Member Sturdivant asked whether the Department is discussing deployment strategies with the Oakland Unified School District regarding areas around school sites and whether the Department has consulted with the City of Richmond regarding their community policing strategy that apparently has dramatically reduced Richmond's homicides.

Deputy Chief Breshears responded there are ongoing discussions between OUSD and the City of Oakland regarding crime around school sites and the Department has met with representatives of Richmond Police Department regarding their community policing strategies. Additionally, the resolutions that guide Oakland's community policing efforts involve more than the police

department, e.g., CEDA, public works, code enforcement and others and at some point, if not already scheduled, other contributors to Oakland's community policing efforts should report out to the committee regarding their efforts.

Chairperson Dorado asked whether the plan, as outlined is a "done deal – with the deployment of PSOs throughout the 35 patrol beats and the remaining 28 dispersed in high stressor beats.

Deputy Chief Breshears responded the plan is basically as outlined in the presentation however, the Department is not adverse to recommendations and suggestions from the Committee and members of the public.

**There was no action taken on this item pending receipt of a written report of the deployment plan from the Oakland Police Department.**

**Item 3:        Discussion: Public Safety and Violence Prevention  
Programming Strategy Topics and Assignments for Research  
Advisory Report to the Oakland Public Safety Committee and  
Oakland City Council.**

(This Item was taken out of order at the discretion of the Chairperson.)

Member Barnett suggested full discussion of this Item be placed as the primary item on the upcoming agenda in January 2011. The discussion should focus on various areas of violence prevention efforts funded by Measure Y and provide the research outcomes to the Public Safety Committee and Oakland City Council.

Member J. Brown added the discussion could also include linkages between analysis from the Oversight Committee and other stakeholder Boards, Commissions as well as members of the public on the issue of violence prevention. Efforts should be made to identify and invite stakeholders to Oversight Committee meetings to discuss areas of interest regarding the implementation of community policing in Oakland.

Member Lee reminded Committee members of the staffing limitations, employment commitments and the need for group direction on the scope and structure of the research such as "guiding questions" to focus the research.

The consensus of the Committee was to agendize Item 3 for the January 2011 meeting for full discussion.

**Item 5:      Scheduling of "Special Meeting" due to Dr. Martin L. King, Jr., Holiday.**

The consensus of the Committee was to schedule a "Special Meeting" on January 24, 2011.

**Item 6:      Agenda Building, "Special Meeting," January 24, 2011**

The March Oversight Committee agenda should include an overview of the "overall" public safety apparatus for the City of Oakland including invitations to other identified stakeholders in community policing.

There were two speakers on this Item:

(Mr. Dexter and Mr. Handa chose, at the discretion of the Chairperson, to speak at the end of the agenda for a total of eight minutes each.)

Jim Dexter, District 4:

The Measure Y Oversight Committee was established in the Initiative placed before the voters and approved in the November 2004 election. The charge of the Committee was to watch over the implementation of Measure Y and ensure it was implemented correctly based upon the wording of the Measure and how it was "sold" to the voters. The current status of Measure Y is in complete disaster. What you have heard from Chief Breshears is the largest far reaching, dilatory change in community policing, ever. We have our City Attorney working very hard to change the legal definition of a "community policing beat" so OPD can call the 35 "patrol beats," 35 "community policing beats." Why is that important? Because OPD does not have the staff to assign one officer to each of the 57 community policing beats. What we are actually going to receive is one PSO per the 35 patrol beats. This is in violation of everything sold to the voters of Oakland; in violation of everything this Committee has discussed for the last few years I have observed. This Committee has had no opportunity whatsoever to influence what is occurring. You are completely isolated, insulated and non-

effective in dealing with the issue. Not because of the value of each individual here, but because the City does not what to hear you. The City Council does not what to hear you, the previous Mayor did not what to hear you and evidently the current Mayor does not want to hear you. This has all been previously approved and is a done deal, today. You have no ability to adjust this. Regardless of what Assistant Chief Jordan said to the Community Policing Advisory Board two days ago; despite what Deputy Chief Breshears said to you tonight, this is a done deal. I went to an Area 1 meeting tonight expecting to hear how the assigned three PSOs in Beat 13 would be joined together as a group. Boy, did I get a surprise. One PSO for Beat 13; the other two PSOs are being assigned elsewhere. Think about it...think about what we were sold as voters. We went through 4 years of understaffing of OPD when there was money to be had and we never got the officers promised by Measure Y. We had \$7.4M taken from Measure Y Funds and spent on general OPD staffing with no response from this Committee. And because of the City Attorney's ruling on the parsing of wording in Measure Y, the expenditure has now been approved by three judges. And now, the City Attorney is saying there is nothing in Measure Y or Measure BB that says a "community policing beat" has to be a "community policing beat," we can now make a "patrol beat" a "community policing beat" and everyone will be happy. This is the largest change in community policing ever and this Committee did not even know about it – and has had no effect on it. So what is the purpose of this Committee? What do you do with this? If you don't stand up and scream bloody murder over this, there is no Measure Y Oversight Committee. It does not exist. I respect every individual here. I think specifically of Maya Dillard Smith, whom I really admire. All this human energy you have put in this Committee is for naught. There has been nothing accomplished. When you look at the overall protection of what the voters voted for in Measure Y it's a farce...it doesn't exist.

Sandjiv Handa, East Bay News Service:

This is nothing new in Oakland. You can go back 20 or 30 years and look at bond measures and special assessments that were passed and the promised services were never delivered. You can go back to the Measure I Emergency Response System, millions

and millions of dollars spent on a new computer system that was known from the start would not work. Staff pleaded with the City Council that this was a road to ruin – but the Council said no because some had friend that had pieces of the contract. At the end of the process the whole system had to be dumped and not a dollar to be recovered. The Year 2000 Conversion contract was awarded to Oracle instead of PeopleSoft, despite urging and begging from experts that it was a mistake. Tens of millions of dollars in cost overruns; funny money like borrowing money from the Police; accounting techniques like taking technology grant money to help the YSK costs. These types of things go on and on and on. It doesn't matter who is on the City Council, the names, faces and personalities change but the bottom line is the same. The public is treated as an impediment; the people are a bother, City Hall has its own agenda and the people keep getting in the way. You even hear that from some of the bloggers who say we need to end the "Oakland bashing." What we need is people going out and talking about the great things that exist in Oakland. We need to talk about the diversity in Oakland. Well, the reality is that the diversity in Oakland is only on the streets; the people here are segregated by neighborhoods, by the places they frequent and the organizations they belong to: the integration spoken about is not there. Oakland is not the most diverse city in the country; Long Beach is. We can't come to basic agreement in Oakland as to what the facts actually are. When you look at Measure Y, we're looking at \$120M of taxpayer money. If sorted out, that \$60M to the Police department. The current police chief has a 3 year contract. Just by coincidence by the time he reaches the end of the contract, he will be 50 years old. His pension is maxed out, thus he is working for free if he stays on. Unless there's some great motivation to stay on, he's going to look at the math and say, "why bother?" You as a Committee are not going to be listened to by the City Council unless you develop a constituency.

**Item 7:**      **Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn. Seconded. Motion passed by consensus.



**MEASURE Y: VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND  
PUBLIC SAFETY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
"SPECIAL MEETING"**

**DRAFT MINUTES: January 24, 2011**

**Oversight Committee Members**

Qa'id Aqeel, City Council At-Large

Peter Barnett, District 5

Joanne Brown, District 1

Michael Brown, Jr., District 3

Richard Carter, District 2

Jose Dorado, **Chairperson**, District 4

Mark Forte, District 7

Vacant, District 6

Nicole Lee, Office of the Mayor

Brandon Sturdivant, Sr., Office of the Mayor

Nyeisha Dewitt, Office of the Mayor

City Hall

Mark Dunakin Hearing Room

1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza

Oakland, California 94612

**Item 1: Roll Call and Determination of Quorum:**

**Present:** Members Aqeel, Barnett, J. Brown, Carter, Dewitt, Chairperson  
Dorado

**Absent:** Member M. Brown, Forte, Lee and Sturdivant, (excused absences)

**Quorum was achieved for this meeting.**

**Item 2: Open Forum:**

(At the discretion of the Chairperson, the public speakers were allowed to speak for a total of 8 minutes each.)

There was one speaker on this Item:

Jim Dexter, District 4:

It's unclear what the Committee is actually doing. The PSO program was eliminated in June without input from this Committee and reinstated without any input, action or announcement from this Committee. Although Deputy Chief Breshears appeared here last month and gave an oral report, this Committee requested a written report. That written report has not been forthcoming. There is nothing on your agenda tonight on the PSO program. There is no representation from OPD here. We have received a re-interpretation of "community policing beat" from the Oakland Police

Department. I went back and read resolution 79235, Measure Y and Measure BB. I cannot find justification for changing the 57 community policing beats to 35 community policing beats. What advice has this committee given to the City Administrator, to the Mayor or to the City Council regarding this incredible major change to community policing in the City of Oakland? Furthermore, we now have 35 community policing beats with the associated PSO for the sub-beats, 13X, 13Y and 13Z officers being assigned to wherever OPD wants to assign them. This is an additional violation of Resolution 79235 and what was promised to the voters. And yet, this Committee has no official communication to anyone in city government. Yes, you asked for a written report; the written report has not arrived. Are you going to allow the non-response by OPD to define what this Committee does? The last part of this is even more extraordinary. Even though I've been at the Community Policing Advisory Board and heard Deputy Chief Breshears, Assistant Chief Jordan and Captain Tracey tell the Board what they were planning to do, I didn't hear anything of changing priorities of the Neighborhood Councils. I attended an Area 1 meeting and I didn't hear anything of changing priorities. When I attended my Neighborhood Council meeting to meet my new PSO I was informed that instead of three priorities, our Neighborhood Council has one priority. Think about the impact of that. That is one priority for three community policing beats. OPD has dropped the number of priorities for beats 13X, 13Y and 13Z from nine to 1. This Committee has said absolutely nothing to the Public Safety Committee, the Mayor or the City Council. And I'm asking you now, why not? I find this unacceptable.

Sandjiv Handa, East Bay News Service:

East Bay News Service is starting its 20<sup>th</sup> year in January. Very little has changed. Jean Quan becoming Mayor has opened up old wounds. The person singularly responsible for most of the ills and shortcomings of Oakland is a man named Henry Gardner. He was the City Manager from the mid 1980's through October 1993. He's a brilliant man, well-spoken and has a lot of great ideas – but he's out of touch. He is of the school of thought that people are a bother, people are an inconvenience and people get in the way of government doing its business. When Proposition 13 was passed

there were staggering cuts to the City's budget and the public was not consulted about the scope of the cuts. So things like parks and libraries were cut but frill programs that the City Council and the City Manager wanted stayed. You added a Department of Human Services but what was not mentioned was the Department was created to avoid a public scandal about a manager harassing another manager. The person who complained was given a new department. Those are the things that make Oakland City Hall run – no matter who is the Mayor or City Manager. The point made by Mr. Dexter on changing priorities; take my neighborhood, Beat 9X, the priorities were things like there are panhandlers on Piedmont Avenue. Little things. No one cared about speeding cars or crime because the people who attended the NCPC meetings were in bed by 9:00 p.m., and the way the rules were applied the people who attended the meeting set the priorities. In the months to come, you will hear a lot about Ms. Quan's agenda and what she wants to do. She is not only the first person in 40+ years to go from City Council to Mayor, she is the first to have to work to undo the problems as Mayor that she created as a City Councilmember. You've an Oversight Committee in name only. You were only created to appease the public. You have no authority, no autonomy or direction. Unlike the Measure B Oversight Committee for Alameda County which has enforcement power, staff and teeth. You have decisions coming up in the future, policy decisions that will impact every neighborhood in the City. Not just where police officers are deployed, but the next round of cuts. For those who have not followed this, the City is looking at an estimated \$50M shortfall for the next fiscal year. Mark my words, unless something drastic happens, there will more police officers out the door, more services cut and taxes will go up.

**Item 3:**      **Approval of Draft Minutes from December 20, 2010.**

**Motion:** Motion by Member Carter to approve Minutes of December 20, 2010.  
Motion seconded by Member Barnett.

**Action:** Minutes approved by consensus.

**Item 3:**      **Discussion: Public Safety and Violence Prevention  
Programming Strategy Topics and Assignments for Research  
Advisory Report to the Oakland Public Safety Committee and  
Oakland City Council.**

Member Barnett led the discussion on strategy topics and assignments for research by Committee members. The research reports will be undertaken over the course of the year culminating in an annual report to the Public Safety/Oakland City Council. The research and report schedule is as follows:

February 2011:	PSO Staffing (Members Qaid, J. Brown and Barnett)
March 2011:	Information Access to City Administrator, Public Safety Committee, City Council and Mayor. Internal Committee Operations
April 2011:	Presentation: Overall City Public Safety Apparatus: Neighborhood Services, Police Department, Fire Department, Code Enforcement, Service Delivery System Teams. (Staff Person Baker to Coordinate)
May 2011:	Examination of Coordination of PSO Program, Neighborhood Crime Prevention Councils, Crime Reduction Teams and Truancy efforts.
June, July, Aug and Sept 2011:	Violence Prevention Programs Funded Through Measure Y
October 2011:	School-based Violence Prevention Programming
Nov and Dec 2011:	Annual Report to Public Safety/City Council
January 2012	Fire Department

**Motion:** Member J. Brown made Motion to accept calendar of research reports.  
Second by Member Barnett.

**Action:** Motion passed by consensus.

**Item 5:**      **Agenda Building, "Special Meeting: of January 16, 2011."**

The agenda of January 16, 2011 will include the following Items:

- a. A report from Sara Bedford, DHS, regarding the status of Leadership Excellence performance measures of 2009-2010 as well as an update on the Re-Entry Specialist and data entry of client information into the CitySpan system.
- b. The Measure Y Evaluation of 2010, Resource Development Associates
- c. PSO Report from M-Y Oversight Committee Ad Hoc Committee

**Item 6:**      **Adjournment**

**Motion** to adjourn. Seconded. Motion passed by consensus. Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

**MEASURE Y: VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND  
PUBLIC SAFETY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
"SPECIAL MEETING"**

**DRAFT MINUTES: February 16, 2011**

**Oversight Committee Members**

Qa'id Aqeel, City Council At-Large

Peter Barnett, District 5

Joanne Brown, District 1

Michael Brown, Jr., District 3

Richard Carter, District 2

Jose Dorado, **Chairperson**, District 4

Mark Forte, District 7

Vacant, District 6

Nicole Lee, Office of the Mayor

Brandon Sturdivant, Sr., Office of the Mayor

Nyeisha Dewitt, Office of the Mayor

City Hall

City Council Chambers

1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza

Oakland, California 94612

**Item 1:      Roll Call and Determination of Quorum:**

**Present:**      Members Aqeel, Barnett, J. Brown, M. Brown, Carter, Dewitt,  
Sturdivant and Chairperson Dorado

**Absent:**      Members Forte and Lee (excused absences)

**Quorum was achieved for this meeting.**

**Item 2:      Open Forum:**

There were no speakers on this Item.

**Item 3:      Approval of Draft Minutes from "Special Meeting" of January  
10, 2011 and Special Meeting of January 24, 2011.**

**Motion:**      Member J. Brown made Motion to approve Minutes of "Special  
Meeting of January 10, 2011. Member Aqeel seconded.

**Action:**      Motion approved.

**Motion:**      Member J. Brown made Motion to approve Minutes of "Special  
Meeting of January 24, 2011. Member Barnett seconded.

**Action:**      Motion approved.

**Item 5: Measure Y Ad Hoc Committee Report: A Recommendation From the M-Y Ad Hoc Committee on PSO Staffing to the Public Safety Committee on Problem-Solving Officer Staffing and the Oakland Police Department PSO Deployment Plan, 2011**

(This Item was taken out of turn at discretion of the Chairperson.)

Member Barnett led the discussion. With reference to the written Ad Hoc Committee Report, Member Barnett provided the Oversight Committee with the Ad Hoc Committee report. (Members of the Ad Hoc Committee include Members J. Brown, Aqeel and Barnett.) Changes to the Committee report (since verbal discussions at last meeting) include three additional recommendations: (1) the City should fund requested enhancements to the OPD SARA data collection system; (2) the written report provided by OPD on the proposed PSO deployment plan should be widely distributed to the public for public comment; and (3) the City of Oakland should support and strengthen the Neighborhood Crime Prevention Program.

Member J. Brown provided the underlying rationale of the additional recommendations. Several Oversight Committee discussions have stressed the importance of having an accessible, accurate database for monitoring the activities of problem-solving officers. The proposed enhancement of the SARA database system will provide members of the Committee, as well as the police department, the public and other stakeholders, a means to collect data on PSO activity and access what is being accomplished. Regarding the PSO Deployment plan, major principles of the plan should have been shared with the larger Oakland community rather than a cloistered group of committees selected by OPD. As a result, the recommendation is to widely distribute the deployment plan and encourage public review and comment. Finally, the NCPC process is recommended for strengthening and support since it is at the core of community policing and engagement – it is the mechanism whereby residents can make their public safety and quality of life concerns known to the City.

Member Barnett added the recommendations do not support the proposed 35-community beat configuration. As traditionally defined, the 57 community policing beats were to have 57 problem-solving officers assigned. Each beat knew there was an officer assigned specifically to address the needs of their community. However, the Ad Hoc Committee acknowledged there are some beats where the need for a full-time problem-solving officer is not as acute as in others. One way to address the deployment challenge is to keep the present 57 beat/officer configuration however, beats which require a problem-solving officer part-time, retain a beat officer, albeit on a part-time basis. Officer hours spent

on non-Measure Y related activities should charge to the General Fund – since the officer is performing non-Measure Y functions. In beats where several PSOs are required due to the severity of quality of life/public safety issues, the PSOs should be deployed accordingly and their hours billed to the Measure Y Fund.

Chairperson Dorado reiterated his concern with the arbitrary decision of OPD to reconfigure the 57 community policing beats to 35 without input from residents, relevant boards/commissions or the City Council. The letter and spirit of the enabling legislation, Resolution 72727, 79235 as well as the Measure Y Initiative provide for problem-solving officers being assigned to each community policing beat. Though the Measure Y Initially does not specifically state “57 beats” there is little doubt the public believed the Initiative (when passed) spoke to the then-present officer deployment (57 problem-solving officers in 57 neighborhood beats) and OPD made no indication to anyone of the proposed change to the beat configuration.

**Motion:** Member Barnett made Motion to approve the report provided by the Ad Hoc Committee and to forward the recommendations to the Public Safety Committee and City Council for review and consideration. Member J. Brown seconded.

**Action:** Motion approved by consensus.

**Item 4:** **Report: A Status Report from the Department of Human Services on Grantee Leadership Excellence’s Performance Measures, 2009-2010 and the Progress of the Re-Entry Specialist Regarding Client Data Entry in the CitySpan Data Collection System.**

Sara Bedford, Department of Human Services, provided a written status report to the Committee. As indicated in the report, Leadership Excellence, by mutual agreement, no longer has a contract with the City of Oakland via Measure Y. The grantee did not receive the full amount of the issued contract and reimbursed approximately 55% of the contract amount – consistent with the level of deliverables met by the agency. The remaining funds have been moved to the DHS Reserve Fund. Regarding the Re-Entry Specialist, in 2009-10, data was entered in the CitySpan database system however there are areas of deficiency in the data entry whereby the data is not reflected in the deliverables. In 2010-11, the Re-Entry Specialist has been entering data into the system however, there are deficiencies in the data entry and DHS cannot report the deliverables are being met at this time.



Member Barnett asked whether the Leadership Excellence contract (as well as other violence prevention program contracts) contains an "outcome" component as well as an "operational" component – that contribute to the contract deliverables?

Ms. Bedford responded most grantee contracts contain both. In the Leadership Excellence agreement the focus was on transitional paid employment – the deliverables were on engaging high risk youth and maintaining the youth in subsidized employment programs. Though DHS tracks elements such as placement and retention in employment, they are not tracked in this program as payment deliverables.

Member J. Brown asked a series of questions: Whether the previous statements made by Ms. Bedford indicate that during the six-month period (July 2010 to the present) Mr. Taggart entered data into the system inaccurately thus CitySpan shows no clients served during this period? Further, during the aforementioned period, the Re-Entry Specialist was housed in the Mayor's Office not the Department of Human Services? Lastly, it is unknown the number of clients actually served, the number of applications processed nor the number of client that went through the re-entry service process?

Ms. Bedford responded the answers to the questions posed cannot be provided through examination of the CitySpan database.

Member Aqeel asked if Mr. Taggart would provide clarification on the performance of the re-entry specialist and the data entry process.

Mr. Isaac Taggart, Re-Entry Specialist, addressed the Committee and reported the position is overwhelming. Many clients received services through individual interviews and group sessions though the numbers are not entered in the database system. During the past six months, Mr. Taggart was the "point person" for the Mayor's Office around the Oscar Grant killing. The focal point for the past six months was to engage various groups to ensure Oakland did not explode with violence during the Grant verdict and Mershele sentencing. Several re-entry clients has gained employment with the City of Oakland in Public Works and Parks and Recreation.

Member Aqeel iterated the requirement that all Measure Y grantees input client data into the CitySpan system and the Re-Specialist is not different from other Measure Y service providers. The requirement for data entry is to provide the Oversight Committee and the Evaluator of the performance deliverable of each provider.

Mr. Taggart promised to provide the Oversight Committee with a status report on the Re-Entry Specialist clients and enter client data into the CitySpan database prior to the upcoming Oversight Committee meeting in March.

Member J. Brown requested Oversight Committee Staff provide a breakdown of the amount of time utilized by the Re-Entry Specialist on non-Measure Y activities – noting the contract was for provision of “re-entry” services – not general, violence prevention efforts pertaining to the Oscar Grant protests. The contract presumes 40 hours a week in the very important area of “re-entry” service delivery.

**Item 6: Measure Y Evaluation Report: Initiative Wide Report, 2009-2010, Resource Development Associates**

Dr. Patricia Marrone Bennett, CEO, Resource Development Associates, introduced RDA staff: Brightstar Olsen, reporting on the community policing component and Rebecca Brown, Phd., reporting on the violence prevention program component.

Brightstar Olsen, RDA: The first area researched in the community policing component was whether staffing levels were maintained in 2009-2010. However, having the position technically “filled” did not mean a PSO was always on the beat and available to problem-solve with residents. RDA found ten police beats experienced extended interruption in PSO service due to leave, injury or temporary assignment. Further, RDA found there was no formal process in place to provide coverage during the absence. The 2009-2010 year was the first in which data was available through the RDA SARA data collection system. On average, 6 problems were solved per beat; there was a great deal of variation between the number of problems solved in each beat; a few beats had no problems solved at all; others had as many as fifteen. Problems related to quality of life issues such as blight and nuisance properties had the highest number of closures; others such as narcotics and burglaries had the lowest closure rates.

The RDA recommendations include: OPD continue to strengthen the department's technical capabilities to hold officers accountable internally as well as provide information to external stakeholders regarding services and activities provided. For the 2010-11 evaluation, we are working with OPD to ensure the SARA database is used regularly and appropriately. The Department has adopted the "Telestaff" software that will provide more accurate and reliable information regarding assignment. We recommend the Department continue to identify the specific duties, outcomes, percentage of effort and responsibilities of problem-solving officers. Without greater articulation, PSOs may prioritize activities that are not the most important or essential in accomplishing their objectives. We also noted that what constitutes a "project" needs clearer articulation by the department. When some PSOs have no projects and others solving fifteen – there is a clear problem in defining "projects."

There are several factors that influence our efforts to evaluate our community policing efforts. We are in a better position to evaluate than ever to fairly evaluate the activities and outcomes of the PSOs. Three years ago there was no quantitative data available on PSO activities, no system to collect PSO information. We are pleased to have the database in place that provides a baseline of problem-solving. We have a commitment from the Department to utilize the database system. There are limitations to the evaluation; the 2010-11 evaluation will cover only a six-month period due to the suspension of the PSO program. We will provide the public with two quarterly reports; one in April, the other in July, documenting the roll-out of the program, the usage of the SARA database and the effectiveness of problem-solving efforts. We will conduct to audit the SARA database, conduct PSO interviews, as well as observations and NCPC site visits. We will analyze personnel and fiscal data in hope to strengthen the PSO program and better inform the public of community policing implementation.

Member Carter asked whether there are "standards" regarding PSO projects given some PSOs resolved up to fifteen projects; other PSOs had no projects at all.

Ms. Olsen responded there are no industry standard – problems vary from beat to beat. The literature review provide no standards. Since the problems range from major blight to illegal dumping to removal of an abandoned auto; another year of data may enable us to compare and determine appropriate outcome levels.

Member Carter followed with an inquiry as to why there are no project categories regarding "robberies" or "assaults" – whereby a PSO obtained and forwarded information to a homicide detective on a murder. Does the "violence prevention" moniker refer to just "quality of life issues?"

Ms. Olsen responded that it is important to look to the outcomes desired and whether the proper intervention is being applied. In Oakland, the community policing efforts are closely aligned with the Neighborhood Crime Prevention Councils, who in turn, generally prioritize "quality of life" issues.

Chairperson Dorado suggested development of a "protocol" to guide development of "projects." The protocol could be used by residents through the Neighborhood Crime Prevention Councils as well as the problem-solving officers.

Dr. Rebecca Brown, RDA, provided highlights of the violence prevention programming findings. After Measure Y services, probationers and parolees experienced decreased recidivism, MY youth experienced improved attendance and reduced suspensions and MY clients reported strengthened resiliency and improved protective factors. Overall, issues identified include: (1) tracking employment deliverables has been problematic and (2) case managed youth are higher risk but case management did not show a positive impact. (Truancy refers to "unexcused absences"; "attendance rates" includes both "excused" and "unexcused" absences. The findings show Measure Y impacted attendance rates but not truancy.) RDA recommendations include: (1) Prioritize programming that offers clients opportunities to participate in group activities; (2) explore case management models that have been proven successful; (3) expand use of a validated risk assessment tool; (4) improve systems for tracking employment placement and retention; and (5) better alignment and evaluative functions of the CitySpan database.

Member J. Brown raised questions regarding both database systems; CitySpan and the PSO data collection system. Regarding the CitySpan system's usefulness, there appears to be a need for consistencies as to what is to be entered in the system for evaluative purposes. It would appear helpful to resolve the inconsistencies so that we will not find ourselves in this same place next year – ambiguities as to what information is to be entered into the system and, more importantly, the data entered is relevant to the evaluation of the programs.

Member Barnett questioned the process whereby program participants are able to receive Measure Y services however decline to identify themselves for evaluation purposes. Consequently, the outcomes somewhat resemble "self-reporting" where only the successful clients appear in the database and the resulting outcomes are always positive.

Ms. Olsen responded RDA is precluded from forcing clients to provide "consent" to identifying information. Secondly, "consent" is requested at the beginning of the program.

**Item 7: Agenda Building, Regular Meeting of March 21, 2011.**

Measure Y Staff will provide the report on the process to provide information/recommendations from the Measure Y Oversight Committee to the Public Safety Committee, City Council and Office of the Mayor. Member Barnett will draft an outline for review by the full Committee.

Member Barnett made reference to earlier statements by Member Lee regarding the scope and direction of Ad Hoc Committee reports, i.e., "the lack of suggestions for group direction, the scope and direction of research and the guiding questions of Oversight Committee efforts." A discussion of these points should be agendaized at the March meeting.

Member J. Brown requested a list of the PSOs as well as an oral/written status report on the PSO program.

Member Carter requested Staff person Baker provide a update on the overall Measure Y Programming efforts and to include the monthly update as a permanent part of the Oversight Committee agenda.

**Item 8: Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn. Seconded. Motion passed by consensus. Meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

MEASURE Y: VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND  
PUBLIC SAFETY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES: March 21, 2011

**Oversight Committee Members**

Qaid Aqeel  
Peter Barnett  
Joanne Brown  
Michael E. Brown  
Richard Carter  
Nyeisha Dewitt  
Chairperson Jose Dorado  
Nicole Lee  
Melony Shelby  
Brandon Sturdivant

**Item 1: Roll Call and Determination of Quorum**

**Present:**

Member Barnett  
Member J. Brown  
Member M. Brown  
Member Forte  
Member Shelby  
Member Sturdivant  
Chairperson Dorado

**Absent:** Qaid Aqeel, Richard Carter, Nyeisha Dewitt, Nicole Lee

**Quorum was achieved for this meeting at 7:25pm**

**Item 2: Open Forum:**

Sanjiv Honda spoke at Open Forum. There is not a manual of procedures for boards and commissions. Most cities have a manual. If you go to CSPAN at every meeting it has an appointed time. Your meeting time is 6:30pm. Bay Area councils have a selected meeting time. When that time comes the cameras and sound are turned on. Oakland does not do that. If you are going to have transparency that means that everything that occurs from the time you enter a room should be recorded and televised. In Oakland, after Dellums became Mayor, Councilmember Quan and Jane Brunner were caught brow beating the Mayor's staff person named Dan Lindheim. Due to the magic of cable television this conversation was picked up.

**Item 3: Approval of Draft Minutes from "Special" Meeting of February 16, 2011**

(This item was taken out of order due to the lack of quorum)

**Motion:** Member J. Brown made a motion to approve the minutes the "Special" Meeting of February 16, 2011. Member Barnett seconded. Members Shelby, M. Brown, and Forte abstained.

**Action:** Motion approved.

**Item 4:** **Discussion: How to Forward Information/Recommendations from Oversight Committee to City Administrator, Public Safety Committee, City Council and Mayor's Office (Staff)**

(This item was taken out of order)

Chairperson Dorado began the conversation. Chairperson Dorado requested that Sara Bedford approach the mic and speak to the follow-up of a report that was previously requested by the Committee.

Ms. Bedford stated that she would come to this Committee in May. Hopefully with the recommendations for renewal with the third and final year of the current third year cycle of the grantee funding cycle of the prevention programs. Currently, DHS is conducting site visits, which is a standard part of the monitoring process. Ms. Bedford suggested that a lot of the members had expressed interest in attending the site visits. Then they will develop draft recommendations that they will take to the Public Safety Committee. Time permitting these recommendations will go to the Oversight Committee first.

Member J. Brown requested information on the timeline. Ms. Bedford replied that in order to have contract renewed and running by July 1<sup>st</sup> DHS would like to take their recommendations to the Public Safety Committee on May 24<sup>th</sup>. DHS will not have completed site visits until the end of April. So the earliest the report will be ready is the first week of May. They would like to bring the report to the Committee sometime in early May. This could be at a regular meeting or at a special meeting earlier in the month which would give the Committee time before the Public Safety Committee hears it.

Ms. Bedford suggested that she would like to bring the report to the Oversight Committee May 1<sup>st</sup> or May 3<sup>rd</sup>, or close to the last week of April. DHS will bring the report whenever it makes sense for this Committee's schedule. The item is scheduled for the 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday in May for the Public Safety Committee. Hopefully it will be approved by the full Council by the first week in June. This would give them enough time to renew those contracts by July 1.

Chairperson Dorado inquired whether Ms. Bedford would be able to have a report available to the Committee by May 16<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Bedford replied in the affirmative. Chairperson Dorado affirmed that this would give the Committee enough time to have something ready for the May 24, 2011 Public Safety Committee meeting.

Mr. Barnett requested information from Ms. Bedford about the substance of the report. Ms. Bedford replied that the Committee will be provided with a 1-2 page summary for every grantee. It will include highlights from the

evaluation, findings from the site visit and a summary of their availability to meet their benchmarks throughout the year including the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter, the report will be lengthy and that is why it will be provided in the format described. The report provided by DHS will not be lengthy as it will only describe the grantee's activities, success, and highlights from the monitoring process and DHS recommendations for renewal. They may also recommend a provisional renewal.

Member J. Brown discussed with the Committee the time limitations of the report being available by May 3<sup>rd</sup>. Ms. Brown expressed concern over the Committee not having enough time to read over and make recommendations on the report before it went to Public Safety Committee.

Ms. Bedford replied that the report would need to be submitted to the City Administrator by May 3<sup>rd</sup>. Shortly thereafter the report could be made available to the Committee, and review it in advance of the May 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Chairperson Dorado suggested that if the Oversight Committee receives the report in advance of the May 16<sup>th</sup> meeting and Ms. Bedford presents to the Committee on the 16<sup>th</sup>, the Committee will have 10 days to put in writing a document to the Public Safety Committee. Chairperson Dorado also mentioned if the draft goes to the City Admin by the 3<sup>rd</sup> then, the Committee will have 10 + days to review the document before it comes to the Committee.

Staffer Harmon commented that the Committee will not have access to the Draft copy of the report until the City Administrator signs off on it. This process can take up to a week or more.

Chairperson Dorado offered that the report does not have to be in its final form. Instead a draft version will be acceptable to the Committee, even if it is not signed.

Staffer Harmon replied that this is usually not the practice; however a request will be made.

Member J. Brown suggested having a special meeting in May 9<sup>th</sup> for the purpose of reviewing the report and recommendations. However, in order for the report to meet the 72hr publishing requirement the report would have to be signed no later than Wednesday, May 4<sup>th</sup>. Member Brown inquired whether this would be possible given the process with the City Administrator's Office.

Staffer Harmon replied that this is exactly the issue. If the report is not given to the CAO until the beginning of May, it is unlikely a signature will be provided in enough time to publish for the May 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Member J. Brown commented that this leaves the Committee very little time to read and discuss the documents.



Chairperson Dorado reiterated that he would like the Committee to obtain an unsigned Draft copy to be placed in the packet for the Oversight Committee.

Staffer Harmon replied that once DHS submits a copy of the report to the CAO, she would work with the CAO to see if an unsigned Draft copy could be made available to put in the packet.

Member Shelby requested a copy of actions made in year one and year two by the Oversight Committee in preparation for reading the draft for year three.

Member Barnett offered that everyone in the Committee will have to review past recommendations as well and determine whether the recommendations seem reasonable based not only on information that we can take a look at, but the history.

Member J. Brown offered that the previous RDA recommendations have the same information.

Member Barnett replied that he would like to look at information from the 1<sup>st</sup> year evaluation, 2<sup>nd</sup> year evaluation, in order to make an intelligent decision instead of endorsing the recommendations of staff. He suggested that we not worry about getting the decision to the City Council by June. They will have to make the decision anyway. Instead they should focus on getting something to the City Council by next September. Then the Council can decide what they want to do in the next cycle. It is too late to affect this budget cycle. The same programs will be funded. Instead it is better to focus on who should be funded in the next cycle and write a thoughtful commentary. Nothing effective can be done by June regarding third year funding.

Member J. Brown inquired where in the process DHS was in regard to RFP funding for the next 2-3 years.

Ms. Bedford replied that her department is in consultation with the Mayor's Office and City Administrator's Office. It would be released in the late Fall after coming to the Oversight Committee. Ms. Bedford encouraged participation in the site visits because it would provide a more hands on feel for discussions about the future RFP.

Chairperson Dorado asked the Committee whether they wanted to participate in the May 24<sup>th</sup> Public Safety Committee. Member Brown replied that she would not want to foreclose any future opportunity to discuss what is brought up in the report.

Chairperson Dorado offered to the group is requesting to get something out of the City Administrator's Office in a draft version, barring that they will look at what comes out at a signed copy from the CAO, for the

meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup>. There will be no special meeting in May prior to the meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup> with the understanding that something will be provided at least 72 hrs in advance to read and review.

Member Brown expressed that the purpose of putting this item on the agenda was not only to discuss internally how to be more effective as an Oversight Committee but also how to engage City government both in gathering information as well as engaging in communication and sharing recommendations and communications out of the Oversight Committee and what the appropriate forum is. An example of this is engaging the CPAB. There seems to be an integral relationship between the two and suggested that on a regular basis to have a representative or multiple representatives attend the CPAB. Member Barnett has done an excellent job of this but each member has to stand up and make a commitment on a rotating basis to establish that communication, by our presence at their meetings. Secondly she would like to see a joint meeting with the CPAB around strengthening the NCPC's and their ability to both reach out to the communities that they are serving, and in an organized way assess the needs of the community and communicate projects to the PSO's in ways that can be put into the data system and in a way that can be monitored. Claudia Albano and her team are essential to that discussion.

**Motion:**

Member J. Brown made a motion that they have on a rotating basis a member who attends the CPAB to convey information from the Committee, ask appropriate questions based on work the Oversight committee has done or to raise questions during the course of that meeting relating to our own work and create a conduit of information going back and forth between the Oversight committee and the CPAB and that we request staff to go ahead and arrange a joint meeting on the issue of strengthening the NCPC's.

Motion was seconded by Member Barnett.

**Amended Motion:**

Member Forte stated that he agreed with Member J. Brown and recalled that discussion about representation at the Rules Committee and the PSC. As a friendly amendment recommend expanding the motion made by Member J. Brown to include the PSC and Rules Committee.

Member J. Brown accepted the amendment.

Member Barnett continued the conversation by recalling a calendar of events that the Committee committed to addressing. That process should result in the form of a report to the PSC. The issues may not always include members of the CPAB, but often it would because it might be in their area of interest. Member Barnett made the point that in order to pass the motion there must be details in it that discuss how it is going to work. It is important to define more precisely in this motion "regular presence." Maybe this should be put in our by-laws how it should work so that when people become part of this Committee they see and understand what we are trying to accomplish.

Member Sturdivant commented asked the Committee how they see the Oversight Committee functioning. Specifically, as a member of the OFCY Committee and as an organizer he may have a different understanding of what oversight means. How does this streamlining of information work with the Oversight Committee? He is lost as to what it was, is, and is trying to become.

Member Barnett responded by asking what he would like it to be?

Member Shelby interjected and requested information on what the group's functions and activities have been. To date all she has received is the agenda. Member Shelby acknowledged that the agenda was helpful, however there was still an initial amount of information that she needs and requires.

Member Shelby also commented that she liked the original motion and the friendly amendment. However, she would not personally be in a position to be able to attend due to her rigorous professional schedule. However, she is present on the Committee because of her experience with oversight, grants, and funding which gives her a different perspective.

Chairperson Dorado offered that he would provide information to Members Shelby and Sturdivant on the past, present, and future direction of the Committee.

**Amended Motion:** Member J. Brown amended her motion to include that the person responsible for attending the PSC and or the CPAB will be the chair of the ad-hoc Committee and his or her designee that prepared the subject matter report that is being presented. There is a calendar of monthly reports that will provide to the oversight Committee that will be discussed/ recommendations will be made and voted on. The goal is that this information and or recommendation shall go on as appropriate to the CPAB, PSC, and Council. There is somebody that would be the chair of the ad-hoc committee. That person would be responsible for making those presentations, at the aforementioned committee meetings on the subsequent month in order to get that item on the agenda and to discuss it fully with the appropriate committee. Regardless of whether there is a report going forward to any of these Committees, members of the Oversight Committee shall still have a presence at these meetings regardless of whether a report has been prepared.

Member Barnett stated for the record that the scheduled reports referenced in the motion are documented on page 4 of the minutes of the "special" meeting of Jan 24<sup>th</sup>. Members of this committee responsible for the monthly report were documented on pg 4 on the minutes.

**Action:** Motion approved

**Item: 5** Agenda Building, Regular Meeting of April 18, 2011  
The discussion was led by Chairperson Dorado.

**Motion:** A motion was made by Chairperson Dorado that the following items be included on the agenda for the April 18<sup>th</sup> meeting:

- A report from the Re-entry Specialist
- Report from Naisha and ad hoc Committee
- A letter from Chairperson Dorado to the City Administrator, OPD, and the Mayor requesting an OPD rep at every meeting. If the PSO could be at every meeting this requirement would be met. There would also be 5 min standing item for a PSO/OPD at every meeting. PSO that attends the next meeting shall provide a step by step of the SARA process for a project they are working on
- Update from OFD at every other meeting
- Monthly financial report from OPD and DHS, including YTD money that was spent, summary of outstanding resources
- Standing agenda item from different service providers
- An e-mail could be sent to the CPAB about strengths and weaknesses of NCPC's and how they could help assist w/ appropriate projects

**Action:** Motion approved

**Item: 6** Adjournment

Moved by Dorado, seconded by Barnett.

MEASURE Y: VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND  
PUBLIC SAFETY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES: May 16, 2011

**Oversight Committee Members**

Qaid Aqeel  
Peter Barnett  
Joanne Brown  
Michael E. Brown  
Richard Carter  
Nyeisha Dewitt  
Chairperson Jose Dorado  
Nicole Lee  
Melony Shelby  
Brandon Sturdivant

**Item 1: Roll Call and Determination of Quorum**

**Present:**

Member Aqeel  
Member Barnett  
Member J. Brown  
Member Carter  
Member Sturdivant  
Chairperson Dorado

**Absent:** Nyeisha Dewitt, Nicole Lee, Michael Brown, and Melony Shelby

**Quorum was achieved for this meeting at 7:06pm**

**Item 2: Open Forum:**

Krista Gulbranson, Chair of the Community Policing Advisory Board (CPAB) signed up to speak. Ms. Gulbranson wanted to introduce herself to the Board, provide comment on an item that was agendaized for the CPAB, and update the Committee on the status of a joint meeting with the CPAB. Ms. Gulbranson said she had not yet had an opportunity to present the idea to her Board. However, she believed that it was a good idea to have a joint meeting regarding the NCPC's and regular attendance at each other's meetings. She also would like for the two Boards to support one another and be engaged with each other with regards to reports that need to be written and presented to both Boards and to the Public Safety Committee.

Ms. Gulbranson briefly summarized the discussion that took place at the CPAB of the three budget scenarios that were presented by Mayor Quan and City Administrator Ewell. She indicated that the CPAB will be sending a letter to the City Council, Public Safety Committee, City Administrator, and Mayor letting them know that they

unanimously and vehemently oppose any elimination or reduction to the Problem Solving Officers, or the Neighborhood Service Coordinators.

**Item 3:**        **Approval of Draft Minutes from May 16, 2011**  
(This item was taken out of order due to the lack of quorum)

**Motion:**        Motion was made by Member Aqeel, seconded by member Sturdivant.

**Action:**        Motion passed. Member Carter and Aqeel abstained.

**Item 4:**        **Standing Item: Problem Solving Officer (PSO) Report**  
(This item was taken out of order)  
Deputy Chief Breshears mentioned that all PSO's are in the process of developing a standardized power point presentation for use by all PSO's. However, for this evening the report will not include a power point but an oral presentation by PSO Garrens on his projects and their status.

PSO Patrick Garrens: He is assigned to beat 10 in North Oakland. However he has worked in that area for three and a half years. As a PSO he responds to priorities which are set forth by the community, and he attends monthly NCPC's. He usually does not take more than 3 priorities. He sticks with priorities until they are thoroughly addressed. The current priorities for beat 10 include:

- House at 892 45<sup>th</sup> St. There is a single elderly male adult that lives there. There is a lot of loitering at the property. The young men that are loitering on the property are moving onto the porch and onto his front steps. The elderly man that lives there is a reverend at a church in West Oakland. He is not always at home due to his obligations at the Church. So he is often unable to regulate the foot traffic. This is a concern for area residents and neighbors. They have tried to address this with No Trespassing letters that are based on section 602 of the penal code. The letters are signed monthly to make sure they continue to be on top of the project. They have contacted APS given that the man is elderly. They are also doing CEPTED assessments of the site to make sure there are no trees blocking lights, garbage or furniture that piles up on the property.
- 5231 West St or MLK- Across the street from Children's Hospital. This has been identified as a violent hotspot. Two people were shot and killed at the property in October 2010. This address seems to be the center point of loitering and drug dealing. This is a Section 8 property so the Oakland Housing Authority has been involved. They have done CEPTED assessments of the park in that immediate area and Ms. Brunner's office has been very helpful. Trees have been trimmed back, lighting has been increased, and there is discussion about elimination some of the concrete benches. The Church across the street has also adopted the park which has been very helpful. OPD and others are in the process of getting that finalized. The property owners have been engaged and are now attending the NCPC meeting.

- 60<sup>th</sup> and San Pablo- Loitering issue. Most of this is drug related and there is a liquor store there on the corner. Our ABAT unit has sat down with the property owner and they have been very cooperative. OPD has been able to take some real aggressive steps to addressing the loitering problems in this area.

Member J. Brown asked how long PSO Garrens has worked in that beat, where he had worked previously. PSO Garrens responded that he has worked in North Oakland most of his career with OPD. He had previously been a PSO in the Rockridge area (beat 12). So he was already familiar with the area and already knew the hotspots based upon his experience in North Oakland. He also studied reports and had access to reports and work from prior beat officers working in that same area dating as far back as the 1990's.

Member Carter inquired about the number of open or active projects. PSO Garrens responded that he had two open projects. He's done three since he came back in January. One is closed already and he has two open projects as of right now. Member Carter also inquired whether he received much input from the community. Officer Garrens responded affirmatively and indicated that the suggestion to work on the project on MLK came from the community. Member Carter also inquired about Liquor Stores and whether there were any limitations to their proximity to each other. PSO Garrens said he was unsure. However, he mentioned that he worked with ABAT who does work with ABC.

Member Barnett inquired about what the No Trespassing statement entailed. PSO Garrens responded that it is very similar to witness statement but is specific to the trespassing. The statement is valid up to 30 days. So even if the property owner is not on site the individuals can still be warned and ultimately arrested. PSO Garrens said he is optimistic and believes this is working.

Member J. Brown inquired whether PSO Garrens worked in any other beat. PSO Garrens replied no and that he spends close to 100% of his time in the beat.

Chairperson Dorado thanked him for the report and mentioned that he was looking forward to the PowerPoint presentation and information from the SARA database. One of the main things was that some of the solutions mentioned tonight can be applied across the board. Given that there are similar problems all over the City, he hopes that this information can be accessible to other PSOs and NCPC's throughout the City.

**Motion:** None. This was an informational item.

**Action:** None. This was an informational item.

**Item 5:        Standing Item: Service Provider Report**

Priya Jagannathan, Planner with the Department of Human Services introduced the Gang Prevention and Intervention Provider. Together they work in collaboration with the Oakland Unified School District Office of Alternative Education, California Youth Outreach, and Project Reconnect. They are funded for \$177,600.

Monica Vaughn was the first speaker and she is the coordinator with the Oakland Unified School District. They are currently working on their gang prevention and intervention project within the alternative schools in Oakland. The project consists of three main components. They include:

- Broad based gang prevention network. These are a group of providers that they meet with regularly to address issues in the broader community.
- They provide direct services to gang involved youth at five of the alternative schools within Oakland.
- Parent Education for middle school students focuses on those students who are seriously at risk for being involved in gangs.

Shirley Yee was introduced as the project coordinator, Geoffrey Godfrey who is the lead from California Youth Outreach, and Daniel Marshall from Project Reconnect.

Shirley Yee continued the presentation. She shared information from their collaborative which is called the Interagency Gang Prevention Collaborative. There are representatives from the school district, the Oakland and School police departments, probation, the Department of Human Services and about fifteen different community based agencies that are part of the collaborative. The focus of this collaborative is around networking, capacity building, and informing policy and practice. They also share best practices, and capacity building. Specifically with California Youth Outreach who provides training to parents and school staff. They also work with policy makers and are members of the Mayor's Gang Prevention Task Force.

Geoffrey Godfrey with California Youth Outreach has worked with the alternative schools for a little bit over three years. The program has evolved to help young men and women coming home from probation and separating from gang culture to demonstrating behaviors that are socially acceptable. Part of the measureables that they use are attendance, behavior, criminal justice involvement, alcohol, and weapons. A lot of the students have displayed better attendance, more socially acceptable behavior, have decreased their use of alcohol and other substances and decreased the carrying of weapons.

Daniel Marshall with Project Reconnect spoke next. They do bilingual parenting programs in Spanish and English. They serve up and down the International corridor. They served 60 families this fiscal year. They work at the Carmen Flores Recreation center and they have about 25 participants there. They go to areas where they are requested and they currently have about four different schools. They work on drug and alcohol abuse, nutrition, have a special class called 911 411 where they actually explain and inform the parents about traits that are common in gang activity.



Member J. Brown had a question regarding partnership with the school district and incorporating it into the regular curriculum. Specifically she was interested in knowing what success they have had incorporating this information into the curriculum for all students, not just those who had encounters with the justice system.

Monica Vaughn responded that they have been able to use this grant as a foundation to get other grants. One of the grants they just completed is with the OJJDP that specifically focused on this. This allowed them to create a gang prevention handbook which they published and provided to all of their schools. The money was also used to pay for a gang expert to come out to the schools to help schools do a gang prevention plan of their own. They have also sponsored gang prevention and intervention training sessions for parents and school staff. Due their visibility several schools have used their Title 1 funds to contract with California Youth Outreach to do work at their school site.

Member Carter inquired about the techniques that they found to be most useful. Monica explained that a combination of strategies is very helpful. One on one attention as well as group settings seemed to be helpful to students. Effective case management has also been beneficial.

Geoffrey mentioned established a relationship and building trust were also very important. A standard, doable case plan, with tangible benchmarks have also proven to be successful. Having a clear method to reach these benchmarks and being able to connect students to the appropriate resources.

Member Barnett had a question regarding how the Board connects the work that is being done by these individuals under this strategy to the evaluations that are before the Oversight Committee. Ms. Jagannathan replied that they were on pg. 60 of the document.

Member Sturdivant asked whether given the budget constraints, is there anything the District can do to better serve these populations? Monica Vaughn responded that although things are uncertain in this climate schools have a little bit more flexibility than they had in the past around how to spend these funds. Most of these decisions are made at a site level, because all schools are different and have different needs. School sites have to make these very difficult decisions. Additionally, the capacity building that they have done thus far has been at a low cost.

Member Sturdivant followed up by asking how this works with the school districts strategic plan. Monica responded that because she is not a part of those cabinet level conversations she is unsure. The plan will be presented next week by the school district. Hopefully she will be invited back to provide us with an update.

Member Brown asked Daniel how they reach out to parents and how do they measure their effectiveness. Daniel explained that they have parents who voluntarily attend, and those that are compelled to attend. They evaluate where they are when they first come to the program and where they are when they leave. This is why they do evaluations so that they ensure that they are providing useful substantive information. They also have homework assignments over the length of the course. The parents also do check-ins around midway to see if things have come up and to ensure that they receive additional help when they encounter obstacles. At the end of the class they do a teach the teacher

and share what they have learned. They also require the parents to search their children's room. During that time period they are available 24hrs if the parents need assistance, have questions, or if they find something and don't know what to do or say. They walk through them through the process.

Sara Bedford from the Department of Human Services mentioned that these resources are deployable. Most recently they have worked with the Oakland Police Foundation to expand their gang prevention classes with the Catholic churches.

Mr. Aqeel asked whether home visits were conducted as part of case management. Geoffrey replied that home visits are part of case management. They meet with parent, probation officers, teachers and go to court with them. Geoffrey also acknowledged that every student does not need a home visit, however in situations where it is appropriate they will conduct home visits.

Chairperson Dorado asked whether there had been any effort to connect with the local NCPC's around the issue of gangs. Shirley responded that they do make regular presentations to the NCPC's. They have been in West, East and in Central and she mentioned they would be doing one more this coming June. Chairperson Dorado suggested doing one in the Fruitvale. Chairperson Dorado also suggested that collaborative with the PSOs in the Fruitvale when a gang issue is identified as a priority and SARA project.

Daniel mentioned that Project Reconnect works directly with the NCPC's and takes referrals from them.

Member Aqeel asked what steps are taken to address truancy and get kids on the right track. Geoffrey provided that they first try and reach out to the student to identify what they need, and then if that is unsuccessful they try and reach out to the responsible adult in the child's life. If they doesn't work then they will do a SART which is where they sit down with the student and school personnel to figure out what is going on to identify the root issue. Member Aqeel asked whether the SART process was helpful for students in high school. Monica responded that they didn't have adequate resources for our high school students and the dropout speaks to that. As such, they have relied more on the Street outreach team and others.

**Motion:** None. This was an informational item.

**Action:** None. This was an informational item.

**Item 6:** **Report from the Re-Entry Specialist**

Sara Bedford from the Department of Human Services (DHS) gave the report.

The Mayors Re-Entry Specialist was originally part of the Mayor's office under the Dellums administration. In January 2011 this position was transferred to the Department of Human Services. The chart in the packet detailed data that was entered for this grantee during the third quarter of the reporting period. Mr. Taggart has provided more data and information on the challenges of meeting certain benchmarks and the plans for continuing to reach those benchmarks by the end of the year. He also provided

information in the report about what he has been doing over the past year. The benchmarks that he hasn't been able to meet are largely due to the lack of hiring by the City of Oakland and available positions that could be filled. DHS is currently looking at his deliverables for next year to come up with appropriate and tangible outcomes given that he is now part of DHS. Specifically, this might include case management around the call-in process, and less pre-employment and orientation meetings. He would also work on the re-entry employment guide.

Member J. Brown asked how much the position paid, and whether DHS was in the process of writing a new job description. Sara replied that they were in the process of creating a new job description. She did not have his specific annual salary, but that it was funded at the level of a Program Analyst II, and it was approximately \$113k fully loaded.

Member J. Brown expressed that she did not see any real evidence or experience with outreach or case management. Instead what she noticed were a lot of activities that didn't seem to connect to anything. As such she asked what activities that are part of his current job description should be kept. Sara offered that he had experience with case management through Project Choice, and that there is job development work that could be tapped into. Work around resources, and policy role is helpful.

Member Brown asked why have this position instead of using these funds to support other more established organizations that are also doing this works and doing it well. Sara mentioned that this is an option, but also that there are still needs in this area.

Member Brown asked how this position could be used to strengthen the re-entry work. Specifically by providing some structure like San Francisco's Re-entry Council. Sara responded that the Re-entry Council is run by the County, however, Mr. Taggart as well as her other staff have participated in this at various times. However, the Council has struggled with its identity over time. Given that the County has a new probation chief it is likely that the Council will have a renewed focus of which the City can play a part in and participating in re-entry councils throughout the state.

Member J. Brown asked whether the bi-weekly sessions were helpful and why they should continue. Member J. Brown also requested to see a copy of the finalized job description.

Member Sturdivant asked who in the DHS and the City does Re-Entry policy. Sara replied that the Mayor's office works on this. Staffer Harmon also addressed the question by stating that the Mayor's Office has an intergovernmental affairs person who pushed legislation at the state level, and lobbies at both the County and State level. Additionally, the Mayor's Office partners with our Measure Y service providers around this work and often brings both parole and probation to the table to make policy decisions.

Member Sturdivant expressed concern that taking policy completely out of Mr. Taggart's job description might be ineffective. He would like to see Mr. Taggart play a dual role.

Sara provided in June they will draft the new job description and will bring it to Committee when it is completed. She thinks this will be in June or July.

Member Aqeel asked whether a quarterly report could be provided. Sara provided that this could be provided in September or October.

Member Sturdivant expressed a desire to be part of this process. Sara welcomed the involvement.

Member Aqeel asked how was Mr. Taggert's position funded. Sara responded that it was funded through Measure Y under the direct services portion.

Mr. Taggert offered that he has over thirteen years of experience working with this population. He welcomes any of the members of the Committee to come out the community or shadow him any day.

Member Sturdivant asked how he saw his role. He replied that he sees it as both case management and policy work.

Member Brown asked whether the narrative report that was referenced was included in the packet. Mr. Taggert responded that he included a narrative report and a bulleted report. The narratives were in each deliverable. Member Brown clarified that she had everything he submitted. Mr. Taggert responded affirmatively.

**Speakers:** Sanjiv Honda spoke on the item. He stated that this is an illegal meeting under the Maddy Act and that it was not properly noticed to agenda subscribers. He also mentioned that due to budget cuts the meetings will no longer be recorded and televised by KTOP. Only City Council and Committee meetings will be recorded by KTOP.

**Motion:** Motion was made by Member Sturdivant to receive the report. Motion seconded by Member Barnett.

**Action:** Motion passed unanimously

**Item 7: Measure Y Evaluation: Community Policing & Violence Prevention Programs**

Dr. Pat Bennett introduced the report, the evaluation and her team which included Rema Sprite, Jeremy Bennett, and Brightstar Olson. Dr. Bennett hopes that this information can be used to celebrate what works and to raise questions.

Dr. Bennett then went through the slide presentation which is included as part of these minutes.

After the violence prevention PowerPoint presentation Chairperson Dorado asked if the Committee wanted to take questions now or later. Member Carter stated that he had a question on the cost per hour of the violence prevention programs. Specifically, he wanted to know what the numbers in the PowerPoint represented.

Dr. Bennett replied that every program has a fixed amount of money to provide services to their clients. The data collected provides the number of hours that a service was provided and did the math accordingly. Dr. Bennett also provided that the numbers did

not seem high as compared to similar programs across the country. However, she mentioned that there were things that influenced the cost. Programs with lower costs are getting money from other places. They just looked at Measure Y funds. Also, some of the young adult and re-entry programs also included subsidized employment. Additionally, the street outreach cost per client only included individual client/case management. Event hours were difficult to calculate. So their numbers were artificially high because it doesn't include all of the time that they are actually out on the street performing outreach.

Member J. Brown asked whether Dr. Bennett came up with a definition of case management. Dr. Bennett replied that they are using what the Department has put into people's contracts as case management versus intensive case management. As such, this may vary from one program to the next. However consistent themes were attributed to case management and intensive case management.

Member Aqeel wanted to know whether students who signed up for the afterschool program were already chronically truant. Brightstar replied that each Measure Y program that targets at-risk youth has certain qualifying risk factors that need to be met and that they vary from strategy to strategy. Each program has criteria that ensure that their respective strategy. These criteria may include chronic truancy, criminal justice involvement, frequent suspension, expulsion, gang involvement, or being on probation or parole. Member Aqeel followed up to ask how providers are identifying people on the first day of school. Brightstar responded that it depends but for example if it is a school based program the provider would be coordinating with school staff to determine which students meet that criteria. Member Aqeel expressed that many kids in the afterschool programs are not the ones that are in our target population and this data does not help identify this.

Member Sturdivant asked for clarification on one of the slides presented and on street outreach. As it pertained to street outreach he inquired whether the reduction was only in East Oakland. Dr. Bennett responded that she only used that slide as an example of how they collected data and their ability to show results in a graph.

Member Barnett stated that the interim report that was published last fall gave a lot of good positive information. This report is not understandable. Most importantly he tried to compare numbers from this year's report to last year's report and was unable to do so. Dr. Bennett responded that part of where there is inconsistency is where there have been changes made. These changes were made based on data from previous reports. For example there are higher test for who is eligible for the program, and now there is better data collection. However, the baseline data collection is the same. The difference is that we are actually getting richer data. Member Barnett acknowledged this but hopes that future reports can be more consistent.

Member Sturdivant offered that the group collectively come up with a process that allows them to go deeper. Whether it's the Oakland Unified School District or some other strategy or street outreach. He also asked how their scope of work impacted by individual evaluation coaching. Dr. Bennett responded that there were people in her team assigned to each program not only so that they could assist with data collection but also so that they could get a better understanding of the program to ensure that the data accurately reflected the services offered and outcomes achieved. After the data was

*Carla  
Hoskins  
See above  
DWH  
Hoskins*

collected and analyzed the write-up was submitted to the DHS and given to the providers so that they could respond, correct, and object to. They also have strategy sessions with the providers to assist them with evidence based and national best practices.

Chairperson Dorado asked the committee what their input was given the short amount of time before this issue goes before the Public Safety Committee and City Council.

Brightstar provided an explanation of the Community Policing power point which is included in these minutes.

Member J. Brown asked about the types of projects that fall into the "other" category. Brightstar raised questions about this category with OPD and the Department seems to address this issue and is being used less frequently. However, there are limitations with the SARA database that going forward they are working to gain access to this part of the database.

Member J. Brown also expressed concerns about providing training and resources to access to resources outside of the Department. Dr. Bennett replied that the Department has come a long way with this and there is support from the leadership. The issue now is how they systemize it. Their current training does provide training on accessing other city departments.

Member Sturdivant asked whether in the current SARA database there was an opportunity to see the progress that was being made on a specific project and how is this tracked. Brightstar responded that right now the PSO supervisor can see and track the progress, however, they are working on their ability to gain access to this information. All they can see right now is whether the project is opened or closed. This limited access is because when they were hired there was no database so they built a shell to collect a system. They are in the process building a more robust system.

**Motion:** A motion was made Member J. Brown to extend the meeting for another fifteen minutes. This was seconded by Chairperson Dorado.

Chairperson Dorado asked whether they saw any indication that OPD was formulating a process with NCPC's actually go through a step by step procedure to develop priorities. Brightstar responded that there wasn't a specific protocol but more of an effort to share information with the community through the standardized PowerPoint to encourage the community to make more informed decisions around priorities. Chairperson expressed that this was a common frustration and without a protocol there was no way to properly ~~identify~~ <sup>develop</sup> priorities from one NCPC to the next.

Member Barnett asked whether the changing of police beats changed or impacted their data collection. Brightstar said they still have the capacity to look at both.

**Motion:** Member J. Brown suggested that they share the Committee's collective opinions or analysis on this report in some formalized way. Motion that they draft a letter over the Chairs signature that indicates that they received the reports, that the Committee had an opportunity to review them, there were presentations made and questions answered, additional

information was provided, there was a good discussion, there was the presence of many community groups and representatives, and there are a few things that the City Council could look at. Specifically, with community policing they could look at the linkages to resources for the PSO's outside of the police department, more support for the NCPC with regard to some formula for creating informed priorities, and supporting the upgrade of the SARA database so that it can be more useful for evaluators.

In terms of the community groups she believes they are doing very well and there is credible data that demonstrates this. The challenge is obviously still re-entry and this area needs more attention and perhaps that is more active participation in the Re-Entry Council.

The motion was seconded by Chairperson Dorado.

**Action:** Motion passed. Member Barnett voted no.

Member Barnett responded that they have to decide what they are going to do. He also stated that the letter should come from the Committee. However, he did not feel comfortable supporting a letter regarding recommendations because he did not have enough to make recommendations.

Member Sturdivant provided that there is no need to write them a letter just to tell them the Committee reviewed something.

Member Sturdivant suggested that the letter should say we received the reports, heard presentations, had a good discussion and these are the five things we recommend.

Chairperson Dorado offered that the letter reflect the details in Member J. Brown's motion and that it could go under his signature to the Public Safety Committee and the Council.

**Item 8:**        **Standing Item: Financial Report & Status of the Measure Y Fund**

Gilbert Garcia gave the report for the Oakland Police Department. He stated the budget was \$6.4 million dollars. To date \$2.9 million dollars has been spent. \$3.5 million dollars is the balance.

Member J. Brown asked whether this was for the fiscal year July 1<sup>st</sup> - June 30<sup>th</sup>. Gilbert replied yes 2010-2011. Member Aqeel inquired about overtime. Gilbert responded that they do not put money for overtime in the budget. Essentially, the budget has money for salaries and benefits. However some overtime is required for projects, but there is enough salary savings to accommodate that if necessary.

Chairperson Dorado asked how many officers were funded through Measure Y. Gilbert said 63. But the number can fluctuate due to disability, illness, or other factors.

**Motion:** No motion

**Action:** No action taken

Sanjiv Honda signed up to speak on this item. On day 121 of the Quan administration he finally understands what she means by transparency. It's about her being on Facebook or on the TV camera. It's not about serving the public. There are basic rules and she is required to uphold California law that requires that meetings be properly noticed. It is not appropriate for her staff to staff meetings that have not been properly trained on public noticing. This will be an interesting legal test since this was found out in the middle of the meeting. Sanjiv will file a complaint with the Ethics Commission. Clearly the agenda is too long so either you need to reduce the number of items or go to twice monthly meetings.

**Item 9:**      **Recommendations for the Third Year Funding Cycle**

Sara Bedford with DHS gave a PowerPoint presentation that is attached to these minutes. She recommended that all programs be renewed.

Member Aqeel asked if the Mayor's Re-entry specialist had to re-apply for Measure Y funds. Sara responded that the position is recommended to be renewed.

Sanjiv Honda signed up to speak on this item. The current proposal for the mayor calls for eliminated 395 positions from the City's general fund. As such there will be a greater need to manage agendas so that staff is not waiting all night to present. Regarding the evaluations there is a need to do outreach and education and to go back to basics for City staff.

**Motion:**      Member Carter moved that the report be accepted. Member J. Brown seconded it.

**Action:**      Motion passed. Member Barnett voted no.

**Item 10:**      **Report of the Ad-hoc Committee: Presentation: Overall City Public Safety Apparatus, Neighborhood Services, Police Department, Fire Department, Code Enforcement, Service Delivery System Teams**

Member J. Brown said at some point in time the Committee needs to address adding to the bylaws and discussing member participation and attendance at the next meeting.

Member Aqeel and Dorado agreed.

Member Barnett said that there was no point in discussing the evaluation. There was not enough time to read it. It was not a good use of time.

**Motion:**      None



**Action:** None

**Item 11:** Agenda Building, Regular Meeting of June 20, 2011

The discussion was led by Chairperson Dorado. The following items should be added to the next agenda.

- PSO Report
- Service provider report
- Ad hoc committee- Status
- The Fire Dept. Report on use of Measure Y funds
- Discussion of Bylaws and Member participation
- Reorganization of the OPD
- Agenda Building

Member Barnett requested more time and consensus around agenda building.

Sanjiv Honda provided that due to the legal opinion by the attorney general this cannot be done without an actual publicly noticed meeting with a quorum.

Chairperson Dorado offered that he and Member J. Brown would come up with an agenda and submit it to staffer Harmon.

**Motion:** A motion was made by Member Sturdivant to include these items on the next agenda. Motion was seconded by Member J. Brown.

**Action:** Motion passed

**Item 12:** Adjournment

**Motion:** Member Aqeel motioned that the meeting be adjourned. Member Sturdivant seconded the motion.

**Action:** Motion passed unanimously

MEASURE Y: VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND  
PUBLIC SAFETY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES: June 20, 2011

**Oversight Committee Members**

Qaid Aqeel  
Peter Barnett  
Joanne Brown  
Michael E. Brown  
Richard Carter  
Nyeisha Dewitt  
Chairperson Jose Dorado  
Nicole Lee  
Melanie Shelby  
Brandon Sturdivant

**Item 1: Roll Call and Determination of Quorum**

**Present:**

Member Aqeel  
Member Barnett  
Member J. Brown  
Member Carter  
Member Dewitt  
Chairperson Dorado  
Member Lee  
Member Shelby

**Absent:** Michael E. Brown, and Brandon Sturdivant

**Quorum was achieved for this meeting at 6:36pm**

**Item 2: Open Forum:**

**Speakers:** Sanjiv Handa, East Bay News Service. Mr. Handa commented that it was June 20<sup>th</sup> and there was still no budget. He said most of the delay is due to delay is due to concessions from the labor Unions. The City Council has been meeting in consecutive closed sessions to over the past few days to try and come up with proposals.

He stated there are 4 important things. The first is Mayor Quan's proposal where a 3 million dollar subsidy would be going from the general fund to keep funding the Violence Prevention component of Measure Y. There is a 3 million dollar shortfall. 13 of 17 the libraries including the African American Museum as well as several support services have been eliminated in the proposed budget. Thirdly, after submitting a public records request for budgets and in the 16 year span from June 1993 to June 2009 in only three years had the police department actually exceeded their budget. One year was only a

half a million dollars. He went on to state that there has been much talk about the massive amounts of overtime. Much of this is reimbursed for activities at the A's game, Raiders' games, and other special events at the coliseum. So if you look at it the police department actually made a profit for 13 of the 16 years.

Finally, for the third year in a row the fire departments budget actually exceeded the police department's budget. The fire department went \$13million and change over their budget. The police department spent \$11.1 million. Since there are a lot of vacancies within the fire department they are able to use this salary savings to address their overtime needs. Finally, he stated that \$3.9 million from Measure Y goes directly to address their overtime needs.

There were no other speakers on this item.

**Item 3:        Approval of Draft Minutes from June 20, 2011**

Chairperson Dorado had a correction on page 10. At the bottom of the page under the motion, where it says that "the Chairperson mentioned that this was a common frustration and without a protocol there is no way to properly identify"...Identify should be replaced with the word develops.

Member J. Brown commented that having detailed minutes is going to be increasingly important since the Oversight Committee will no longer be on KTOP. The minutes will be the only means for the public to know that the Committee is doing the type of oversight, asking the type of questions, and doing the type of analysis that is expected from an Oversight Committee.

**Motion:**        Motion was made by Member J. Brown to accept the minutes as amended, seconded by Member Barnett.

**Action:**        Motion approved. Member Lee, Shelby, and Dewitt abstained.

**Item 4:        Standing Item: Problem Solving Officer (PSO) Report**

Problem Solving Officer (PSO) Jorge Pereda gave the report. Officer Pereda works in the Fruitvale District and is the PSO for beat 23. Late last year he and his partner were often dispatched to the Fruitvale District to respond to robberies. Many of the people there felt that no one cared about what was happening. Many of the people are first generation from Mexico. He is also first generation from Mexico. The culture there is that calling the police creates another problem. Many of the people in this community have this same mentality as it applies to calling the police for assistance. They want to change this mentality. So he and his partner decided to take this on as a project. They made a lot of contacts with residents by walking the beat, and speaking at meetings. Yet, still no witnesses came forward. There were only 5 city owned cameras in the Fruitvale district. Some business owners had cameras and they were facing the wrong direction. So in conjunction with the Mayor and Councilmember's office they decided to do a camera project in the area. They were told that the project qualifies for use of redevelopment funds. They were able to order 33 camera sets for the merchants. The applications were recently signed, and they were able to meet with the merchants. Right now they are waiting on the cameras to be installed.

16 of the sets will be placed on International from Fruitvale to 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave and the remaining 17 will be placed along the Fruitvale and Foothill corridor by the end of next month.

In May there was a homicide on 34<sup>th</sup> Ave. There were two cameras that could have been used to apprehend the suspect. The problem was the placement. The cameras captured the suspects walking from a distance. So all you could see was from their chest down. The cameras could capture their faces because of where they were placed. He and his partner will not only work with the merchants on the right placement of new cameras, but for the old cameras as well.

This is the big project he and his partner are working on. He is currently being trained on the motorcycles so he has been missing some of the work with the cameras.

Member Carter asked how many projects PSO Pereda was currently working on. PSO Pereda responded that he and his partner were working on four projects. One of the other projects which focuses on prostitution is area-wide. They have been working on this project since February and they have had over 140 misdemeanor arrests. The other project is Cesar Chavez Park. He and his partner are working with city officials to do CEPTED evaluations and have appropriate lighting. The other project deals with two abandoned houses on 37<sup>th</sup> avenue. The tenants were operating a drug enterprise out of the houses. The tenants were evicted. Now the houses are abandoned and they are trying to deal with the squatters.

Member Carter asked how PSO Pereda and his partner found projects. PSO Pereda responded that they found projects driving around the beat, talking to people, NCPC's, and then they prioritize.

Member Carter asked if he and his partner could take on more projects in addition to the ones they currently have. PSO Pereda replied that he and his partner have time to drive around, meet people, walk 2-3 hours a day, and go to schools.

Member Carter commented that he thought it would be a much more robust program if he and his partner were able to take on more projects.

PSO Pereda said that he and his partner take complaints from residents. For example they have received complaints about properties on E. 17<sup>th</sup> St. These complaints also go into the SARA database.

Member Lee asked whether OPD was partnering with other agencies and if other strategies outside of arrests were being used to deal with the prostitution issues. Lt. Yelder responded that it was three prong project where they used enforcement, social networks like BAYWAR, and the community. There have been three or four rallies on this project.

Member J. Brown asked what impact the motorcycle training had on PSO Pereda's job responsibilities in his beat. PSO Pereda responded the motorcycle is a dual purpose motorcycle and that he will be away for 3 weeks but that he would be back. He also explained that the dual purpose motorcycle was a good tool and he will be able to use

the bike in the Fruitvale. Deputy Chief Breshears also added that the bikes were requested by the community and is often requested at NCPC meetings. Use of the bike is directly related to the needs of the community.

Chairperson Dorado commented that the protocol for priorities at the NCPC level dovetails with the SARA process. Ultimately he would like to see the priorities developed into projects and that at each step of the way the scan, analysis, response, and assessment, there is a report from the PSO and it is done on a consistent basis. He would hope to see a report at each step of the SARA process on each project at the Fruitvale and Unity NCPC. PSO Pereda responded that this could be done and that it could also be done on PowerPoint.

**Speakers:** Sanjiv Handa, East Bay News Service. Mr. Handa commented that there have been several issues that have come up. One of the issues is the way that the priorities have been developed by the Neighborhood Crime Prevention Councils (NCPC). Each NCPC was allowed to develop three priorities. In some neighborhoods the people most impacted by crime would not attend the meetings and so the priorities were largely focused on non-crime related issues. In Beat 9x and in other areas a new requirement has been established that requires that the priorities must actually be related to crime or crime prevention.

The second issue was when this was envisioned there were supposed to be 19 neighborhood service coordinators (NSC) and two supervisors. The funding never materialized for the supervisors, so two of the NSC's became supervisors. Currently there are two supervisors and 9-10 NSCs. This did not occur because of the economy tanking. Instead it occurred because of the decision of councilmembers who used allocated funds for other projects.

The other issue is communication. Many years ago when the PSO's were first implemented the police department had to go and ask the community to help raise funds to get cell phones for their officers, because the City of Oakland wouldn't pay for cell phones. The money that is allocated for Measure Y largely goes to pay for salaries.

Finally, Mr. Handa suggested that the Committee agendize a communications strategy. There are very few people that are part of the NCPC's. There are only about 280 unduplicated members of the community that are a part of the listservs. The last citizen satiation survey which was done in 2000 and 2005 indicated that despite seven years of outreach and millions of dollars that were spent less people knew about community policing in 2005 than they did in 2000. The blame for that was largely lack of communications with the community, not with the police department.

Chairperson Dorado stated that there were over 500 people on the Maxwell Park listservs. Mr. Handa responded that he was referencing the PSA 1-6 listservs. His point was that when communications go out it only goes to these listservs and not all the neighborhood listservs.

**Motion:** None. This was an informational item.

**Action:** None. This was an informational item.

**Item 5: Report On The Reorganization Of The OPD**

Deputy Chief Breshears gave the report. He mentioned that there had been discussion about the reorganization and so the Chief wanted to bring a report with some of the maps and organizational charts and answer any questions.

Deputy Chief Breshears then went through the PowerPoint presentation which is included in this packet.

Chairperson Dorado asked what the border would be between the two different areas. Deputy Chief Breshears replied 23<sup>rd</sup> Ave.

Member Barnett asked what impact the reorganization would have on staffing. Deputy Chief Breshears responded that there would be very little impact on staffing. The officers would work the regular schedule in the same areas. The beats would stay the same. The PSO's would remain the same. The only thing that changes for some officers is the name of the bureau/area that they work in and some of the commanders for that area.

Member Lee inquired as to the advantages and challenges of this new structure. Deputy Chief Breshears replied that at his level things were unbalanced. If you look at the Department a majority of officers are in field operations. This is the primary bureau. The ability to have command staff focused on this at his level is really important. One of the drawbacks is going back out and re-educating the community on the new structure. The other drawback could be the capacity of the radio system. Currently, they have an additional channel for the areas which is extremely helpful during the busier hours of the evening. However, now that there are two areas the Department is having a discussion on the most effective way to split the two areas when most of the calls for service will be coming out of Bureau of Field Operations (BFO) 2.

Member Shelby asked how the redeployment will be communicated to the general public. Deputy Chief Breshears responded that they will be going to the NCPC's and providing a presentation similar to the one given tonight. It will be on the website with the names of the commanding officers, put out on the listservs, a press release, and they are scheduled for the next Public Safety Committee meeting. Member Shelby suggested that they utilize any faith based networks, community based organizations throughout the City, and KTOP to inform the community of the change.

Member Barnett asked how many sworn and civilian personnel are assigned to the compliance unit. Deputy Chief Breshears responded that he did not have the exact figures. Member Barnett asked whether the property crimes division had been taken out of CID. Deputy Chief Breshears responded that one of the Chief's goals is to get investigators back out into the field. SO investigators will be

assigned to bureaus. This will get them to work closer with the patrol officers and PSO's.

Member J. Brown asked whether the area commanders will have two captains working underneath them. Deputy Chief Breshears responded that the Deputy Chief who commands the area will have an operations commander and an administrative captain.

Member J. Brown asked how things were going with the PSO database. Deputy Chief Breshears responded that things were going fairly well. They met with Brightstar last week and she identified some issues with the amount and type of information going into the database. Some of the issues included whether the goals and assessments were listed clearly enough.

Chairperson Dorado commented that he believed there were 35 people in Internal Affairs. Chairperson Dorado also asked whether in the PSO database he saw that there was any problem on the request that PSO's make a report on every step throughout the SARA process. Deputy Chief Breshears replied that he didn't think so. However, he is meeting with the evaluators and is meeting with the PSO's and their supervisors quarterly to go through each of the projects.

Chairperson Dorado asked whether property crime investigators that are now in the field can also work more closely with the NCPCs. He is interested in the process between OPD and the community in terms of what type of information the NCPC's can provide about investigations to the PSO's, patrol, and OPD operations. Deputy Chief Breshears he did not know how to answer this given their caseload. However, ultimately this is the goal.

Member Barnett commented that the crime lab was listed under one of the deputy chiefs and it is placed elsewhere in another slide. Deputy Chief Breshears acknowledged that this might be a mistake and that the crime lab would continue to report directly to Deputy Chief Israel.

Member Barnett also asked whether there had been any effort to utilize the crime labs analysis of property crime evidence as an investigative tool. Deputy Chief Breshears responded that there had been an effort to do this, and that based upon his understanding the crime lab had increased their staffing. The collection of evidence is done in the field by an evidence technician. However, DNA is not typically collected unless there are a string of burglaries.

Deputy Chief Breshears mentioned that the reorganization was set to go into effect July 9<sup>th</sup>. He mentioned that the Department was still working through some of the personnel details and nuts and bolts.

**Speakers:** Sanjiv Handa, East Bay News Service. Mr. Handa noted that this was the fifth significant reorganization in ten years as a result of the declining resources. When Jerry Brow was the Mayor of Oakland OPD had an authorized strength of 777. The force was further reduced to 739. One of the things that came as a result of this was Measure Y. The City collected Measure Y funding for years without delivering what was supposed to be promised under Measure Y.

The second issue with the reorganization will be is that several relationships that have developed have been disrupted in the community. OPD is now supposed to have 640 officers in Mayor Quan's budget. However, this number is slated to go down as low as 580.

The final point with the reorganization is with the criminal investigations division. There is a proposal for 15 furlough days. This could go as high as 26 in a couple of the alternative budget proposals. This would not only impact City Hall but will impact sworn staffing.

**Motion:** Member Barnett moved to receive the report. This was seconded by Member Carter.

**Action:** Motion passed.

**Item 6:**        **Standing Item: Report From The Oakland Fire Department On Measure Y Activities**

Interim Chief Mark Hoffman of the Oakland Fire Department gave the report. He stated the OFD continues meet the requirements of Measure Y by maintaining enough staff to operate 25 engines and 7 truck companies, and to establish a mentoring program. Along with maintaining the service and establishing paramedics the OFD has provided various youth services including mentoring at the fire stations and outside the fire stations. Activities include but are not limited to homework assistance, station tours, open houses, career fairs, and they have moved to providing an Explorer program.

They are also trying to make better connections with some of the smaller programs. This includes partnering with MetWest through the mentoring program and are constantly looking at ways to improve their program.

From a generalist perspective they have reached out to 11,000 people since 2005. This included situations where they brushed up against citizens and youth at job and health fairs. This year alone they are up to 16,503 contacts and the month has not ended. They continue to explore hockey programs and Midnight Basketball and lots of other ways to provide mentoring to the youth. This summer with the Mayor's jobs programs they will not only have young people working throughout different divisions of the department but they are also working with Youth Uprising to provide for 30 students to go through 'CORE for Kids,' shadowing of the inspection program, and a ride along in the firehouse.

Member J. Brown had a question about the vacancies in the Department and the money being drawn down through Measure Y. Chief Hoffman responded that the Measure Y money goes to support of OFD's operations. The operations division has a minimum



staffing level and almost 100% of their overtime goes to firefighters in fire companies on fire apparatus.

Member Barnett asked how they were recruiting for the Explorer program. Chief Hoffman responded that they will start with the kids from Youth Uprising that are already participating in the CORE program. Most of the youth from Youth Uprising are foster youth. The OFD have also sent out flyers to schools and youth centers. Chief Hoffman stated they will continue to reach out. The Youth Uprising program is a summer program, and the Explorer program is year round.

**Speakers:** Sanjiv Handa, East Bay News Service. In the 1990's a decision was made to put firefighters on overtime as opposed to hiring new firefighters. The thought was that overtime was cheaper than hiring additional fully burdened staff. Oakland's benefits structure is so high that it actually makes sense to do this on overtime as opposed to hiring new staff.

One of the budget proposals from the Mayor is to close four fire stations. Savings are only \$300k for a whole year. It makes no sense from a logistics or deployment plan to do this type of closure.

**Motion:** None. This was an informational item.

**Action:** None. This was an informational item.

**Item 7: Standing Item: Service Provider Report—Restorative Justice**

Mark Henderson from the Department of Human Services introduced Fania Davis, Executive Director and Founder of Restorative Justice for Oakland Youth (RJOY). Currently, RJOY serves two high schools within the Oakland Unified School District. These high schools are Street Academy and McClymonds.

Ms. Davis gave the report. The organization was founded in 2005 with key support from Nancy Nadel. The mission is to provide a cultural shift from punitive responses to youthful wrongdoing that increases harm to restorative responses that heal the harm. They provide advocacy training and technical assistance with school, community, and juvenile justice partners. Their methodology is the peacemaking circle process. The hallmark of that process is the face to face encounter between the person who is harmed and the person who causes the harm. In these circles the person causing the harm can see the human consequences of their conduct, and empathy and healing are promoted.

For example, if two girls at McClymonds are constantly fighting. One girl is making upsetting remarks about one girl's father. This girl making the remarks does not realize that the other girl's father has died. When she hears that there is an apology and hugs and now these girls are friends. These type of reconciliations are not uncommon.

They average about 280 circles per year at McClymonds and Street Academy. In their outreach they reach about 2,000 people in trainings. Due to their successes at Cole Middle School they were also funded through the Cal Endowment so they are in their

first year at Castlemont. They have a community coordinator who is also training parents in these circles. They are also training clergy in East Oakland to do these circles for youth who are returning after a period of incarceration. Those are called circles of support and accountability.

Member Carter asked whether there is a restorative side for the offender. Ms. Davis replied yes and that the restorative justice coordinator prepares for the circles and works with all of the parties involved.

Cole Middle school was their first project and suspension rates were reduced by 87%, the teacher attrition rate also decreased. They were able to completely eliminate violence at Cole Middle School.

Member Carter asked how many other organizations in Oakland are using this model. Ms. Davis responded that the Oakland Unified School District passed a resolution adopting this approach and has hired coordinators within the schools to do this type of work. Catholic Charities was also trained.

Member Shelby asked how someone is re-engaged who was a formerly a beneficiary of restorative justice. How does this person continue to encourage others to take part in the process. Ms. Davis replied that the coordinator has a follow-up plan. Additionally, trainings are conducted at the schools for the adults to spread the word.

Member Shelby also asked what are the benefits to the program as a result of Measure Y funding, and what the top two challenges are. Ms. Davis replied that one of the reasons that the Cal Endowment is so interested in the work is because of the success of the Measure Y funded pilot project at Cole Middle school. They are considering using the Castlemont site as a statewide model. Also, the policy change of the school district would not have happened without the seed money from Measure y. The biggest challenge is the high staff turnover at McClymonds.

Member Barnett asked whether the evaluation of the program represents the program accurately and adequately, and what should members of the Committee look for that are measures of success. Ms. Davis responded affirmatively. The evaluators really worked with them and did a lot of the leg work to get a full grasp of the program. MS. Davis would suggest that the group look at the impact on suspension and expulsion rates and the impact on violence. If kids are kept in school this will decrease their chance of engaging in violence. Also, looking at the qualitative data.

Member Dewitt asked whether the teachers were trained on how to use restorative justice practices in the classroom. Ms. Davis responded affirmatively and this is done to increase sustainability.

Member Aqeel asked whether there was any outreach to West Oakland Middle School since it is a feeder to McClymonds. Ms. Davis responded that the priority was in the high schools due to the high incidences as violence. However, she would like to expand to the feeder schools. Member Aqeel inquired as to when the expectations akin to restorative justice are made to the youth and parents before they engaged in behaviors that harm. Ms. Davis replied that every youth and student are engaged in the process through circles even before they participate in harmful behaviors. Only a small portion of

the student population actually participates in violent behavior. As such, most of their work is done with the entire student body to prevent the harm.

Member Dewitt asked what types of healing circles are facilitated between law enforcement and the community. Ms. Davis responded that there has been a lot of discussion around that, but there has not been a program that has been specifically developed. She would like to see it on a larger scale.

**Speakers:** None.

**Motion:** None. This was an informational item.

**Action:** None. This was an informational item.

**Item 8: Discussion Of The Ad-Hoc Committee Status And Schedule**

Member Dorado began the discussion. Chairperson Dorado began with the report that was originally scheduled to come to the Committee in April that focused on the overall public safety apparatus.

Member Dewitt acknowledged that this was the report that she was working on and she was trying to get a meeting with Deputy Chief Breshears. Member Dewitt acknowledged that she and other members of the Committee were still working on this report.

Chairperson Dorado mentioned that he had tried to get a hold of Deputy Chief Breshears but with no success. However, he would double his efforts to get in contact with him. He also suggested that anyone that was interested in participating in this report should let Nyiesha know.

Member J. Brown expressed that the title was very broad and that this was purposely done so that the individuals writing the report could focus on what was of interest to them. It was not her expectation that this all be completed by April. She was interested in knowing about the Neighborhood Service Coordinators (NSC) and what they are doing in coordination with the NCPD's. She would like information on how they fit in in the overall system of having people in the community really participate in what kind of policing they want, having their priorities expressed and solutions to these concerns carried out. She is not sure what they do, and would like information in the report about this and how the Committee could assist in carrying out their goals and objectives.

Member Barnett commented that the process of communication in community policing may need to be improved. Despite the workload of PSO's the individuals participating in community policing have to be receptive and available to receive questions and feedback. This committee could explore in a smaller forum some suggestions on ways that this process could be more effectively done by people in the City. Generally, he is not sure whether the NSC's, the PSO's or their supervisors are particularly good at responding.

Member Dewitt wanted to have information included on how the projects were selected especially if people do not attend NCPC meetings. Specifically, what is the outreach strategy to go beyond the participants of the NCPC.

Member J. Brown reiterated that pieces of this report that make the most sense to the committee should be taken and further explored. These things should be something that the Committee can actually take concrete steps to address. She suggested that there ought to be a timeline or deadline for the report

Member Barnett suggested that due to the lack of Council and Committee meetings in August the Oversight Committee didn't need to have the report until August.

Member Shelby suggested that due to the budget and the reorganization of the police department, it would be advisable to push it off for a period of time.

Member J. Brown suggested August.

Member Barnett suggested that a draft of the subject matter be made available in July.

Chairperson Dorado suggested that the initial focus should be the NSC's, and if they are eliminated in the budget that the Committee look at the Neighborhood Services Division next and report on the status and future of that function, from there they can then look at the overall public safety apparatus.

Member J. Brown and Dewitt agreed.

Member Dewitt asked whether the other reports that were supposed to be reported on were ever presented to the Committee. Chairperson Dorado indicated that the report before the April one was presented, so this report would be next.

Member Barnett asked the Committee about the remaining dates where there were no reports scheduled. Specifically he would like to focus more time on the policy recommendations and decisions in implementing the violence prevention programs.

Member Lee offered that it would be helpful to have some type of shared analysis and recommendations that could be taken forward to the Public Safety Committee or the City Council.

Member Dewitt expressed that she thought she had signed up for the May report which focused on the examination of the coordination for the PSO program and truancy. She would instead like to focus on this report instead.

Member Shelby offered that she would focus on the NSC report since Member Dewitt's skill set is truancy.

Member J. Brown commented that she and Member Shelby had previously discussed the fact that the RFP process begins this Fall and should be a priority. The discussion of where violence prevention money may be focused has definitely had an impact on the shift of funding strategies over time. A strong way for the Committee to have a role in that is for the Committee to say distinct and specific things about the programs or the

strategies for reducing violence that the Committee thinks would be the most effective. Defining the RFP is very critical in terms of whether they get the most effective use of the funds available.

Chairperson Dorado clarified that the report that Member Shelby was to work on will be heard in August and the report by Member Dewitt will be heard in September.

Member Barnett commented that the schedule was not intended as instructions on how to proceed instead it was drafted up so that there would be some ideas for discussion. The early reports were focused more on enforcement and the later reports were intended to be focused more on the citizen response. However, he was in agreement with Member J. Brown that the Committee needs to have input on the RFP before the Fall. He would like to hear from Sara Bedford at the next meeting about the overriding policy concept that drives what is in the RFP. Some sort of statement on the philosophy that guides what people are responding to.

Member J. Brown agreed and stated that the violence prevention program is divided up into six (6) categories with twenty-eight (28) programs. She presumed that a theoretical framework guided these categories. She expressed interest in taking one of the categories and doing more research and analysis to see what is the practice model or the research base and best practices that guides the programs that are operating under a particular strategy. And then using the evaluations and analysis to identify which strategy works best and putting more efforts behind that strategy. She would be willing to pick a strategy and report back to the Committee on what the evaluations and best practices indicate works best. She expressed interest in hoping that the other committee members would do the same and pick one.

Member Barnett suggested that there be a document that provides a guiding principal for each of these strategies. If such a document does not exist then the Committee should recommend such a document. If the document does exist he would like to have it included in the packet for the next meeting.

Member Lee offered that these guidelines were included in the most recent RFP; however, they had not been included before.

Member Barnett said he would like to see this in written form.

Member Carter mentioned that the strategies were outlined in the evaluation. As such, the strategies are already out in the public forum.

Member J. Brown clarified that she was not suggesting that the Committee adopt new strategies but instead gain a better understanding of how these programs link together under these strategies and analyzing the research that supports it.

Member Carter commented that he agreed that Sara Bedford should attend the next meeting and outline how they have come up with the strategy that they have in place and whether they are going to make any changes going forward. He suggested that the Committee was looking at it from a top down approach and that some consideration must be given to the capacity of service providers. Specifically, the RFP must be reflective of the interplay between the strategies and the tools available to address it. It

would be helpful to have Sara explain given these considerations how she arrives at this decision.

Chairperson restated that the Committee was looking to having Sara Bedford speak to the guidelines, research base, and best practices per category that is guiding the RFP process.

Member Lee agreed and added that she would also like information from Sara about matching best practices to capacity on the ground.

Member Carter also added that he would like information on the decision making that goes into the proportion of funding allocated to each strategy or program.

Member Shelby added that she was very interested in the RFP process moving forward. She also would like information from Sara on what process the City was planning to employ and that she would like to get engaged at the beginning of the process as opposed to being a checkpoint once the decision has been made.

Member J. Brown inquired whether there was a suggestion that this to go into the agenda for the next meeting.

Chairperson Dorado and members of the Committee confirmed.

**Speakers:** Sanjiv Handa, East Bay News Service. Mr. Handa stated that under the Ralph M. Brown Act, any committee either permanent, or temporary, decision-making or advisory that is comprised of less than a quorum of councilmembers may meet for a short term purpose or limited duration for a specific task. But if a committee has continuing subject matter jurisdiction, regardless of what it is called then there cannot be an ad-hoc committee.

The Brown Act also says that any use of intermediaries, technological devices, or written communications is also defined as a meeting.

Mr. Handa indicated that the purpose of bringing that up is to flag that the Committee cannot have continuous ad-hoc committees. However, the proposal for individuals to come back with information on a strategy is permissible and not a violation.

The second thing is that every board, committee and commission in the city of Oakland is going to be hit with legal papers because he is suing the City of Oakland. He will personally name the Mayor for conspiring to violate the civil rights of the citizens of Oakland by concealing information that should be in the public domain. That will open up the discovery that he needs to open up memos, emails, and appointment books for evidence of staff being told to look the other way.

**Motion:** No motion

**Action:** No action taken

**Item 9:**        **Discussion Of Bylaws And Member Participation**

Member Barnett began the discussion on this item. He indicated that the bylaws make it clear what is required for participation in the Committee. He recited the section detailing the cause for removal. He expressed that the Committee could abide by these terms.

Member Barnett also informed the Committee of the packet that he created for members that includes a CD and hardcopies so that new members can quickly get up to speed.

Member J. Brown commented that the Committee and the City had not done such a good job orienting new members to the rules of the Measure Y Oversight Committee.

**Speakers:**     Sanjiv Handa, East Bay News Service. The Mayor is not in tune to what needs to be done nor has she directed the City Administrator on what needs to be done. Additionally ordinances used to be updated so that a citizen looking for an ordinance could get a revised copy instead of multiple copies in varying forms of revision.

Lastly, the City Council has a model set of bylaws were supposed to be standardized for every board and commission. On page 2 item C there are contradictory terms.

He would suggest a letter from the chair to the new Deputy City Attorney Barbara Parker asking for a written manual of procedures as to what is the status for bylaws as they are standardized and to ask her to have Mr. Morodomi appear before the Committee at a future meeting and run through once again how documents can be reconciled.

**Motion:**        Member J. Brown moved that the Committee reaffirm their commitment to operating by the bylaws of this Committee and that includes diligence in attending meetings and diligence in each member to watch who is attending the meeting as required and make every effort to accept under those circumstances as specified in the bylaws to attend. If there are members that don't feel they can participate fully in the committee anymore or can't participate consistently she would urge them to look at whether they still want to participate and consequently speak to their council person. Member Barnett seconded it.

Member Lee explained that she had not been attending because she had received a notification from Mr. Baker that he would no longer be staffing the committee. After this she did not know who to contact or and had not been receiving information about meetings. She was able to get some clarification and realized that staff did not have the correct contact information for her.

Member Shelby commented that she did not know whether it was necessary to take action if the attendance at the meeting was indicative of the direction the group was going in. She indicated that everyone had a copy of the requirements and after the attendance and tonight's discussion she didn't feel that she need to take action.

**Action:** Motion approved. Member Shelby abstained.

**Item 10:** Agenda Building, Regular Meeting Of July 18, 2011

Member J. Brown requested that the Oversight Committee staff present or report back to them on a list of available experts in the Bay Area on community policing. One of the things she thought might be helpful is for the committee to be grounded in the most current thinking in community policing and how community policing might be most effective in terms of the whole array between staffing, training, job descriptions, supervision, and integration into the police department. She knows of people at Berkeley and at Boalt who would could provide information. She also knows that Chief Magnus in Richmond might be willing to attend. She would ask staff to inquire whether some of these experts would be willing to come in and make a brief presentation regarding how they implement community policing in Richmond to explain what it means for them and the community. As a means of providing a foundation on what works now and best practices in community policing.

For the July meeting staff reiterated the following items:

- A report from Sara Bedford detailing what she currently has available that speaks to the guidelines of the RFP, how programs are linked to the guidelines for each strategy including the best practices under each strategy and how the decisions are made given the capacity of applicants and the proportion of funds allocated to each strategy. With this document provided significantly ahead of time.
- PSO Report
- Service Provider Report
- Budget
- Agenda Building

Member Shelby requested adding information to the budget item regarding the impact on violence prevention programs in the new city budget.

**Speakers:** Sanjiv Handa, East Bay News Service. Mr. Handa suggested that the committee consider agendaizing the following items at a future date:

- The impact of the new budget
- An update from the City Attorney on the Brown Act and Sunshine training
- CA AG's opinion 92-212 as it relates to boards and commissions exchanging emails

**Motion:** No action taken.

**Action:** No action taken

**Item 11:** Adjournment

**Motion:** Motion made by Member Aqeel and seconded by Member Lee.

**Action:** Motion approved unanimously.



MEASURE Y: VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND  
PUBLIC SAFETY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES: July 18, 2011

**Oversight Committee Members**

Qaid Aqeel  
Peter Barnett  
Joanne Brown  
Michael E. Brown  
Richard Carter  
Nyeisha Dewitt  
Chairperson Jose Dorado  
Nicole Lee  
Melanie Shelby  
Brandon Sturdivant

**Item 1:        Roll Call and Determination of Quorum**

**Present:**

Chairperson Dorado  
Member Barnett  
Member Carter  
Member J. Brown  
Member Dewitt  
Member Sturdivant  
Member Lee  
Member M. Brown

**Absent:** Member Aqeel, Member M. Brown,

**Quorum was achieved for this meeting at pm**

**Item 2:        Open Forum:**

**Speakers:** Jim Dexter signed up to speak but was unable to stay. Instead he e-mailed the following statement that he asked to be reflected in the notes:

I've been positively impressed with the actions taken by the Measure Y Oversight Committee in the past few months. Thank you for these actions, which in many cases has led to positive results within the City Council, and with the Mayor of Oakland.

However, upon review of tonight's agenda, there are no new or follow-up issues that are up for decision/action by the committee. This deeply distresses me. There is SO much for this committee to accomplish to meet even the minimal goals set by Measure Y, and much of it is not being done.

1. Having reports given by one PSO to the group each month is a nice new feature presented to the Committee by OPD, but these reports do not even begin to account for the PSO activities for all 45+ NCs. The reports do not document the percentage of time each PSO spends on a beat. To date, OPD has not been forthcoming with even the most cursory data about PSO time spent on a beat. This Committee cannot tell the residents of Oakland how the money is being spent, only that the money IS being spent. Why have you not insisted that such PSO time-on-beat data be provided by OPD immediately?
2. This Committee cannot address how much Measure Y money is being spent for OPD overtime, or why it must be spent this way, or if there are ways for overtime to be covered by the General Fund instead of Measure Y. Why have you not insisted that such overtime data be provided by OPD immediately?
3. The recent re-organization has not been examined by the Committee in relationship to the goals of Measure Y. The voters that approved Measure Y monies to be spent by OPD never were a part of this decision, and it falls to the Committee to be their representatives to ensure that Measure Y is not further violated by this reorganization.
4. This Committee has not asked for a City of Oakland City Auditor audit of the Measure Y OPD performance. Why not?

**Item 3:**        **Approval of Draft Minutes from July 18, 2011**

This item was taken out of order. Quorum was achieved at 7:10pm

**Motion:**        Motion made by Chairperson Dorado to accept the minutes. Seconded by Member Lee

**Action:**        Motion approved.

**Item 4:**        **Standing Item: Problem Solving Officer (PSO) Report**

This item was taken out of order.

Deputy Chief Eric Breshears addressed the Committee and introduced Problem Solving Officer (PSO) Pedro Elias. PSO Elias is assigned to beat 33x.

Officer Elias presented the power point presentation to the Committee. A copy of the presentation is included in the this packet.

After the presentation Member Barnett asked PSO Elias when crimes were most often taking place. PSO Elias replied that crimes most often occurred in the evenings from 8pm-12am.

Member Brown asked what other resources PSO Elias was using to help him do his work. PSO Elias indicated that he worked on different projects with different people. For example on the shooting project he has been working with the NCPC, Eddie Simlin in

the Neighborhood Services Division to try and get more lighting along the International corridor.

Member Lee asked how the PSO's choose the selected projects, and if this process was consistent for every PSO in every beat. PSO Elias responded that typically the members of the NCPC suggest projects and they will vote on them. However, officers also use observations, calls for service, and drug hotline calls to help make a determination. These factors are also shared with the NCPC membership.

Member Lee also asked if he was reaching out to any community based partners to help out on his projects. PSO Elias said that he has not contacted any yet.

Member Carter asked whether he received any help from people in the neighborhood providing him information. PSO Elias responded that he was not receiving any information from neighborhood residents and indicated that they are very reluctant to provide information to the police.

Member Carter asked about the total number of projects that he was currently working on. PSO Elias stated that he had 3 projects and that the third one was the blighted property that he and his partner were in the process of closing the project after monitoring illegal activity for approximately 1 month. He indicated that he and his partner would have more time for more than three projects.

Member Carter expressed that he would like to see a more active process between the NCPC and the PSO. If the program is really robust then it will generate more projects. The Committee would like to see a more robust process. Member Carter also wanted to know whether he had received any training on the social service programs that the City provides.

PSO Elias responded that the PSO's received training on the social service programs offered in February at the PSO school. Since the training he had tried to reach out to the Street Outreach providers, but was unsuccessful. He intends on following up.

Member Lee inquired about the "shooting project." Given that they are difficult to predict, and that it is a much broader topic and not specific to certain individuals she wanted to know how this project might be addressed by a PSO and how success could be measured.

PSO Elias responded that a measure of success is a decrease in the number of reported shootings on the beat. This type of project is addressed by close communication with the Criminal Investigations Division to see if they are able to identify suspects. If so, they can use search warrants and probation sweeps to try and address these problems. Deputy Chief Breshears added that one of the things that the Department also looks at is trying to identify why shootings are taking place in certain areas. So for example, if there are a large number of shootings in a block, it could be blight related or it could be related to a person on the block or property on the block. As such, it is equally important to analyze what might be occurring in the location that might cause some of the shootings.

Member Carter inquired if it was normal for PSO's to work with the Criminal Investigations Division around shooting investigations and if information was regularly shared between them.

Deputy Chief Breshears replied that this information should be shared between the PSO and the Criminal Investigations Division because the PSO is on the ground and may have information that is relevant to an investigation. He added that in this case it doesn't sound like that has occurred but that could be because there isn't any information on the case.

Sergeant Vierra, PSO Elias' supervisor also responded that because PSO Elias was new he wanted to make sure the Committee's questions were adequately answered. Regarding outreach he indicated that PSO's have been given a handout, and that PSO's were given cards and informational handouts from the providers. Regarding building board ups, a lot of that information goes through building services and they assess the fines and deal with the banks. They also utilize the Neighborhood Law Core to deal with problem property owners.

Chairperson Dorado inquired about break-ins by squatters and whether PSO Elias has spoken to the people who live directly around the property to see if they would be willing to cooperate by calling the OPD when they observe the squatters trespassing.

PSO Elias responded that they have spoken to the people in the neighborhood and provided them with the number to call. The PSO's also cross check these properties with the ones reported on the drug hotline and in the calls for service. However, with the particular project property there were no calls for service, drug hotline calls, or calls to him or his partner.

Chairperson Dorado suggested that the NCPC folks might be in a better position to talk to the neighbors and might have more success getting them to call. He also inquired whether cameras might be an option. PSO Elias responded that the cameras could not be used in a residential area unless they were mounted on light poles.

Chairperson Dorado asked Deputy Chief (DC) Breshears why the PSO PowerPoint presentations did not follow the SARA format. DC Breshears responded that it can be added, but this is an outline for the PSO. It is a template for the PSO to discuss his/her project. However the Department is open to modifying the presentation so that it is more useful to the NCPC.

Member J. Brown expressed concern that the nature of the projects were difficult and that it appeared that it might take a while for the community to buy-in and take a risk and have some trust in the process. She inquired if there was some mechanism by PSO's to share strategies that they have used or some type of internal communications that are included in the database?

Sgt. Vierra offered that there is a problem oriented policing website, and there are books that deal with a lot of the issues that officers face in communities. These books have been used by other agencies to solve these problems. Officers read these books and have access to these books which provide general guidelines, and offers solutions. Officers always share information. They are in the same office together.

DC Breshears replied that he reviews the projects quarterly, and that with the reorganization he has been able to review the projects more frequently. At these meetings the Commanders and Supervisors are also brought in and each of the projects are discussed. Successful strategies are discussed at these meetings and assistance is provided to overcome challenges and obstacles. This is also an opportunity to provide information to the supervisors on how to access appropriate resources outside of the OPD to address priority projects.

Chairperson Dorado commented that his focus is on how NCPC's develop priorities, and how this dovetails with the SARA process so that there is a smooth transition from the NCPC to the SARA process. He also commented on the coordination between the NCPC and the PSO and figuring out the most valuable intelligence that can be provided to the PSO. One of the most valuable things a NCPC can provide a PSO in dealing with specific projects and priorities is information. The other thing is going to the community and asking for help and resources.

Sgt. Vierra responded that some NCPC's are large and small, and at the meetings the membership does not equally represent the issues within the beat. Specifically, members in attendance may not mention the violent crime that occurs in the other portion of the beat as a priority. As such, PSO's often have to work with the membership to help them identify and prioritize the violent crime issues. To address the issue of developing the most valuable intelligence for dealing with most pressing priorities, PSO's often encourage the community to call or e-mail them with license plate numbers, dates/times of illegal activities that were observed. Sgt. Vierra also reads through all of his violent crime reports and if there is a particular M.O. or other identifying information then he will e-mail it to the NCPC chair who shares the information with the membership and the listservs.

Member Sturdivant inquired whether the demographic of NCPC's were mainly older adults and homeowners. Sgt. Vierra responded affirmatively. Member Sturdivant then followed up by asking if there were opportunities for outreach to ensure a wider community involvement, especially from a younger population. Sgt. Vierra responded that in the past home improvement days were setup at the local middle school, they gave out "clubs", and did mass mailers to every house in the beat. The results demonstrated that people would come to the first meeting, and then eventually the membership trails off leaving the core members that are most often older homeowners. Member Sturdivant suggested identifying neighborhood leaders, and developing a relationship with them in hopes of bringing in newer and younger participants. Sgt. Vierra responded that in the past they have been more successful in working with the ministers.

**Speakers:**

**Sanjiv Handa** addressed the lack of communication within the City of Oakland. Specifically, he suggested that members go to the Alameda County Grand Jury's website and read the report. Since 1957 the City of Oakland has been the most aggressive as it relates to blight enforcement and abatement. Since 1957 the City of Oakland has been wrong. He is personally going to take this on as one of his pet

projects, and he will personally sue one of the code enforcement supervisors for acting outside of the scope of his employment. One of the things that has happened is the City has \$10-\$11 million in liens that have been attached, and law abiding people have had to pay them. Former City Attorney John Russo was so upset with this that he issued subpoenas to inspectors and their supervisors. Depositions were taken and reviewed for possible criminal action.

Councilmember Libby Schaaf has asked for a report to come to Council. It was delayed and will be postponed until the Fall. You will also find that close to \$2 million dollars was paid to one individual. This individual was the brother-in-law of the former code enforcement manager.

Regarding the report of the Problem Solving Officers, Mr. Handa added that each of the NCPC's get to select their top priorities every month. This selection is by simple majority vote of who is present. OPD has implemented a policy that the priorities must at least be crime related. On Piedmont Ave there have been a lot of issues of panhandling. The PSO put up a gallery of people who had been arrested in the area. Two of these individuals were sent to jail this week.

As it relates the oversight and budgeting of the committee there is approximately \$600k going to the COPS grant that is going to the OPD allowing them some discretionary money to do some of the things the Committee has talked about.

**Motion:** None. This was an informational item.

**Action:** None. This was an informational item.

**Item 5: Standing Item: Service Provider Report**

The previously scheduled provider was unable to attend at the last minute, as such, there was no report from the service provider.

**Speakers:** Sanjiv Handa

**Motion:** None. This was an informational item

**Action:** None. This was an informational item

**Item 6:**

Report from the Department of Human Services: Discussion of the Measure Y RFP Process & Schedule

Ms. Bedford addressed the Committee to discuss the timeline and the process for the RFP. Department of Human Services (DHS) is in its third and final year of the grant

cycle. The new RFP will be issued this Fall and the new cycle will start July 1, 2012. This year the application process will be online, both applicants and reviewers can complete the work online.

The internal strategy review process is occurring now. This includes DHS staff meeting internally to discuss current programs, deliverables over time, and looking at the evaluation data and providing an assessment by strategy of what the programs have looked like over the past three year cycle. Staff is currently doing a needs assessment where they will look at the new census data, and specifically the general demographic data of Oakland, specific data around probation/parole, juvenile justice, employment and broader information. They will also look at the gap between what we are currently doing and what the need is. A multi-layer needs assessment will be done which also features input into the process.

The stakeholder input will also include a check-in with our partners that will include the Superintendent, Chief of Probation, and partner stakeholders including public agencies. There will also be a broader provider education that will also include providers that are not funded to get feedback on where we have been and where we are going.

Client feedback will also be included. Focus groups will be helpful in key strategy areas. So that the focus groups are not tainted DHS will have an outside group host them.

This process also includes conversations with the Oversight Committee and she hopes to figure out what makes sense to the Committee on how to facilitate this. It would also obviously include conversations with our Councilmembers and the Mayor's staff. Once that information is gathered recommendations will be formulated that go to this Committee and to the City Council.

The entire funding landscape will be looked at to include CDBG, OFCY, to ensure that it is partnered with other funding streams.

The report will be a draft RFP with recommended funding categories and amounts. This draft report will be brought to the Oversight Committee in October and will go to the Public Safety Committee in November. The goal is to release the RFP just before Thanksgiving. DHS is proposing a two-step process which includes a letter of intent first, and then invite a subset of those letters of intent to go to the next step which is the submission of a full proposal. The letters of intent will not be due until the first week of January. There will be a one month review process of those letters of intent. The review process always includes experts in the strategy fields. These individuals are usually outside of Oakland. Panelists will read and rate and then the tallied forms will come back.

At that point full proposals will be solicited based upon the results of the letter of intent. They would be out for a month and then in for a month. There will also be a week for appeals based upon factual errors. This would be completed by April and then they would go to Council in May with specific agency recommendations and with a new round of funding available in July.

Member J. Brown asked if Ms. Bedford expects to have a document

Ms. Bedford responded that she is updating the best practices piece and updating the population piece. Ms. Bedford mentions that the partner landscape has changed, and she will put that in the strategy. The Chief of probation has changed. She mentions that she will have a document that reflects this.

Member Sturdivant states that 1,900 people will be coming back to community because of realignment, and he would like to know how that will go. He asks for clarification regarding the measure Y final decision making and if that will be going to council. He asks Ms. Bedford where the input of this committee will go and how much does it matter? He wants to know if this committee can be influential in the conversation.

Ms. Bedford responds by saying that she does not have a clear answer. She mentions that she will continue bring her work to review for this committee which is a good thing. She will continue to bring recommendations for everyone to consider and reflect upon. She mentioned that this is the best way to get this group to be influential. She added that she is happy to have everyone participate in the focus groups, and to get their voices in as early as possible. As a committee she would like to provide something for the members to wrestle with, have reports done in draft form. Ms. Bedford would like to know what is useful for the group?

Member Sturdivant asks if this is the primary forum for wider community involvement. He asks how more residents can get involved?

Ms. Bedford responds by mentioning that she does not have any planning dollars and limited capacity. She would like to get more input from the community, however a structure is already in place and does not want to mislead any residents.

Member Lee emphasizes that transparency is critical. She states that it would be helpful for the committee to see Ms. Bedford's thinking as soon as there is something to review about priorities for the document that will be going out in the Fall or Winter. Member Lee would like to know if there are opportunities to be involved in the front end of this process. Member Lee would like to know if there are other committee members who are interested in participating in the beginning of the process rather than simply reviewing what has been done.

Member Barnett states that he has been comparing how the program has been proceeding for the last two years, and it has been difficult. The format of the evaluators reports have not been consistent, and it has been difficult to find the evaluation of the same program for example in 2008 & 2009 and 2009 & 2010, the titles appear to be different.

Ms. Bedford reports that 2009 & 2010 are two different funding cycles. She states that the programs did change.

Member Barnett mentions that there's a lot of deficiencies in the evaluation in terms of not measuring the same things for all programs. He suggests taking a look at the programs that have been historically of value and review them. He suggests that the committee get



a look at the RFP's as they come in, so the committee can get a chance to comment on them. He also suggests that the providers come in to talk to committee. He also suggests that Ms. Bedford work with evaluators in their organization.

Ms. Bedford mentions that she has looked at a few other communities that use different strategies. She mentions that there needs to be something that is accessible to the general public.

Member Lee mentions that there needs to be clarity on the process.

Ms. Bedford clarifies the process by mentioning the following:

1. Staff will review the letters of intent
2. Second group will submit proposals (from those selected)
3. Another set of review with panels
4. There will be a set of service providers that will be recommended
5. Decision will go to council

Chairman Dorado states that the earlier the committee gets information the better.

Ms. Bedford added that she will work with the committee to get information to them as soon as she can and she also committed to working with Member Sturdivant on integrating more public input. She cautions to not make the public think that they will start from scratch, it's important to be focused on their objective.

**Speakers:** Sanjiv Handa, East Bay News Service. Mr. Handa mentions that the IRS has revoked the non-profit status of 926 non-profits in Oakland and all over the country. He mentions that several non-profit organizations get funding from the City, and asks the question - how does the city deal with this? He mentions that all service providers are not doing good work. He states that the Mayor decided to support revocation of \$1,000 in funding for NCPCs that were active. A number of NCPC's have stopped providing basic services and attendance has dropped. He asked if this money should be restored for the NCPCs. He asked the committee to put that on agenda.

Mr. Handa also mentions that the Measure B oversight committee will be doing their annual report, they did several public meetings, to take public comment on their draft report. Opportunity for community to weigh in on what's in the draft report before it's finalized. This is on the measure B website. He just wanted to point this information out to the committee.

**Motion:** None. This was an informational item

**Action:** None. This was an informational item

**Item 7:** Standing Item: Financial Report & Status of the Measure Y Fund

Deputy Chief (DC) Breshears provided a report on the documentation of expenditures from the beginning of the year to June 30th. He states that they are currently under

budget. The total budget is 6.4 million and they are currently at 4.8 million. He mentions that they are under budget for supplies, training and equipment.

Member Carter commented that this was a significant gap on a percentage basis. DC Breshears mentions that as officers are injured funds don't come from Measure Y. Member Carter asked if unspent money comes back to the Measure Y fund, and what happens with that money. DC Breshears was unsure and did not want to speculate.

Member J. Brown asked if there were plans for capital equipment. DC Breshears stated that they are trying not to spend Measure Y money.

Member Barnett asks if the committee can get updates on the data gathering system.

DC Breshears stated that there is lots of work going on in the database. His staff has set up times in the last three weeks to have updates presented. There are technical issues at hand. His staff is spending lots of time on the database. DC Breshears added that the database allows PSO's to document projects their working on.

Member Barnett asked if the money that is not spent here can fund phase 2. DC Breshears stated that he did not know.

Member Barnett asked if the committee can get an answer for next time. DC Breshears responded affirmatively.

Report from Ms. Sara Bedford on DHS portion of Measure Y Funds:

Ms. Bedford began made a presentation on grantees. She mentioned that some grantees have met their deliverables and made their Request for Payments. This process goes back and forth with the revenue office to make sure revenues are coming in.

Member Sturdivant asked if the OUSD manager's salary was paid for through Measure Y.

Ms. Bedford replied affirmatively and added that Castle Redman JJC program manager left for another position.

Member J. Brown added that it looked like only one large payment was made to healthy communities. Ms. Bedford replied that contracts are pretty substantial. CYO has more than one contract with Measure Y. CYO receives approx. \$350,000. Not sure if this includes gang work or outreach.

**Speakers:** Sanjiv Handa with East Bay News Service. Mr. Handa commented that Oakland decided to do two year budget cycle. He said that there was an incentive for doing a two year budget, any money the dept. did not spend, stayed in budget for two years. If money was left at end of the second year each department could spend that money on special projects, equipment, etc.

A draft of administrative instruction was supposed to deal with special measures like Measure Y. Mr. Handa stated that the City is good at creating overhead, such as the library parcel tax, this is supposed to keep libraries open 6 days a week. This is why there is a credibility gap.

The history of first 4.5 years of Measure Y was supposed to deliver 63 officers. Who knows what kind of lives could have been saved. Now you have another proposal for \$80 per family for a parcel tax. There is 15 million dollars of fluff in the city budget. Mayor Quan decided to suspend the personal police cars for Chief Batts and Assistant Chief Jordan, this can be detrimental if there is a natural disaster or a large scale emergency as they would need to drive their personal cars to the station and check out police cars. Police officers have dire equipment needs, cars need to be replaced, this is a public safety threat. None of that has been taken into account. One thing you might want to look at is the capital needs of the police department and whether or not the committee might want to look into helping the police department

The final thing is 2 million from general fund, has been taken out to help supplement violence prevention programs. Mayor Quan has told the media that there is no money for a police academy.

**Motion:** No motion

**Action:** No action taken

**Item 8:** Agenda Building, Regular Meeting of August 15, 2011

**Discussion**

Member Barnett stated that to have effective input on the violence prevention program for the next funding cycle, the committee needs to do that now. First thing he suggested was to review the 2 previous RFP's that were included in budget package and see if there is anything that the committee would want to change in it. There are a number of deficiencies in the evaluation as a result of the providers not doing what they should be doing, not keeping track of what their successes are, a need to document how they keep track of things. One of the programs that he looked into was not inputting data into the CitySpan system as such the evaluation could not retrieve a reasonable amount of data, making decisions based on 5% of people. If the Committee wants to do something effective, Member Barnett recommended that they draft a letter that can go to DHS with some suggestions that could go into RFP that would enable evaluation to be done better. Specifically, providers are not required to make data available. This should be in RFP.

Member Barnett's proposal is that the Committee draft a letter that goes to DHS and maybe to the Mayor's office about who has input, add any recommendations in the RFP that are not there. This could be put together and discussed at the next meeting. Looking at the timeline the RFP reports are due in November. The oversight meeting will be mid-October. The committee should get started on drafting this document at the next meeting. Member Barnett recommends putting this on the agenda for next meeting so we can start getting some points together.

Member J. Brown suggested looking based on the minutes from last meeting, for staff to look for Bay Area experts on community policing who we could invite to come and have a discussion with us and their experience. Member J. Brown mentioned that she spoke to Chief Magnus in Richmond last week and he indicated that he would be able to attend an upcoming meeting.

Member Barnett mentioned that he knows of a former Berkeley Chief. Member Barnett volunteered to ask if this individual would attend a meeting.

Staffer Harmon committed to get a list of Berkeley, San Jose, Richmond chiefs to join a future meeting to talk about community policing.

Member J. Brown mentioned that she was interested in the reductions in Mayor Quan' budget, specifically the \$1,000 coming from NCPC's. Member J. Brown was astounded that she was not previously aware of those reductions. NCPC's are the core of the PSO work, and mentioned her concern that there is not enough support for their work.

Member Dorado, mentioned that there was not going to be enough money for the NCPC's. He mentioned that there were some NCPC's that could not decide what to do with the money. He mentioned it would be nice to have the money, but unfortunately, some NCPC's were not able to come up with a way to spend the money.

Member J. Brown mentioned having neighborhood services coordinators come to the next meeting. She commented that it would be good to have someone come and talk what the issues are for PSO's and improving Measure Y's responsiveness to the community. She mentioned how the committee can help NCPC's strengthen themselves.

Chairperson Dorado mentioned doing more outreach and getting the underserved to NCPC's meetings especially in the higher stressor beats. He suggested that it would be important to get the NCPC's to do more outreach in those areas where crime is a problem. Mentioned that as a committee, they need to figure out how to do that.

Mr. Barnett mentioned that as a committee, the members should attend NCPC meetings, should consider going to these meetings, all 57 of them. Since not all have meetings this could be doable and this might be a help to the NCPC's.

Mr. Barnett: As an agenda item, ask Claudia Albano how many NCPC's have meetings, and get a list of contacts of folks on the NCPC meetings.

Mr. Dorado responded that the NCPC chair list is confidential and block captains list is confidential. The committee would have to work through Claudia Albano.

Staffer Harmon recommended going online to get the date and location of NCPC meetings and the contact information for the NSC.

Mr. Barnett suggested this be put on the agenda so that the committee can formally pass a motion and follow through on it.

Member Lee commented that NCPC's critical component of community policing in city. It would be important for the committee to look at strengthening outreach of NCPC's to get a broader demographic represented. The committee has to look at other strategies of reaching out to other demographics that may not come to an NCPC meeting. Member Lee suggested getting creative at reaching out to young people who might not otherwise attend a NCPC meeting. She mentioned her work with young people and how there are power dynamics that exist between young people and homeowners that can serve as barriers to the young people participating in these structures. We need to acknowledge those dynamics.

Chairperson Dorado mentioned looking at the 11X NCPC as an example of how they organize. They take their beat divide it up into 7 sectors. They don't have monthly meetings. They have three general meetings in a year and 9 other meetings. They have sector captains that represents issues specific to their sector. NCPC's want to see neighborhood watch strengthened. Getting sector reps gets closer to the street issues that are going on in a beat. This could be a way to reach out to a wider demographic.

Member J. Brown added that Member Shelby's report was to be made in August. Not sure what member Shelby's report was to target after all. Staffer Harmon replied the report was more of a focus on work that NSC's and Neighborhood services do. Member Dewitt mentioned that she will be making a report for September on "examination of coordination of PSO program, crime reduction strategies and truancy efforts".

Staffer Harmon responded that she will review the agenda items for the next meeting:

1. Standard PSO reports
2. Service provider report
3. Report from Oak Fire Dept. – alternates every other month
4. Community policing best practices, get former PD Chief of Berkeley, San Jose Chief, Richmond Chief or reps from their departments to talk about efforts in community policing.
5. Ad Hoc Report from member Shelby. This would focus on neighborhood services coordinator and their work/role on public safety apparatus.
6. Member Barnett suggestion to draft a letter or report that would go to DHS or Mayor's office on recommendations for next RFP, in that to have members review previous RFP to see if there is anything they would want to change that would be in the report.
7. Neighborhood Services. Report from Claudia Albano that would discuss how committee can help NCPC's do their work. Having contact list of NCPC's for the City and improving relationship with the community.

Member Barnett commented he would like to be sure that substantial amount of committee members present at the next meeting, suggested tabling some items.

Member Brown suggested allocate specific time for the agenda items.

Member Carter suggested leaving it up to Chairman Dorado to adjust the agenda in order to make time for the different Chiefs of Police attend the next meeting.

**Measure Y Oversight Committee**  
**September 19, 2011**  
**Minutes**

*The following minutes were developed by watching the DVD of the meeting recorded by KTOP. Inaudible portions of the meeting are so indicated.*

**Item #1: Roll Call and Determination of Quorum**

Assistant to the City Administrator Patrick Caceres introduced himself and said he was filling in for Measure Y Oversight Committee staff member Reygan Harman. The roll was called and the following Committee members were present: (inaudible). A quorum was established.

**Item #2: Open Forum**

Below is a summary of the speakers' comments:

Jim Dexter commented that the Committee's agendas are not relevant because the relevant items are not being brought to their attention. For example, there have been 2 reorganizations of OPD and neither one had been brought before the Measure Y Oversight Committee before the reorganizations were implemented. After the fact, the Committee was told it could comment if it wanted, but that defeats the purpose of the Committee. He said the Committee has a fiduciary responsibility, and felt the Committee was there to insure that there is oversight over Measure Y - how its organized and implemented, how the budget is spent, and how the PSOs are assigned and deployed. He appreciated that OPD was at the meeting, but the information they present is superficial. He asked the Committee to directly ask the City Auditor to review the OPD implementation of Measure Y in terms of finances and PSO assignments. This request has not yet been made. The agenda includes many informational items, not action items, and he asked, respectfully, what is the Committee is doing here, what is the Committee accomplishing, and is the Committee achieving the goals set forth for the Committee? He said the Committee was not providing the advice to OPD or the oversight of Measure Y that it should.

Jeff Baker commented that he was disappointed that KTOP no longer broadcasts the Committee meetings, and the Committee should contact the City Administrator for assistance in finding funding to rectify this. He feels it is important because there is another election on another parcel tax coming up and it is important for residents to see what is going on with Measure Y. He also said, in going through the minutes, he can't find the Committee's budget. So, he is not sure how much money there for the Committee to work with - for example what are the staff costs, how much interest is being earned on the Measure Y fund (since it is a segregated fund) - are there delinquent taxes that need to be collected from 2005 to the present. He requested that Chairperson Dorado contact the Finance Director, and ask if he would come before the Committee and provide an update on the fund. Lastly, in December 2010 there was an

issue raised regarding the parking surcharge on the commercial parking spaces in the City - where a portion of those funds come to the Measure Y fund. He reminded the Committee that the City was in a lawsuit with Alameda County over whether or not funds should come to Measure Y from the Coliseum. In a December 10, 2010 memo from Mark Morodomi he informed the Committee that the City had won a law suit and would be collecting the funds. But in going over that memo it omits to say if the City is collecting the back taxes from 2005 through 2010. He is concerned that the Committee is being "managed" and that the staff person working with the Committee must be from the City Administrator's Office. It can't be someone from the Mayor's Office because that way when the Committee asks questions the Committee is not getting an answer from the Mayor, but an objective answer from the Administrator.

Sanjiv Handa, East Bay News Service, commented that shortly there will no longer be an Oakland Tribune because on November 1, 2011 the Oakland Tribune, Fremont Argus, West County Times, Daily Review, Alameda Times Star and the Hayward Daily Review will publish their final editions under those names. On November 2, 2011 all those papers will be combined into a new paper called The East Bay Tribune. Also on November 2, 2011, all the papers on the other side of the Tunnel will disappear and the new paper in that area will be called The Times. Those will be the two big papers in the East Bay. So each city has to decide who their paper of general circulation where they will print legal notices because the City Charter says ads must appear in the paper with general circulation of more than 25,000 printed and published in the city of Oakland, of which there will be none. The Post and the Express have circulation of less than 25,000.

He also said that you might have read that San Francisco Acting Chief Jeffrey Godown was being hired by OPD as a Deputy Chief - but that didn't happen because there was no job description for the Deputy Chief. However, a job description for the OPD Deputy Chief has been approved by the Civil Services Commission and the job will be posted and Godown can apply like everyone else. This relates to the points made by Mr. Dexter in that Mr. Handa believes that City Hall supports the idea that administrative decisions are not under the purview of the City Council or other Boards and Commissions and that is why you do not see them before your Committee.

There are a number of staffing changes in City Hall. Fred Blackwell has been hired as the second Deputy City Administrator. He is coming over from San Francisco where he was the Director of the Redevelopment Agency. He is not coming over here simply to take over CEDA, but to an expanded role with responsibilities for Museum, Library, Park & Recreation, and some aspect of what the Measure Y Oversight Committee does. He said it would be important for representatives of the Committee to get on his calendar to discuss issues affecting this Committee such as the number of businesses being affected by the downturn and the direct effect it has on Measure Y finances.

**Item 3: Approval of the minutes from the July 18, 2011 meeting.**

Motion to approve with the correction that Melanie Shelby was not present at the July 18, 2011 meeting. Moved and seconded by (inaudible) motion passed.

**Item #4: Panel Discussion**

None of the police chiefs were present to address this item; they were in a meeting regarding alignment. Deputy Chief Jeff Israel clarified that realignment relates to the Governor's proposal to address the overcrowding in the prisons by releasing offenders back into their communities.

Speaker Sanjiv Handa commented that there have been at least six models of community policing in Oakland in the past. However, information on those efforts is lost. Twenty-two bankers' boxes, including 5 on early community policing efforts, are missing.

**Item #5: Standing Item – Problem Solving Officer (PSO) Report**

PSO Supervisor Roland Holmgren introduced himself, and PSO Chris Keating who is the PSO for 19x.

At this point Member Shelby asked if there was a prioritization process regarding which PSOs present to the Committee. Chairperson Dorado said there was no prioritization process but having one would be beneficial for the Committee.

Officer Chris Keating began his presentation, which is an example of what he gives at his NCPC meetings, and consists of the following elements:

- 1) **NCPC Crime Data:** PSO Keating reviewed the crime data for the last 30 days including a map highlighting vehicle robberies and aggravated assaults among other crimes. He commented that there has been an uptick in gold-chain robberies. He asked residents to tuck chains in, be aware of their surrounding, and not to be distracted by talking on their cell phone. He also reviewed year to date crime stats from the beat - comparing it to citywide data.
- 2) **NCPC Crime Hotspots:** PSO Keating reviewed a list of hotspots in beat 19x including prostitution, gang issues on East 15<sup>th</sup>, and a problem house on International. He commended that doing this PowerPoint presentation at NCPC meetings has been effective in making residents aware of the current precautions they should be taking – see above.
- 3) **Top Problem Property:** PSO Keating said he used the SARA method (an acronym referring to the 4-step process of Scan, Analysis, Response, and Assessment) to solve a problem property on International Blvd. This property had a high volume of criminal activity from prostitution to drug dealing. It is a foreclosed property owned by the Bank of America. Thirty



different people were living there with 20 on probation. His approach was daily enforcement with arrests for violations. He worked with Nuisance Abatement Officer Arturo Sanchez to have a letter sent to the owner with a 30 day notice to abate. Eventually he got cooperation from the Bank of America to evict the "tenants" and the property boarded up. It didn't solve the problem, but the realtor he was working with put up a no trespassing sign which gives OPD the authority to arrest. That worked well, and in the course of the project, over 20 people were taken to jail. It took over a week and multiple dump runs to clean up the property. Now the property is cleaned and boarded up. In response to questions, PSO Keating and/or Lt Holmgren said it took approximately 9 months to complete this project. Also, that it was not the type of project that would naturally have benefited from increased community involvement since much of the work was research on drug arrests and compiling reports. Also, this project is flagged in the SARA database as a success so that other officers can use as an example. He also said it took 3 months to get the cooperation from the Bank of America.

Melanie Shelby requested a copy of the PSO presentation and was assured she would receive one. She also requested a list of the top 10 beats in Oakland with the greatest challenges for OPD. This would be a good way to prioritize what PSOs come before the Committee to make presentations. Staff member Patrick Caceres commented that it would be good ideal to combine the top 10 most challenged beats with a list of foreclosed properties as a way to prioritize PSO hot spot work. Lt. Holmgren said he could compile such a list for his area.

- 4) **Top 3 Calls-for-Services Locations:** PSO Keating said the top calls in the last 30 days include: 911 hang-up and alarm calls at the Peralta Community College main office (14), a hotel on Embarcadero (12), and at a charter school (10). There were a total of 36 calls for service which occur at all hours of the day and night.
- 5) **Current Top 3 NCPC priorities:** The NCPC priorities include the following issues: prostitution and robberies on International Boulevard, and gang issues on East 15<sup>th</sup> Street.
- 6) **PSO Report:** 1) The problem property on International project reviewed above. 2) Prostitution on International Boulevard was addressed with high visibility patrols with 47 arrests thus far. Sgt. Holmgren stated they are working on the issue holistically by focusing on prevention, intervention and enforcement. Advocacy groups are on site including BWAR, EBAYC, OCO and others. There is an effort to change the culture in Oakland as it relates to the sexual exploitation of minors. In response to a question from Member Lee, Sgt. Holmgren said he has not worked with MISSEY and Nola Brantley in approximately 6 months. There is an effort to enforce

against the pimps, but it presents a host of problems. They are working with the City Attorney's Office on it. There are issues related to the dialogue the pimp has with the undercover officer. BFO 1 and 2 try to work together to tackle the problem although the split between the two is at 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. 3) Bicycle Patrol Robbery Arrests - Officers were able to stop a robbery of a woman of her purse, and arrest the perpetrators (their photographs were shown). In response to questions Sgt Holmgren and PSO Keating said they made a decision to show the photographs of perpetrators, who are minors, but not give their names. Ms. Shelby said it was disconcerting to see their photos and perhaps in deference to the fact that they were minors, and to protect their identity, that both their names and photos not be shown. Chairperson Dorado concurred. Sgt. Holmgren also responded to a question saying that PSOs do attend meetings other than NCPCs in their beats and, for example, was recently at an EBACY meeting. They do try to encourage people to come to the NCPC meetings because it is more effective and efficient. Sgt Holmgren also commented that he felt the attendance at the combined Beats 17, 18, 19 NCPC meetings had been reduced due to the lack of funding for translators. He said he would support looking for additional funds for translation services and spoke to Councilmember Kernighan about restoring funds.

PSO Keating stated that the majority of his day is spent working on these projects. He reads email, meets with community members, goes to meetings, and works with other PSOs who may need assistance.

Public Comment: Sanjiv Handa made three points: 1) The Committee should ask OPD to provide the status of PSOs vis a vis the reorganization of OPD including the staffing challenges given the available resources. OPD has reorganized to have 35 beats which are both for problem solving and patrol. This is in contrast to the old system where there were 57 community policing beats. 2) There needs to be a philosophical discussion about whether or not 18 year old should remain the age where you are charged as an adult given the numbers of juveniles under the age of 18 who are committing serious crime. 3) The Committee should consider inviting the new County Probation Chief who has implemented many exciting models given he is joining Mayor Quan and the Chief at the upcoming Summit.

**Item #7. Standing Item - Service Provider Report: City County Neighborhood Initiative (CCNI).** Joe DeVries, CCNI Supervisor, provided an update on the City-County Neighborhood Initiative which is a Measure Y funded project. This project is a partnership between the Neighborhood Services Division and the Alameda County Health Department's CPAE Unit in two neighborhoods: Sobrante Park in East Oakland and Hoover in West Oakland to build resident capacity to advocate and to solve problems.

Joe stated this project is fortunate because the Health Department has spearheaded extensive survey research on the impact of this project - starting with a baseline survey in 2004 and follow-ups in 2007 and 2010. He reviewed key components of the projects in Sobrante Park and Hoover. He then described the neighborhood demographics and provided a PowerPoint presentation with highlights of the survey research which shows that CCNI is successful in many areas. He also answered questions about the structure of the survey and the findings. A few of the highlights from the May 2010 door-to-door survey, as compared to 2007 survey, include:

*In Sobrante Park:*

- 68% of the residents feel the neighborhood is a safe place to live.
- 51% of households attend sponsored events such as Resident Action Council meetings, National Night Out, neighborhood clean ups, etc.
- Residents feel better prepared for disasters due to neighborhood trainings and participation in the city-wide disaster drills. Trainings have also been given in Spanish.
- Conditions of the parks and lack of activities for youth continue to be the biggest concerns of residents.

*In West Oakland:*

- Residents say they have better access to health resources such as childhood immunizations, fresh fruits and vegetables, and safe places to exercise.
- Crime has decreased including violence around liquor stores.
- Access to computers and the internet has increased slightly.
- Hot spot areas, including San Pablo Avenue at St Andrews Park, where there have been issues with the sexual exploitation of minors, have seen a radical reduction.
- Residents say they are more satisfied with City responses to blight calls.
- About a 4% increase in those that say problems get solved in West Oakland.

Mr. DeVries also responded to questions regarding whether the program has met its goals of reducing poverty, health problems and violence given the data they have collected. Mr. DeVries said the work being done in the community is successful and has played a role in reducing crime, poverty, suspension rates, etc. but could not claim a direct correlation since there are many inputs. Since CCNI is in the last year of its contract we would like to emphasize the institutionalization of the work through the existing neighborhood organizations that have been built up.

Public Comment: Mr. Handa said that by multiplying the funds needed for this project by 35 and then by 10 and you will see the amount of money needed to begin to address the city's problems. That is the level of investment required. Rather, he said, the Mayor and other politicians have other priorities, and, for example, hired two full time Public Information Officers instead. His comments continued, saying that billions of dollars have been spent in Oakland, on a variety

of things; however, overall there are more people in poverty than before. Also, there are more than two times the number of people employed by the City of Oakland than before Proposition 13 and he wondered what all these staff members were doing?

#### **Item #7: Drafting of the Letter to the Department of Human Services**

Chairperson Dorado said the purpose of this item was to develop points that could be included in a letter to DHS and Mayor Quan regarding the Measure Y RFP. Several concerns were raised including: 1) the need to have Sara Bedford from DHS at the Measure Y meeting to answer questions; 2) what DHS means by the term "stakeholder", 3) what the process is, 5) how the evaluation is structured, and 4) was it meant to include Measure Y Oversight Committee members in the stakeholder interviews. Staff responded saying that DHS has reached out to a variety of providers and other stakeholders to get information that would provide input into the RFP. But, she is not aware of their intentions vis a vis the oversight committee. Possible points to include in the letter are:

- Rationale for changes in the funding.
- The data collection process needs to include data that is comparable between programs and needs to reflect the actual violence prevention accomplishments so efforts are measured the same across groups and can be compared to each other. This will help in prioritizing funding decisions.

It was said if they didn't write a letter they could express their concerns and opinions to DHS at the next meeting. They don't have to support the process and can go directly to the Public Safety Committee or to City Council with the Committee's opinion. It was also expressed that writing a letter is good because it expresses directly the opinion of the Committee. It was agreed that Chairperson Dorado would write a letter with help from Member Shelby on the above points and Chairperson Dorado will send the letter.

Staff member Reygan Harmon commented that the letter should come to the Mayor's Office as well since they are involved in the RFP process. She recommended that concerns in the letter be expressed as explicitly and specifically as possible.

Public Comment: Mr. Handa commented the Committee has been in a rut ever since its inception. He recommended the Committee have a work session to talk about what they need in terms of budgets, finances, etc. He suggested the Committee send a letter to the City Administrator saying they want to be involved in the RFP process, want to see the timeline, scope, final language of the RFP, etc, so the Committee can be truly involved. The Committee needs to be more proactive. There is \$22 million of tax payer money being spent in Measure Y so if you are frustrated you need to work to get what you want. Have special meetings and requests.

#### **Item #8 Agenda Building**

Member Shelby requested getting presentations in advance, if possible. She also suggested getting clarity around who will be presenting and reporting. She reiterated her point that the PSO item is good, but they should be prioritized by the top ten stressor beats, initially, as the Committee tries to get oriented to what is going on in the city.

Member Lee commented that the standing report of the finances needs to be back on the agenda as a standing item. Timing and spacing of items also needs to be considered so the meeting does not go over time and there is more time to discuss action items.

It was also suggested that the agenda be timed-out to keep the meetings on schedule.

Another item for the agenda is a retreat for the Committee, as well as the need for a timeline so the Committee could better judge when their input was needed for the RFP.

Member Shelby read her notes on the items that should be included in the letter. These include, but are not limited to: the process basis of understanding, how resources are spent, strategy for the funding cycle, RFP process, finances, service providers and timeline, how to address standing reports, how staff and other resources are spent, how to address the new funding cycle, how the committee can get more involved, and a retreat.

Public Comment: Mr. Handa made a number of recommendations including but not limited to: 1) the Committee should be meeting twice a month. He said you cannot limit speakers' time when there are so few members of the public here. He also said that speaker time is governed by State law. Time is limited on speakers (2 to 5 minutes depending on the complexity of the subject matter), presenters (5 minutes) and members (no more than 5 minutes each) as well. 2) Request a report from the City Attorney about how speakers' time is determined. 3) Develop a community outreach strategy it is nonexistent as it is. 4) Consider ADA compliance because no one turned on the door stop and there are accessibility problems with the entrances. He also suggested agenda items, including: What happens if there is a fall-off in funding and another round of cuts in the City budget.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:39pm

*Submitted by: Claudia Albano, Measure Y Coordinator*

## Measure Y Oversight Committee

### Minutes of the November 21, 2011 Regular Meeting Oakland City Hall - Ervin Romans Hearing Room #1

*The following minutes were developed by watching the DVD of the meeting recorded by KTOP. Inaudible portions of the meeting are so indicated.*

#### Item #1: Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

Interim staff member Felicia Verdin called the roll and a quorum was declared as 6 members were present.

Peter Barnett	Present	Melanie Shelby	Absent
Ryan Hunter	Present	Brandon Sturdivant	Absent
Oa'id Ageel	Present	Nyeisha DeWitt	Absent
Nicole Lee	Present	Michael Brown, Jr.	Absent
Chairperson Dorado	Present	Joanne Brown	Absent
Richard Carter	Present		

#### Item #2: Open Forum

Jeff Baker reiterated several points he made at the September meeting:

- He was glad to see a staff member from the City Administrator's Office taking over staffing the Measure Y Oversight Committee. This, in his opinion, was acknowledgment by the Mayor that it was a violation of the City Charter to have a person from her office staffing the Committee and the need for a neutral person in that role.
- It has been 6 to 7 months and you have yet to see your budget. You need to request a review of the budget from the City Administrator.
- Where is the parking surcharge money from 2005 to present from the Oakland Coliseum? In these hard times we can't afford to neglect these funds.

#### Item #3: Approval of Draft Minutes from the September 19, 2011 meeting.

Approval of the minutes of the September 19<sup>th</sup> meeting was postponed until next meeting until they could be completed. There was some problem with the DVD of the meeting from which the minutes were derived that will be resolved by then.

#### Item #6: Standing Item: Problem Solving Officer Report

This item was moved up on the agenda. Commander Blair Alexander BFO 2 Special Resources Section introduced PSO Brian Hernandez to provide the Committee with a condensed version of the monthly update he gives to one of the two NCPCs he is responsible for. He also introduced Sgt Alison who supervises a PSO Squad including PSO Hernandez.

Prior to the presentation, Chairperson Dorado asked how the SARA 1.1 database was doing. Commander Alexander replied that it was going well and many projects are entered in it. Working with RDA there has been significant process improvement. The database mirrors the SARA process steps as this

helps the PSOs. He also commented that OPD sent officers to the annual community policing conference for additional exposure and training. This information will be disseminated to other officers.

Beat 30x PSO Hernandez gave a condensed version of his NCPC presentation which included the following elements:

- *NCPC Crime Data*: showing a map with the major crimes highlighted including 2 homicides and 6 robberies.
- *NCPC Crime Hotspots*: showing a map of hotspots with darker colors indicating a concentration of violent crime which are primarily along the major thoroughfares.
- *Top Problem Property*: A Dashwood Street property with loitering for the purpose of drug sales. There have been numerous calls on the drug hot line about drug dealing and shootings. The goal is to lower the number of drug hot line calls by 50% over a three month period. Since the project was opened there have been numerous successful enforcement activities at this property including a search warrant, arrest, weapons violation, and a fine on the property through the City Attorney's Office.
- *Top 3 Calls for Services Locations* 1) 25 calls at a group home in one month with runaway reports and narcotics. In response to a question he said he does not know the number of beds at that group home. 2) 23 calls within one month at a Weld Street location with drug dealing and disturbing the peace calls, 3) a 73<sup>rd</sup> Avenue pay phone location with 911 hang-ups, and medical and mentally ill calls.
- *Current Top 3 NCPC Priorities*: the Dashwood location and the community hasn't decided what the other two will be.
- *PSO Projects Update*: Open projects include the Dashwood location, and the Weld Street location.

PSO Hernandez, in response to several questions, described the NCPC by saying it is well attended with approximately 20 people and there is a lot of community participation in the projects. He also said there is no language issue that he has experienced. If he does come across someone who is Spanish speaking his partner will translate and his partner also attends NCPC meetings. He also discussed the time it takes to work a project saying the two projects he is working on take about 70-80 percent of his time. The other 20% is spent "scanning" on other issues. He also said he does high visibility patrols, knock-and-talks, going to project-related meetings, contacting community members, etc. He said he could probably handle three open projects at one time. He said on average it takes about (inaudible) although they are all different. He said he generally gets cooperation from community members. People do actively seek him out and this impacts the other 20% of his time.

PSO Hernandez said, in response to questions from Chairperson Dorado, said that he does describe the SARA process as part of his NCPC

presentation, but it depends on the number of items on the agenda so it won't go necessarily go over the specific process every time. He also said that when he is describing a project it all flows together and he will not necessarily describe the result of each step of the SARA process. However the SARA database does reflect the 4 steps in the process... (Inaudible). It was suggested by Chairperson Dorado that a handout of the SARA process for NCPC and community members would be helpful so they can understand how the process works.

Regarding the Community Policing Conference he said there was information presented that would be of benefit to the NCPCs. PSO Hernandez said successful beat projects were presented. One such project was from London where in response to burglaries the community and police department utilized data to focus hot spot enforcement patrols, (inaudible), utilize security devices where they thought there would be burglaries, CEPTED techniques, etc. And, over a one year period the burglaries dropped 70% and crime did seem to disperse. Chairperson Dorado said as the Chair of the Maxwell Park NCPC he would be interested in this information particularly regarding the use of security cameras.

Regarding resources that would be needed to bring down crime in his beats, PSO Hernandez said there is not only resources in particular, but many including community support. (inaudible)

Regarding the impact of Occupy Oakland on PSOs coverage of the beat, Commander Alexander said that, in his opinion, it has taken a lot of time and drained their energy because they have more and longer shifts. The funds, however, do not come from Measure Y they come from the General Fund instead. Commander also said that received approval to spend around \$40K of Measure Y funds purchasing computers and sending officers to the community policing conference, and purchasing entry and breaching tools.

#### **Item #4: Report from Resource Development Associates on the Second Quarter 2011 Community Policing Evaluation**

Patricia Bennett, the CEO of Resource Development Associates introduced Brightstar Ohlson the primary investigator on the community policing component. She presented an overview of the Quarterly Report which covers the period April 1 – June 30, 2011. She showed a PowerPoint presentation of relevant findings, which include:

- Coverage and Turnover – Is there enough staff in place and adequately trained to do this job? Yes, and during this period all positions were staffed, and there were no vacancies. However, turnover of PSOs had been a problem in the past, but there were fewer turnovers in this report. OPD has made good progress in developing a plan to address coverage gaps.



- Problem Solving: Are PSOs opening SARA projects? Yes, all beats had at least one open project and the average was four. There was agreement from staff that the target is 3-5 projects per beat. Narcotics are the most common problem with abandoned houses and blight coming in second.
- Conditions: Were the conditions in place for the PSOs to be successful? Yes, as there is in-house training, tools like Forensic Logic for the PSOs to use, and support from the supervisors and managers.
- Morale. PSOs are engaged and interested and observations at NCPCs indicate there were effective engagement between residents and PSOs
- Tracking: the report provides two examples of problem-solving
- Updated the SARA database the PSOs are using.

#### Areas to improve

- Ongoing professional development
- Need to deploy PSO resources more strategically.
- Important for mid level management (Sergeants and Lieutenants) to understand the SARA process and be able to provide training and guidance to the PSO.
- Two command areas with different Lieutenants (Alexander and Hamilton) so you could end up with two separate PSO programs if there is not a conscious effort to align them across the two areas.
- Ensure that the funds set aside for training are, in fact, used for training.

Pat Bennett then provided a briefing on this year's plan for information gathering and evaluation:

- Going back to the single annual report format that will be released after July 2012.
- The SARA Database has been upgraded to 1.1 and we would like to go to 2.0. We are talking with the CAO's about getting a small contract in place to do that. We will be getting a data dump to see if 1.1 is being used appropriately. In 2.0 they hope the system will be upgraded so management could access it and use it as a management tool.
- There will be a PSO survey on problem solving and tracking progress in the database.
- Fields research will continue and will consist of observations, interviews, attending NCPC meetings, going on ride-a-longs, and having bi-monthly meeting with management.

In response to a question by Member Lee regarding the categories in the database which are: narcotics, blighted properties and suspicious persons. How is "suspicious persons" a project? Brightstar Ohlson responded that this refers to people who are related to a problem at a specific location who maybe a person of interest.

In response to a question as to why the Committee was getting the report now since it was turned-in in July, Pat Bennett said there were a lot of changes in the City Administrator's Office and the staff person they submitted the report to was

moved to another department. However, since a new staff person has been assigned and this was brought to her attention it was put on the agenda right away.

In response to a question as to what Ms. Ohlson would recommend regarding training for the officers, she responded that there are a number of things that officers would benefit from including going to conferences and being exposed to what other cities are doing. However, developing the skills of officers on an ongoing basis is most important and it does not have to be done from the outside. Doing it on a continual basis what is important.

For example, in doing the SARA process PSOs will often skip the "analysis" step and go straight to the "response" step. Training has to be ongoing and repeated, as in this case so officers learn why all steps are important and their supervisors can help them do this. Training is not just for people who are new. Chairperson Dorado said it was interesting to hear that many PSOs skip the "analysis" step. He will mention this to OPD as an important step not to be skipped over.

Pat Bennett added that in order to institutionalize community policing it needs to be department-wide. (Inaudible) Given the 3 years RDA has been doing the evaluations we have seen an intentional increase in the training which is very good.

A Committee member commended that regarding the reports generated by the database, if they get to the place where they can be given to the command staff it would be good to see them in Committee members' packet's as well.

Member Barnett said it would be helpful if there was a standardized list that projects fit in to.

In response to a question regarding consistency in the quality of NCPCs, Ms. Ohlson said there is a range. Many have good turnouts and she sees that some are improving.

Ms. Ohlson also said, in her opinion, it is the role of the PSO to help build the capacity of NCPC members to make informed decision about their priorities.

When asked about the lack of language diversity at NCPC meetings Ms. Ohlson commented that PSOs often work with their NSC to increase participation and that there is a lot of informal translation at meetings given that that funding for translation has been cut.

When asked if the PSOs are being effectively utilized, Ms Ohlson said they are. They are working hard, she sees PSOs analyzing crime reports and crime data, talking to residents to gather data. Or, she sees them investigating issues that

may not be at the problem level that do make a difference to the quality of life in the beat.

In response to a question, Ms. Ohlson said that she does think that 3-5 projects is sufficient for a PSO given what it takes to address problems adequately. The beats with only one open project were due to staff transition. PSOs, she believes, are focusing on the right projects, however sometimes there is a need to be more strategic in choosing the priorities. This is true for both the PSO and the community. Education of the community about crime trends and other indicators is important and a role the Officers can play more effectively.

When asked if she thought OPD was paying attention to the RDA evolution reports – or does the Committee need to be more vocal, Ms. Ohlson responded that compared to 3 years ago this is the best position we have been in in terms of access to OPD and sharing our results. OPD agrees with most of the findings, and feel the evaluation is fair. OPD has its resource constraints to deal with but there is a commitment to the program that wasn't there before. Pat Bennett added that OPD has been going through enormous leadership changes and RDA has access to the people at the highest level (inaudible).

Chairperson Dorado said he would like to see a protocol developed for how NCPC priorities are developed so they were consciously developed using a stepped process.

Public Speaker: Jeff Baker commented that it was inexcusable that this report is coming six months late and will be of no use whatsoever by the time it gets to the Council. Secondly, he appreciated the presentation by RDA, but he is sorry that they still have to promote obtaining the 2.0 version of the database. Without that, there is no accountability for the officers, and management does not know what officers are doing on their beats. Thirdly, in the officer's presentation, at no time did he mention any of the other Measure Y funded projects. It's as if he had no idea they existed. So there is no coordination between the PSOs and the DHS funded projects. \$63 million have been spent and we are still talking about the need to train the PSOs.

Public Speaker: Rashidah Grenache, Pueblo: The word she hasn't heard all night long is "violence prevention". Measure Y was intended to reduce violence and it is not clear to her what talking about "suspicious people" or the "number of people attending NCPCs" has to do with violence. So she's not sure what's being reported on, and if the core mission of Measure Y is being addressed. She would like to see more strategic planning to see a nexus between the programs and how they are directly reducing violence. There was no mention of officers getting out of their cars. There are basic questions that need to be asked and addressed. She wants to see the evaluation related to how it reduces violence and the current public safety initiative put forward by the Mayor's Office. How do the Measure Y strategies fit into that initiative? These programs are not

being measured by how they are meeting the mission of reducing violence and they should be.

**Item #5: Informational Report from the Department of Human Services on the Measure Y Request for Proposal (RFP) Process and Recommended Program**

Sara Bedford from Human Services outlined the proposal for the next RFP funding cycle. (Handouts were passed out because the computer was not working.) The City is in the second three-year funding cycle for Measure Y Violence Prevention Programs (2012 -1215) with \$5.7 available in prevention programming annually over the 3 years. The 2012-15 funding cycle will be the last for Measure Y, which sunsets in December 2016.

The guiding principals are:

- Focusing on the highest risk individuals - intervention programming for youth and young adults who, for the most part, are already in the system.
- Supporting more intensive interventions because of the focus on high risk individuals.
- Prioritized services in the neighborhoods most impacted by violence. We have always used the stressor analysis as a way to focus services in those neighborhoods. We have re-analyzed and as a result have re-ordered the stressor list and they overlap with the Mayor's 100 blocks.
- Emphasizing coordination among public and community service systems. We have made an effort to align with our public funding partners like the Probation Department as they fund complimentary programs such as youth employment and case management. In every case we have aligned the proposed strategies with those funds and we will share common outcomes and performance measures.
- Data driven analysis and outcome based evaluation.
- Integrating family and community into service plans.
- Programs are using evidenced-based work and best practices.

The planning process to prepare for the RFP process, will include the following:

- Comprehensive needs assessment
- Performance data and available evaluation results review
- Crime data analysis
- Focus groups to obtain client perspectives on potential gaps in services
- Reentry employment provider focus groups
- Key stakeholder input was collected from public institutions
- Information from key informants and national experts on violence prevention and reentry.

The RFP Process has the following elements:

- The majority of funds will be allocated through a competitive RFP.
- Proposals will be solicited from established non-profit community-based and public agencies.

- Leveraging will be required.
- There will be an on-line application, and a review process.
- The letter of intent allows for feedback.
- There will be a bidder's conference and on-going technical assistance.
- Subject matter experts will be required for the review panels.
- Review panels will use a standardized rating scale.
- DHS Director will make the final recommendations based on scores and geography.

The RFP Timeline is as follows:

<b>RFP Release</b>	<b>January 9, 2012</b>
Bidder's Conference	January 16, 2012
Letter of Intent Due	January 23, 2012
Proposals Due	February 28, 2012
Review Process	March 1 – 23, 2012
Notification of Recommendations	March 27, 2012
Appeals Due	April 2, 2012
Recommendations to Oversight Committee	April 16, 2012
Recommendations to Public Safety/City Council	May 8 and May 15, 2012
Contract Negotiations and Execution	June 1 – July 1, 2012
Contract Start Date	July 1, 2012

The recommended funding categories include four broad areas:

- Focused Youth Services
- Young Adult Reentry Services
- Family Violence Services
- Street Outreach and Crisis/Incident Response Services

#### Focused Youth Services

Services to specific populations of youth, who are most likely to be victims and/ perpetrators of violence

- JJO Wraparound \$900,000
- Youth employment \$450,000
- OUR Kids \$200,000
- Restorative Justice \$150,000
- Gang Strategy \$125,000
- Subtotal \$1,825,000

The changes to the Focused Youth Services category include the following:

- JJC:
  - Incorporate use of risk assessment in referral process of JJC
  - Incorporate Gang and CSEC populations into JJC Strategy
  - Include youth returning from Camp Sweeney
- Youth Employment:
  - Incentivize education
  - Combine afterschool and summer employment
- Restorative Justice
  - Incorporate trainings for grantees
- Gang Strategy
  - Case Management incorporated into JJC strategy
  - Incorporate trainings for OUSD

Services to youth and young adults on probation or parole who are returning or have returned to Oakland

• Project Choice	\$ 300,000
• Reentry Employment	\$ 1,200,000
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$ 1,500,000</i>

Changed to the Adult Reentry Services Category include:

- Project Choice:
  - Include Santa Rita population
- Reentry Employment:
  - Prioritize education and family support
  - Require CBOs to have relationship with employers
  - Match federal OJJDP grant to support Outreach Developer/Call-In Case Manager

#### Family Violence Intervention Unit

Services and advocacy to address family violence, defined broadly as violence between family members, child abuse, and sexual abuse

Family Violence	\$ 500,000
Intervention Unit	
Outreach to Commercially	\$ 175,000
Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC)	
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$ 675,000</i>

Changes to the Family Violence Intervention Unit include:

- Family Violence Intervention Unit:
  - Incorporate Mental Health for 0 to 5
  - Focus intensive follow-up on cases within Mayor's 100 blocks
- Outreach to Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC):
  - Case management of CSEC will be incorporated into JJC strategy

## Street Outreach and Crisis/Incident Response

Strategies designed to interrupt violence before it happens, mediate impact of violence when it does happen, and change the culture of violence

Street Outreach	\$ 1,050,000
Highland Intervention	\$ 125,000
Crisis Response	\$ 300,000
Late Night Live in the Park	\$ 250,000
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$ 1,725,000</i>

Changes to Incident Response include:

- Street Outreach:
  - Match OJJDP grant to ensure street outreach teams remain at full force
  - More focus on intensive case management
- Highland Intervention:
  - Increase age range served up to 30
- Crisis Response:
  - No Changes proposed
- Late Night Live in the Park:
  - New Strategy proposed by Mayor
  - Previous strategies City County Neighborhood Initiative (CCNI) and Mayor's Public Safety District support will be incorporated into this strategy
  - Continuation of community engagement funded by OJJDP

Ms. Bedford acknowledged in response to a question/comment from Member Barnett that there are multiple components to each of the programs listed above and there might be multiple providers and the particular programs are reflected in the RDA reports. The prior annual reports are all available on the Measure Y website and the performance and evolution data will be available to the Measure Y Committee. She also said that the appendix of the RDA reports track the individual agency's performance over the period.

In response to a question asking if Mr. Taggers was still employed in the reentry program, Ms. Bedford responded that that position is the Mayor's Reentry Specialist positions and works out of the Department of Human Services in the areas of job development. This position works with employers to find people jobs since the economy has been so bad. This position is not recommended to be continued, but the work of job development is recommended to be continued through the open RFT process. It would be eliminated as a City position as of July 1, 2012.

Regarding the Late Night Live in the Park, it was asked how much that would possibly cost? Ms. Bedford said she doesn't have good figures but she believes

the \$250,000 proposed is enough to do 2 parks although additional funds would have to be raised. Regarding how the data for this project could be captured, she responded saying it could be called an "event" and tally how many people participated. For the pilot project they did this summer, when they compared crime data for this 6 block area on those Friday nights in 2009 and 2010, it showed a 48% reduction in crime in 2011. This is a dramatic decrease and gives us an idea of what you could do if you had a more intense program of working with high-risk families.

In response to a question from Member Ageel, Kevin Grant said the Outreach Teams work well with OPD and PSOs. There is a difference between what the PSOs do and what the Outreach Workers do. However, he wants to strengthen the relationship with OPD by working with the Lieutenant in charge to be sure that every violent incident that meets a certain criteria, is funneled to Kevin so the Outreach Team can work on it. The Outreach Teams members focus on violence and work a "slow dance" in the community to reduce violence over time. Their goal is to work with high risk households to connect individuals with opportunities and programs.

Member Lee made two points: asking how does the SARA process work with violence? One PSO commented at a previous meeting that the SARA process is not conducive to homicides while it works well responding to blighted properties. Secondly, it seems clear that the PSOs do not know about and/or coordinate with the other Measure Y funded providers. One PSO when asked if he coordinated with MISSEY said he did not. There needs to be more consistency with how PSO works with the providers.

(Inaudible)

#### **Item #7: Agenda Building, Regular Meeting of December 19, 2011**

(Inaudible)

Member Lee asked that: 1) the budget be a standing item and 2) that the Measure Y provider report and PSO report be alternated.

Chairperson Dorado requested that: 1) City Manager Santana be invited to attend a meeting to discuss what support will be provided to the committee on a regular basis, and 2) the unresolved item from the Oct 13 City Attorney report on the settlement of the litigation vis a vis the Coliseum parking revenue, 3) invite OPD to discuss the retention of the realignment made under Chief Batts made.

It was also suggested that the December meeting be rescheduled due to the holidays. It was suggested that it was important to have a response from the Administration regarding the budget and the parking issues.



Chairperson Dorado suggested the next Measure Y Oversight meeting should be held on December 19<sup>th</sup> and that he be authorized to write separate letters on these issues.

- City Administrator Santana/City Attorney regarding the parking surcharge revenue
- Chief Jordan regarding realignment and the questions about community policing
- Gil Garcia and the status of the budget

There was a general discussion about the Committee's lack of power and their frustration at asking for these items to be addressed with no response. There was general consensus that Chairperson Dorado should write the letters.

Public Comment: Sanjiv Handa made a variety of comments, including but not limited to the following:

- For years he has been telling the Committee how bad things are in the City. The Parking surcharge they are interested in, for example, is far down on the priority list given what the City is dealing with.
- The PSO program was set up to be a liaison between the community and City Hall. In the early 1990s there was community policing task set up through Oakland Sharing the Vision and the head of the task force was Dan Siegel. Two interesting things happened – 1) For someone to be a PSO they had to volunteer 2) There should be 19 NSCs and 2 supervisors. The funding for the supervisors only got approved 2-3 years ago and now the number of NSCs is reduced to 9.
- The NCPC are to set the priorities for the month. At the Rockridge NCPC, PSO Thompson told the group he spends approximately 2/3rds of his time dealing with domestic disturbances. In Piedmont they are more concerned about panhandling and the people who run the NCPC are in bed by 9pm.
- The NSCs get caught in the middle between the community, police officers, the Committee, and watchdogs groups all giving direction.
- Also there is no clear advancement route for the NSCs. Some have been there for 20 years and are burned out.
- There have been several staff changes in the city – including your former Measure Y staff person Anne Campbell Washington, who, as of today is the Mayor's Chief of Staff. Captain Joyner is on Special assignment and Brian Medeiros is not the Captain in BFO II.

#### **Item #8: Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:24pm

*Respectfully submitted by Claudia Albano, Measure Y Coordinator*

Claudia's copy

MEASURE Y OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
Minutes of the Regular Meeting  
December 19, 2011  
Oakland City Hall, Ervin Romans Hearing Room, #1

*The following minutes were developed by watching the DVD of the meeting recorded by KTOP. Inaudible portions of the meeting are indicated.*

*These are "action minutes" and, as such, are intended to report official action taken by the Measure Y Oversight Committee (Committee) and provide a brief synopsis of the items heard. Please refer to the recording of the meeting for more detail. The recording of the meeting is available from the Measure Y Coordinator at 510 238-6372 or [calbano@oaklandnet.com](mailto:calbano@oaklandnet.com).*

**Item #1: Roll Call and Determination Quorum**

Claudia Albano, Measure Y Coordinator called the roll and a quorum was declared as 7 members were present.

Qa'id Aqeel	Present	Richard Carter	Absent
Peter Barnett	Present	Joanne Brown.	Absent
Chairperson Dorado	Present	Michael Brown, Jr.	Absent
Nyeisha DeWitt	Present	Nicole Lee	Absent
Ryan Hunter	Present		
Melanie Shelby	Present		
Brandon Sturdivant	Present		

**Item #2: Open Forum**

Speakers (6) - Kitty Epstein, Jeff Baker, Marie Delrosario, Earl Harper, Rose (inaudible) and Sanjiv Honda

- Kitty Epstein
  - The Citywide Reentry Specialist funded by Measure Y should be maintained.
- Jeff Baker
  - City Administrator's Office needs to supply the Measure Y Committee with a copy of the Measure Y Budget
  - Staff working with Committee must be from the City Administrator's Office
  - Update on the Parking Surcharge at the Coliseum needed – and are those funds coming back to Measure Y?
  - The effectiveness of the Committee's oversight of Measure Y committee
- Maria Delrosario with translator Fabian Martinez
  - Support Services needed for the families of crime victims.
- Earl Harper
  - Restore the position of citywide reentry specialist funded by Measure Y.
- Rose (*Inaudible*)

- Restore the position of citywide reentry specialist by Measure Y.
- Sanjiv Honda - General comments on the following subject
  - Measure Y Budget: regarding positions, salaries and benefits.
  - Reentry citywide specialist position
  - Resolution not to shut down the Port is on the City Council's agenda tomorrow night.

**Item #3: Approval of the Draft Minutes from the September 19, 2011 and November 21, 2011 Oversight Committee Meetings.**

Chairman Dorado stated that the October 2011 Committee Minutes are still being developed and will be available soon.

**Motion:** A motion by Brandon Sturdivant seconded by (inaudible) to approve the meeting minutes of September 19, 2011. Motion passed

**Motion:** A motion by Brandon Sturdivant seconded by Qa'id Aqeel to approve meeting minutes of November 21, 2011 with correction, the spelling of Qa'id Aqeel name. Motion passed.

Speakers (0): None

**Item #4: Status Report /from the City Attorney's Office on Coliseum Parking Surcharge**

A verbal report from Mark Morodomi of the City Attorney's Office provided an update on the lawsuit regarding the Coliseum parking tax. This case is ongoing and has been moved from Alameda County to San Francisco County.

Nyeisha DeWitt requested the report be in writing. In addition, Melanie Shelby requested the written report include information on the finances beginning with 2006 - for example, how much was collected from July 2009 to present? How much is allocated to Measure Y? How much is in question as it relates to the County?

Mr. Morodomi will provide the information when it is available in approximately 2 months.

Speakers (1) Sanvij Honda

Sanjiv Honda

- The Joint Power Agreement between the City of Oakland and the Oakland Coliseum affects this parking tax situation.

**Item #5: Measure Y Budget – OPD Revenue and Expenditure report for October, 2011 and Projects.**

The Violence Prevention and Public Safety Act (Measure Y) FY 2011-2012 Budget & Year to Date Expenditures for the period ending October 31, 2011 was distributed to the Committee.

Felicia Silva, Fiscal Manager at Oakland Police Department discussed the Measure Y expenditures for the Oakland Police Department which has a budget of \$11.4 million, and has spent approximately \$3.1 million to date in personnel and \$17,000 on maintenance and materials. OPD is on track to be on budget by the end of the year, if not below budget.

It was requested that a detailed narrative and be provided with a breakdown of overtime hours produced monthly by the type of overtime used. OPD Budget Director, Gilbert Garcia used to provide the Committee a written report with a detailed budget and narrative. It was requested that the budget report be in the Board packet each month. Brandon Sturdivant stated that the reports we are getting are not through. Nyeisha DeWitt requested to have all reports in writing beforehand. Chair Dorado asked that OPD provide information on the percentage of time a PSO actually spends doing PSO work.

Speakers (1) – Sanjiv Honda

Sanjiv Honda

- The Measure Y Revenue and Expenditure Report is important for the Committee to see every month. It should be put in the context of the larger Measure Y budget, which the Committee has not seen including the Audit.

**Item 6: Measure Y budget – DHS Revenue and Expenditure report for October 2011 and Projections.**

Sara Bedford said that DHS will provide a detailed monthly revenue and expenditure report to the Committee from this point forward

Speaker(s): None

**Item 7: December 13, 2011 Public Safety Committee Report from DHS on RFP Process and Allocations.**

Sara Bedford from the Department of Human Services provided an abbreviated version of the report she gave to the Committee at their November, 2011 meeting which discussed the Measure Y RFP process, allocations, and the next 3-year funding cycle. At the December 13, 2011 meeting of the Public Safety Committee they remanded this item back to the Committee for their input. The Public Safety Committee continued the item and will again hear it, with input from the Committee, at their January 10 meeting.

It was suggested that the Committee form ad hoc committees based on the recommended funding categories and hold a Special Meeting of the Measure Y Oversight Committee on January 4, 2012 to develop their recommendations the Public Safety Committee meeting on January 10, 2012.

**Motion:** A motion by Brandon Sturdivant seconded by Qa'id Aqeel to authorized Chairperson Dorado to appoint members to ad hoc committees based on the recommended funding categories, and that Richard Carter speak to the Chair of Public Safety Committee to move the date back to the end of the month. Motion passed

Speakers (21) - Ann Marks, Fabian Martinez, Lynette from Allendale, Earl Harper, Kimberly Mayfield, Jeff Baker, Joe Tuman, Charles Eddie, Kevin Thompson, Marlene Hurd, Cindy Hillford, Andrea Guzman, Pam Drake, Gwen Hardy, Sanjiv Honda, Pamela Weston, Jasper Lawry, Gary Goddard, Kitty Kelly Epstein, Charlie Eddie, Rashidah Grinage, Geoffrey Pete

- Ann Marks, Youth Alive!
  - Increase funding for the Crisis Response and Support Network.
- Gwen Hardy, PUEBLO
  - Involve the community in the Measure Y deliberations.
- Kevin Thompson
  - I want to be involved in violence programs for my community
- Fabian Martinez, Youth Alive!
  - Youth Alive! served 110 family this year
  - Family intervention provided resources for families in the community
  - Want to continue to provide that service
- Rev. Dr. Jasper Lawry,
  - Rev Lawry is the Area Team lead for Measure Y Outreach.
  - Retain funding for the citywide reentry position
  - When one person is shot, it effect 4 or 5 family members
  - A gap analysis need to be done on these services for families
- Gary Goddard, Posey, CA
  - Drove for 5 hours to be here, retired from Department of Corrections, sat on the State Board for reentry.
  - Oakland has problems with a high crime rate you need someone who can tell you what is on the reentry report.
  - The State issues a reentry report every 6 months.
  - Do not get rid of your reentry specialist. You need this position during this time. Make reentry the most important thing going for your community.
- Cindy Hillford, Catholic Charities
  - We run the Crisis Response and Support Network
  - Concerned that about the funding given the number of people needing help.
- Geoffrey Pete
  - Absence of Black males on the City staff and in the Administration

- The Reentry Specialist should be funded by Measure Y.
- Marlene Hurd
  - Interned with Isaac Taggart for about a year and a half as part of a course she was taking at UC, Berkeley.
  - In her opinion Mr Taggart did an exceptional job spending time with clients, relationship-building, counseling families, and finding resources.
  - Retain the Reentry Specialist position.
- Pamela Wesson
  - She is the voice of the child that got shoot in the head.
  - Where are you when you are needed the most
  - Where have we gone wrong?
- Inaudible
  - We need more community outreach people like Mr. Taggart
- Kitty Kelly Epstein,
  - If something working, keep it.
  - Mr. Taggart has a long list of accomplishments (Distributed a list of accomplishments to the committee members)
  - This work is important, you cannot casework 300 people in Oakland
  - Reentry position should be maintained in DHS.
- Kimberly Mayfield, Holy Names College
  - If any City need a reentry position its Oakland
  - Significant accomplishment is the banning of the box
  - A group of people is ready to fight.
- Lynette, from Allendale Network
  - Isaac Taggart was the only person I can talk to when someone comes out of jail and need resources. He was very helpful.
- Joe Tuman
  - He is encouraged about the process used; now the Committee needs to empower themselves and do what they are required to do.
  - Evaluation of programs is important.
  - Tie those goals of Measure Y back to the outcome.
- Jeff Baker
  - All Measure Y strategies should start with the Oversight Committee
  - You are the mandated by the Charter to see this report first
- Rashidah Grinage, PUEBLO
  - The best thing you can do in nothing but continue the contracts with all the providers for an additional 6 months
  - Do a program by program analysis on what is working, what is not.
  - Do a public process and collaborate with the WIB, Alameda County or OUSD and the community.
  - What 100 Block we are talking about?
- Charlie Eddie, Non-profit based in Oakland
  - I support 6 month moratorium on the RFP.
  - As a deliverable, use collaborative strategies with the providers.
  - Use Non-traditional strategies – like community focus groups.

- Sanjiv Honda
  - Thanked the Chair for the best meeting he ever attended.
  - We have more homicide now than there were during the Dellums' Administration.
  - Have a retreat to set priorities

**Item #8: Agenda Building**

1. Notice the Special Meeting of the Measure Y Oversight Committee for January 4, 2012
2. Each ad hoc committee will report out at that meeting.
3. Recommendations from the Measure Y Oversight Committee will be formulated for presentation at the January 3, 2012 meeting of the Public Safety Committee. .

**Item #9: Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:05 pm.