



**CITY OF OAKLAND
REIMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Draft)

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

1. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

Co-Chairs Council President Bas and Councilmember Taylor.

The meeting began at 6:04pm.

Task Force members present: Anne Marks, David Kakishiba, Antoine Towers, Brooklyn Williams, Mariano Contreras, Keisha Henderson, Reygan Cunningham, James Burch, Pat Kernighan, Gus Newport, John Jones III, Brenda Roberts, Carol Wyatt, Nikki Dinh, Ivan Garcia, and Losaline Moa.

Task Force members absent: Member Ginale Harris was absent at the time of roll call, Member Harris joined the meeting during Item 4.

2. Opening Remarks

Co-Chairs Council President Bas and Councilmember Taylor, and Co-Facilitator David Muhammad provided opening remarks.

3. Youth Advisory Board Presentation

Task Force members Losaline Moa and Ivan Garcia presented about the Youth Advisory Board's (YAB) structure, strategy, and outcomes. The YAB is chaired by Member Moa and Member Garcia, facilitated by Fresh Lifelines for Youth, and has fifteen members between ages 16-25 years-old. The YAB's two partner organizations are the Youth Leadership Council and the Oakland Youth Advisory Commission, and multiple community organizations are represented by YAB members, including Youth Alive, CURYJ, Young Women's Freedom Center, and Homegirl Visionz. The YAB led a call to action which included four community engagement projects to gather youth input: a youth public safety survey, youth advisory conference, social media engagement and community listening session. The eleven-question youth public safety survey opened on December 3rd, 2020 and asked youth between the ages of 13-25 to share their experiences of police and community safety in Oakland, as well as ideas for how to make the community safer. Each youth survey participant received a \$15 gift card for completing the survey. The survey received over 900 responses, which were then narrowed down to 400 eligible responses. The majority of respondents expressed support for alternative unarmed responses to situations such as mental health emergencies, traffic violations, and non-violent offenses, as well as support for increased investment in areas such as social supports that help meet basic needs, housing for people who are unhoused, and addiction treatment services. The youth advisory conference was held on December 14th, 2020 for Oakland youth between ages 13-25, and the YAB strategically outreached to organizations that specifically work with young leaders of color who have been directly impacted by the system. The conference included interactive workshops and in which youth reflected on their experiences in their communities and shared ideas for how to

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REIMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Draft, continued)

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

make community safer. Over 50 youth participated in the conference, 98% of whom identified as Black, Indigenous, People of Color (BIPOC), and each participant received a \$50 gift card. The conference participants identified their top three areas of importance: 1) alternative response for mental health related crisis, 2) restorative justice for addressing root causes and healing to prevent violence, and 3) programs for youth and community relationship building. The YAB also conducted a social media campaign to promote the youth survey, youth advisory conference, and community listening session. The community listening session was held on February 8th, 2021, the YAB shared their public safety recommendations and gathered feedback from participants in each recommendation category. Fifty-two community members registered for the community listening session and twenty-two demographic surveys were collected from participants. The YAB's recommendations development process was to compile the data from the survey and the conference to identify categories and themes, and assess the information through the unique, expert lens of each YAB member based on their personal lived experience, education and knowledge. The YAB shared their recommendations with the co-chairs of the other advisory boards and invited work group members to attend YAB meetings to consolidate recommendations where appropriate and integrate more youth voice into other advisory board's recommendations. In addition, members of the Oakland Youth Advisory Commission (OYAC) and YAB participated as members of other advisory boards to elevate youth voice throughout the process. The YAB recommendations are organized into the categories of alternatives to policing, community and culture, and youth programs. A key recommendation from the YAB, and the only YAB recommendation that was submitted as a stand-alone item, is Recommendation #122, "[Increase Investment in OYAC & OPC-YLC](#) to enable effective resourcing for recruitment, planning, and coordination needed to center and legitimize youth voice related to improving community safety at scale." The YAB urged the Task Force to approve this recommendation.

Member Anne Marks asked the YAB representatives to share their reflections on Recommendation [#125](#), Member Ivan Garcia responded that this recommendation was integrated with Recommendation [#59](#) but the YAB might re-submit #125 as a standalone recommendation.

4. Community Outreach Presentations

Representatives from three of the base-building community partner organizations, Community & Youth Outreach, Inc. (CYO), Anti Police-Terror Project (AFTP), and Oakland Rising, presented about their respective community engagement processes and the outcomes and findings of that work. Dr. Macheo Payne, Executive Director of CYO, shared that CYO operates several programs that work with the most vulnerable citizens in Oakland in terms of gun violence, has a life coaching contract with the City and engagement contracts for youth and adults who are exiting prison in Alameda County. CYO gathered written feedback from clients, and more detailed feedback from eighteen participants ages 17-30 in the Healthy, Wealthy, Wise group. In the session, participants

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REIMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Draft, continued)

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

focused less on how they are policed, instead focusing on what their conditions are and how their lives could be improved. Many participants emphasized the need for housing, jobs and a healthy environment, and many of the recommendations they provided matched recommendations created by the Task Force and advisory boards. Recommendations included more support for children and youth, particularly resources such as jobs and job training for youth who are/are not on probation, in school or in the foster care system, more support for community outreach and restorative justice, neighborhood accountability boards, and other diversion intervention support services. Additionally, participants expressed support for creating employment hubs, as many clients struggle to provide resources for themselves and their families due to lack of accessible, livable wage jobs. Lastly, some participants described a desire to give back and create safety in their communities, such as by creating neighborhood watch groups in higher-crime areas.

Luz Hernandez and Daniel Robelo with the Anti Police-Terror Project (AFTP) described their coalition efforts and tactics to engage the community in the Reimagining Public Safety process. AFTP convened the Defund Police Coalition, a Bay Area-wide coalition with 13 BIPOC-led organizations and is currently participating in the Oakland Progressive Alliance's Refund Committee to co-create a People's Budget. To inform the community about the Reimagining Public Safety process, AFTP created graphics and visual assets to share on social media and through their coalitions. During Martin Luther King Jr. Day weekend, AFTP held a Defund Teach-in, healing space for Black women, multiple press conferences, mass car caravan and live-stream, engaging over 5,000 people during the weekend. After the draft recommendations were published, AFTP and the Defund Coalition issued a report analyzing each of the 114 recommendations, and subsequently published a second version of the report analyzing the final recommendations and providing new analysis of Oakland Police Department (OPD) data and financial information. Through their analysis, AFTP found that 4% of OPD calls involve violent crime and that the majority of OPD's time is not spent investigating or responding to violent crime. Since December, AFTP has sent one or more weekly emails to thousands of Oaklanders with messaging about the Task Force, and volunteers, fellows and staff post and share information regularly on all social media channels. Since February, AFTP has done nearly 15 press interviews and encouraged followers on social media to engage in the public comment portion of Task Force meetings.

Liz Suk, Interim Executive Director of Oakland Rising, presented about the mass texting campaign conducted by Oakland Rising from February 3rd-27th, 2021. In the texting campaign, Oakland Rising sent 30,883 initial texts to voters in Council Districts 3, 5, 6, and 7 using the voter registry database. The campaign targeted people of color earning \$75,000 or less annually, and received 2,602 responses including 1,117 sustained contacts who answered at least one additional question. As of February 27th, a total of 302 surveys were completed. Of the 302 survey respondents, 215 reside in the flatlands, 188 are BIPOC, and 52% of all survey respondents were systems impacted. Of the 1,117 respondents, 733 (65%) agreed with the following question: "almost half of Oakland's general budget goes toward policing, we want to defund Oakland Police Department by

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REIMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Draft, continued)

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

50% to refund, restore and reimagine public safety in Black and Brown communities. Do you agree?” Participants were also asked how safe they feel in Oakland, and while most responded that they feel safe, nearly half of BIPOC residents in the flatlands responded that they feel unsafe or very unsafe in Oakland. The overall survey responses showed that BIPOC feel unsafe or very unsafe in Oakland, a majority of respondents do not feel safe when they see OPD, and a majority of respondents feel that police rather than community programs should respond to physical altercations with weapons and physically violent domestic arguments.

Member Keisha Henderson asked Dr. Payne if since the youth were less focused on how they’re policed, did that mean they were neutral about efforts to transform how police interact with the community, or did they indicate what they’d want to change about how police operate with them; Dr. Payne responded that participants did share ideas about how they could be policed differently, such as reducing over-policing monitoring activities.

Member Ginale Harris asked Ms. Suk how participants in the text campaign were selected, and if any strategies have been proposed for how community organizations can respond to potentially dangerous calls for service; Ms. Suk responded that Oakland Rising volunteers did a texting program to registered voters in Oakland that earn \$75,000 or less, and that the question of response is will have to be considered by the Task Force, City and City Council.

Member Antoine Towers asked how the Oakland Rising survey questions were developed, Ms. Suk responded that the questions were modeled after the survey issued by PolicyLink and was designed to inform the Task Force, but that even after the conclusion of the Task Force, Oakland Rising plans to continue to engage with participants and in the City’s budget process.

5. Recommendations Poll and Discussion

Co-Facilitator David Muhammad presented the [results of the recommendations poll](#), which was open from March 1st-10th, 2021. Task Force members were asked three questions for each recommendation: 1) what is the safety impact? 2) what is the equity impact? and 3) do you agree with this recommendation? Forty-nine of the recommendations received 12 or more yes votes (a supermajority), and two recommendations have 11 votes with 16 Task Force members voting on them. The 49 recommendations that received a supermajority of yes votes were grouped into a ‘consent calendar’ which the Task Force members could vote to approve or modify in the meeting. The 49 consent calendar consists of the following recommendations: 56, 59, 61, 86, 95, 98, 46, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 77, 79, 81, 83, 109, 110, 114, 145, 147, 1, 7, 8, 21, 24, 29, 31/84, 32, 34, 36/97, 41, 53, 93, 103/88, 104, 105, 106, 122, 137, 140, 143, 49, 54, 55, 44, 52, and 97. Co-Facilitator Muhammad also shared that after the Task Force has concluded voting on the recommendations, the Executive Committee would likely send another poll to gather Task Force member’s opinions and input regarding the priority

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REIMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Draft, continued)

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

level of each recommendation as well as potential approaches for phasing-in recommendations, particularly those that may face legal challenges. This information would be included in the final report to the City Council.

Member Brenda Roberts shared that one of the recommendations from the Budget Data and Analysis Advisory Boards is about the implementation phase of the Reimagining Public Safety process. The recommendations relate to where funds should be funneled, and this provides a framework for how the proposed public safety department should be operated, however the recommendations do not indicate specifically where City Council or the City Administrator should be looking from the OPD budget to exact those budgeting streams – the implementation phase can help guide the City Council, City Administrator and OPD in determining how to reconcile the OPD budget with regards to cutting or realigning that is still in-line with all of the recommendations that have been voted on. Member Roberts stated that implementation phase will ensure the overall alignment of the recommendations, and determine where the funding will come from to support implementation of the recommendations.

Member Carol Wyatt stated that new industries in Oakland, particularly the cannabis industry, have had security challenges and experienced break-ins, robberies and other issues, and when these businesses experience these issues it brings law enforcement into the community. She emphasized that if these businesses are going to be permitted to operate in Oakland, they must have the security in place to prevent the operations from provoking more violence in the community, which has happened in District 3. Member Wyatt also expressed concern that recommendation [#144](#) was accidentally left out of the poll, and that the ability to work with alternative safety resources that are not law enforcement-led is very important.

Member Pat Kernighan stated that she agrees with Member Roberts' comments about the importance of the implementation phase. She also expressed concern that none of the recommendations relate to jobs or job training, particularly since jobs training funds were eliminated in this year's budget proposal for the Department of Violence Prevention (DVP).

Co-Facilitator David Muhammad responded that Recommendation #80 is to [Create a Workforce Equity Fund](#), and that Task Force members have the option to submit additional recommendations before the final meeting on March 17th.

Member Anne Marks shared that one of the issues that has been explored and discussed extensively by the Task Force and advisory boards is the question of how to respond to mental health-related calls. She shared that when reviewing the recommendations, she observed that many touch on mental health and mental health crises, but it was unclear what the expected roles and responsibilities of each of the different proposed response groups, such as community ambassadors, MACRO, and behavioral health unit would be and how these groups would interact and communicate with one another. Advisory Board Co-Chair Liam Chinn responded that 14 specific call codes were identified that the community ambassadors would respond to which are not considered emergency calls,

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REIMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Draft, continued)

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

MACRO would respond to emergency 911 calls often involving crisis, and the behavioral health unit (BHU) would be explicitly focused on mental health calls that require a clinician. The County provides some mental health co-responder programs, and the Mobile Evaluation Team program includes Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services, OPD, and a mental health clinician, but these programs are extremely limited and have a countywide focus. The proposed BHU is a multi-pronged approach that focuses on referring people with mental health challenges to a continuum of care that is explicitly Oakland focused and will hire and train people of color to participate as BHU responders. Co-Chair Chinn stated that non-emergency calls could be routed to a number other than 911, while MACRO can be dispatched through 911, and the BHU would operate as a conventional clinician co-responder team that focuses on a continuum of care. Anne Marks asked what call codes MACRO would be responding to other than calls regarding unhoused individuals; Co-Chair Liam Chinn responded that MACRO would respond to calls involving highly vulnerable, possibly unsheltered individuals experiencing personal crisis, and because the MACRO team includes an EMT they can conduct an assessment and call for back-up if needed. Community ambassadors would not be involved in any emergency calls, but would respond to more low-level calls such as a conflict between neighbors, noise complaints, or fireworks. Member Anne Marks stated that after examining the call data, she is not certain if the volume of those calls is large enough to warrant a \$20 million investment.

Member Antoine Towers expressed concern regarding Recommendation #49 ([Move most traffic enforcement to OakDOT](#)) and asked what the history exists with transportation departments managing traffic enforcement and whether it would be safe for the City to transition traffic stops to civilian staff in the Oakland Department of Transportation (OakDOT). He also stated that he didn't see a recommendation in the poll regarding increasing the budget of the Department of Violence Prevention (DVP). Co-Facilitator David Muhammad mentioned that Recommendation #74 ([Adequately fund gender-based violence prevention](#)) recommends adding \$1.35 million to DVP's budget to fund gender-based violence prevention, and the reports from the Budget Data and Analysis Advisory Board included a recommendation to increase DVP's General Fund budget allocation to \$25.6 million. In response to Member Towers' question about alternative traffic enforcement history, Advisory Board member Chiamaka Ogwuegbu responded that there is no history of this type of program in Oakland and it would be modeled off of existing programs in other countries and programs that are under consideration in other parts of the country. Advisory Board member Ogwuegbu also shared that the data reviewed by his Advisory Board showed that assault and serious injury against an officer during a traffic violation stop is highly unlikely, and that OPD would continue to respond to violations such as reckless driving and extreme speeding. Regarding the question of a recommendation to increase DVP's budget, Advisory Board member Megan Steffen shared that many recommendations that involve reallocating money suggest that those funds should be directed towards violence prevention and would therefore involve an increase to DVP's budget and operations.

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REIMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Draft, continued)

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

Member Ginale Harris stated that in 2020 there were 115 homicides, and most occurred in her area. She shared that as a Police Commissioner, she went on a service call with OPD and observed 143 calls in the queue that were violent, and emphasized that while the overall call data may indicate that OPD spends the least amount of time responding to violent calls, many residents experience violence in their community on a frequent basis. Member Harris also expressed concern that violence interrupters may not be able to conduct their work safely.

Member Keisha Henderson expressed concern about voting to transition traffic enforcement to OakDOT without studying Oakland-specific data to assess the safety, she asked if this recommendation would require purchasing additional vehicles, and whether the Advisory Board contacted OPD to request data on the number of assaults against officers during traffic violation stops.

6. Public Comments

There were seventeen (17) speakers for Public Comment.

7. Vote on Recommendations

Task Force member Reygan Cunningham made a motion to approve the 49 recommendations on the consent calendar; member Brenda Roberts seconded the motion.

Task Force member Antoine Towers proposed a friendly amendment to remove Recommendation #59 ([Move most traffic enforcement to OakDOT](#)) from the consent calendar to be considered separately; member Cunningham accepted the friendly amendment.

Member James Burch asked for clarification why #59 is being removed from the consent calendar, since enforcement and accidents would remain with OPD and OakDOT would respond to calls such as auto-tows, crossing guards, and other low-risk activities. He stated that transitioning enforcement and accidents outside of OPD would first require a change in state law, and the recommendation includes that the City pursue and advocate for this change at the state level. Co-Chair Councilmember Taylor clarified that this recommendation can still be considered by the Task Force through a separate vote in this meeting or the next Task Force meeting.

The motion to approve the 48 recommendations on the consent calendar was approved by the following vote:

Maker of the motion: Reygan Cunningham

Second: Brenda Roberts

Aye (13): Antoine Towers, Brooklyn Williams, Keisha Henderson, Reygan Cunningham, Pat Kernighan, Gus Newport, John Jones III, Brenda Roberts, Carol Wyatt, Ginale Harris, Nikki Dinh, Ivan Garcia, and Losaline Moa.

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REIMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Draft, continued)

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

No (3): Anne Marks, David Kakishiba, and Mariano Contreras.

Abstain (1): James Burch.

Member Anne Marks shared that her no vote was out of concern about there being too many recommendations without clearly articulating the Task Force's priorities, and that while many motions mention the DVP and touch upon potential cuts in the existing budget or ways to generate money to address violence prevention, she does not feel that the Task Force has made a strong enough statement.

Task Force member Anne Marks made a motion that the Task Force prioritize violence and set aside the first \$20 million identified through the Reimagining Public Safety process to fund the Department of Violence Prevention (DVP) to address violence; Task Force member Carol Wyatt seconded the motion.

Member David Kakishiba expressed support for the motion, and shared that his previous no vote was for strategic reasons as he is also grappling with the question of how to prioritize the recommendations.

Member Brooklyn Williams asked Member Marks for clarification about how the \$20 million would be spent and on what types of services or programs; Member Marks responded that the DVP would still be subject to Council approval and oversight, but that these funds are critically needed because DVP's budget is currently so small.

Member Ginale Harris expressed concern with allocating such a large amount of money to DVP without providing a plan, guidance, or accountability measures.

Member Pat Kernighan agreed with the concerns around how these funds would be managed by DVP, and suggested that this motion could be revisited at the next Task Force meeting so the proposal can be further developed.

Member John Jones III shared that his primary concern in this process has been gun violence, and the Task Force needs to look beyond policing to consider community safety overall, including through efforts such as engaging with youth and addressing root causes.

Member Antoine Towers stated that DVP was created to provide alternative responses to policing and that these alternatives have to be effective in addressing violence, and that he is in support of Member Marks' motion.

Member Brenda Roberts shared that the proposed \$20 million allocation to DVP would double the department's budget, and it would be prudent to require a plan that details the timeline and the metrics that will be used to evaluate the outcomes. She stated that it's also important to assess whether DVP can ingest a full doubling of its budget in a short period of time, and that therefore a plan, metrics and timing will be critical to provide some overarching governance in providing this funding to DVP.

Member Nikki Dinh emphasized that there is an existing accountability process to evaluate non-profit and community providers; Member Dinh shared that as a member of the Safety and Services Oversight Commission, she participates in the oversight process

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REIMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Draft, continued)

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

of DVP's spending of Measure Z funds, which is the majority of funding that DVP receives. This represents one of multiple layers of oversight that DVP is subject to, including third-party annual evaluations, that provide checks and balances in the spending and accountability process.

Member David Kakishiba stated that there are a number of recommendations on the consent calendar and other recommendations that relate to increasing the range of gender-based violence programming and prevention/intervention services, violence interruption, employment and transitional employment, and that once there is a better sense of the structure and prioritization of the recommendations many of these programs and services will likely be housed in the DVP. He suggested that additional details that are consistent with these recommendations be added to Member Marks' motion that will help clarify how it aligns with the broader list of recommendations.

Member Reygan Cunningham asked if there is an opportunity to take up Member Marks' motion at the next Task Force meeting, given that there is support for the idea in concept but desire for further clarification.

Task Force Member Reygan Cunningham offered a friendly amendment to discuss Member Marks' motion in more detail at the next meeting in order to provide more information about the prioritization and spending plan for the \$20 million; Member Marks accepted the friendly amendment.

In response to Member Cunningham's friendly amendment, Member Marks stated that the Task Force should provide general guidance to staff, but should allow staff determine the details regarding allocating funds to support their violence prevention services and programs. Member Cunningham responded that the Task Force and Advisory Board members have had more time to assess and understand the existing recommendations, and because this motion creates a new recommendation to allocate \$20 million to DVP as the first priority, the members would appreciate more time to provide more clarity around the recommendation in terms of the accountability measures.

Task Force member Gus Newport proposed a friendly amendment to add to Member Marks' motion that some Task Force members meet with the Department of Violence Prevention before the next Task Force meeting to discuss a spending plan and accountability measures with the department; there was no response to this proposed amendment.

Member Brooklyn Williams asked Member Marks for some clarity regarding what programs or services the Task Force is considering from the other recommendations that could be implemented by DVP through the \$20 million allocation.

Member Carol Wyatt shared that there should be greater community awareness that DVP addresses homicides, sex trafficking and domestic violence, but that many Oakland residents struggle with ongoing neighborhood problems like problem properties, encampments, poor roads, violence, violence, drugs, reckless driving, and others, and receive little assistance from the City. Member Wyatt stated that given these ongoing,

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REIMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Draft, continued)

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

chronic issues that the City continues to struggle to address, it is critical to have performance evaluation matrices in place to ensure money is spent effectively.

Member John Jones III noted that it's important for Task Force and Advisory Board members to understand which department will be responsible for implementing each recommendation, for example there are recommendations involving to gender-based violence, and the DVP's current work and services involve addressing gender-based violence. If Task Force and/or Advisory Boards believe a different department should handle certain programs or functions, that should be stipulated in the recommendation. Lastly, Member Jones reminded the Task Force that the City Council would help to further assess and flesh-out the details of the recommendations.

Member Mariano Contreras stated that he'd like to see how Member Marks' motion will affect the adopted recommendations from the consent calendar and their prioritization, he would like this to be discussed at the next meeting as well.

Task Force member Anne Marks withdrew her motion to prioritize violence and set aside the first \$20 million identified through the Reimagining Public Safety process to fund the Department of Violence Prevention (DVP) to address violence, with the understanding that this matter would be brought for discussion at the next Task Force meeting.

Task Force member Mariano Contreras made a motion to approve the 25 additional recommendations that received a 'yes' vote from 2/3 of Task Force members who voted either 'yes' or 'no' on the recommendation (excluding the 'no opinion' votes) in the [recommendations poll](#) (Recommendations: 57, 60, 64, 65, 67, 75, 78, 80, 82, 102, 111, 4, 22, 37, 38, 40, 94, and 100); Task Force member James Burch seconded the motion.

Member Ginale Harris requested a response from the Chief of Violence Prevention about the proposals discussed in this meeting and in previous meetings.

Member Brenda Roberts asked how many recommendations will be remaining for consideration at the next Task Force meeting; Co-Facilitator David Muhammad responded that there are 102 recommendations total, 48 have been adopted so far, and if the additional 25 recommendations are also adopted there will be 29 remaining. If the 25 recommendations are not adopted there will be 54 remaining.

Chief Guillermo Cespedes shared that he has observed all Task Force meetings and out of respect for the Task Force's work he has not participated directly in the process. He stated he is available to meet with any of the Task Force members and is happy to discuss the recommendations, but has been waiting to engage until a later stage in the process when called upon the Task Force or City Council to weigh-in and participate.

The motion to approve the 25 additional recommendations that received a 'yes' vote from 2/3 of Task Force members who voted either 'yes' or 'no' on the recommendation (excluding the 'no opinion' votes) in the recommendations poll failed by the following vote:

Maker of Motion: Mariano Contreras

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REIMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Draft, continued)

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

Second: James Burch

Ave (6): Brooklyn Williams, Mariano Contreras, Pat Kernigan (**except for no vote on recommendations #64, #75, and #78**), Gus Newport, Brenda Roberts (**except for no vote on recommendation #75**), and Nikki Dinh.

No (8): Anne Marks, David Kakishiba, Antoine Towers, Keisha Henderson, Reygan Cunningham, John Jones III, Carol Wyatt, and Ginale Harris,

Abstain (3): James Burch, Ivan Garcia, and Losaline Moa.

8. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Member Brooklyn Williams provided an amendment to the Draft Minutes under Item #4 to include the details of the presentation of Recommendations #108 and #109 provided Representatives from the Legal and Policy Barriers and Opportunities Advisory Board (page 6).

The amended draft meeting minutes of February 17th, 2021 were approved by: Anne Marks, David Kakishiba, Antoine Towers, Brooklyn Williams, Mariano Contreras, Keisha Henderson, Reygan Cunningham, James Burch, Pat Kernighan, Gus Newport, John Jones III, Brenda Roberts, Carol Wyatt, Ginale Harris, Nikki Dinh, Ivan Garcia, and Losaline Moa.

9. City Budget Update and Process, City Administrator's Office

Assistant Budget Administrator Bradley Johnson presented a high-level overview of the current Fiscal Year 2021-2023 Budget process. The first element of the process was the receipt by the City Council of the budget priorities poll, which occurred in early March, and a Council retreat is scheduled for March 30th to develop the Council's priorities for the next two-year budget. In addition, the Administration is working to develop the Mayor's proposed budget, which must be balanced for the next two years and must be presented to the Council by May 1st. After hearing the Mayor's proposed budget, the Councilmembers will conduct community forums, request additional information from staff, propose amendments, and adopt a balanced budget by June 30th. Mr. Johnson also shared that on March 8th the Finance Department presented the City's second quarter Revenue and Expenditure Report to the Finance and Management Committee, the report details a substantial shortfall in the City's current year General Purpose Fund balance and in other City funds including Measure Z violence prevention, cultural arts program, youth recreation programs, and others. Staff is hopeful that the Federal stimulus funding will add about \$200 million in resources over the next 2.5 years to the City, and while this funding will help to address the City's budget shortfall it will not be sufficient to close the gap over the next two years.

Member James Burch asked Mr. Johnson if all the Federal stimulus funds were directed towards closing the budget shortfall, how much of a gap would be remaining, he also asked about the size of the cultural arts funding budget shortfall and Measure Z funding

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REIMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Draft, continued)

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

shortfall. Mr. Johnson responded that exact numbers would be brought to an upcoming City Council meeting, but stated that an approximately \$30-40 million gap is expected to remain after the stimulus funds are received. Mr. Johnson also mentioned that the City and Council will also likely need to consider service reductions based on this gap and the timing of those reductions, whether in this fiscal year or next fiscal year.

Member Keisha Henderson asked about the Measure Z funding sources; Mr. Johnson shared that Measure Z has two revenue sources, an 8.5% parking tax surcharge and a parcel tax, and the parking tax in particular has experienced a significant decrease in revenue due to the Coronavirus.

Member Nikki Dinh asked what happens when there is a deficit in the Police Department, how does that impact the Measure Z funding allocations or the general fund; Mr. Johnson responded that the requirement is that the first 3% of Measure Z funds are allocated for evaluation, then a flat \$2 million is allocated to the Fire Department for emergency medical services, and the remaining balance of funds is split 60% for the Police Department and 40% to the Department of Violence Prevention. Each of those entities needs to be balanced individually to maintain that percentage allocation, so a decrease in revenue will impact the 60% and 40% allocations to the Police Department and DVP. If there is a gap in either department's funding due to lower Measure Z revenues, the Council can choose to allocate supplemental funds to these departments from other sources, such as Federal stimulus funds.

Member Mariano Contreras asked Mr. Johnson if would be providing presentations to boards, commissions, or other groups about potential budget reductions and services in OPD and other departments if the Task Force did not exist; Mr. Johnson responded that his job is to be agnostic about which services the City's policy makers choose to fund, rather his job is to hold the fiscal responsibility of the City and advise that if the Council chooses not to fund something, then its service level must be reduced. Mr. Johnson stated that he expects he would provide budget presentations regardless of the reimagining effort, but this effort is designed to gather community input and inform the Council as to how resources should be allocated to address public safety.

Member Brooklyn Williams mentioned the service reductions in DVP's spending plan and asked if these reductions were due to the Coronavirus; Mr. Johnson confirmed that is correct. He also stated that the Finance Department's revenue estimates were overly optimistic, and that the actuals have turned out to be lower than expected. Member Williams asked if the \$20 million funding for DVP proposed by Member Marks would have to be used to fill the existing budget shortfall for DVP, Mr. Johnson responded that if the shortfall hasn't been closed through other funding sources, then it is correct that these funds would be used to cover that shortfall.

Chief Guillermo Cespedes shared that as part of the budget development process, each department was asked to submit a service inventory to show how their services align with their core mission and the priorities of the Council.

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REIMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY TASK FORCE
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Draft, continued)

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Via Teleconference

Member Anne Marks emphasized that in addition to the discussion of DVP's budget it's also important to consider OPD's budget, and because the financial shortfall is so severe, service reductions will not generate savings; Mr. Johnson responded that OPD is the largest element of the City's General Purpose Fund, and it is very difficult to close a deficit in the General Purpose Fund without making service reductions to OPD, therefore, in order to balance the General Purpose Fund it is likely the Council will make reductions in OPD's budget. Member Anne Marks asked if the Task Force's recommendations are shaping the City's development of the budget and potential budget reductions; Mr. Johnson responded that the City and Council are expected to take the Task Force's recommendations into account when considering service reductions or re-allocations. Member Marks asked if the Task Force makes "x" amount of suggested reductions in the budget, but the Council is already required to make that same amount of reductions, is it true that none of the reductions proposed by the Task Force would be new money to go towards the Task Force's recommended programs and services; Mr. Johnson confirmed that is correct.

10. Open Forum

There were ten (10) speakers for Open Forum.

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:15pm.