



Oakland Measure Z Policing Services

2018 Annual Evaluation Report

February 2019



Prepared by:

Resource Development Associates





Oakland Measure Z Policing Services

2018 Annual Evaluation Draft Report

Patricia Bennett, PhD

Thato Ramoabi, MPA

Sarah Garmisa-Calinsky, MPP/MBA

Lupe García, BA

Audrey C. Clubb, PhD

Kirsten White, MPP

Kevin J. Wu, MPH

David Onek, JD

This report was developed by Resource Development Associates under contract with Oakland City Administrator's Office.
Copyright 2019 by Resource Development Associates

About Resource Development Associates

Resource Development Associates (RDA) is a consulting firm based in Oakland, California, that serves government and nonprofit organizations throughout California as well as other states. Our mission is to strengthen public and non-profit efforts to promote social and economic justice for vulnerable populations. RDA supports its clients through an integrated approach to planning, grant-writing, organizational development, and evaluation.





Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary..... | 4 |
| Introduction..... | 8 |
| Oakland Police Department & Measure Z Services | 14 |
| Key Findings..... | 42 |
| Recommendations..... | 47 |
| Conclusion..... | 47 |
| AppendixA..... | 49 |



Acknowledgements

We wish to express our appreciation for the support and assistance of Oakland Police Department, specifically the units that welcomed the evaluation team during the observations, Timothy Birch and Tonya Gilmore. We especially wish to express our appreciation for the contributions of Joseph Broadus, whose insight and support was instrumental in the development of this report.



Executive Summary

Evaluation Overview

In 2014, City of Oakland voters overwhelmingly approved the Measure Z ballot initiative to continue many of the services funded under the City's Violence Prevention and Intervention Initiative, Measure Y. As part of the effort to support the implementation of Measure Z-funded policing services, the Oakland City Administrator's Office hired Resource Development Associates (RDA) to conduct an annual evaluation of these services, assessing both their implementation and their effectiveness in advancing the legislation's objectives and the larger violence prevention goals of the City and the Oakland Police Department (OPD).

This report presents findings from RDA's second year of evaluation activities. In the first year of the evaluation—2017—RDA reported on the progress of Measure Z-funded policing services, highlighting: (1) OPD's commitment to the goals and objectives of Measure Z; (2) the activities conducted by Community Resource Officers (CROs) and Crime Reduction Teams (CRTs); and (3) progress in implementing geographic policing and engaging the community in local problem-solving projects. The 2017 report also identified challenges the department faced, including staff retention, concerns about internal and external awareness of OPD's community policing efforts, and unclear departmental expectations around the role of CROs and CRTs. This report builds upon these previous findings and describes where there are remaining institutional or other challenges to implementing the legislation. It concludes by presenting recommendations for how the implementation process might be strengthened to better advance Measure Z objectives.

Methodology

In order to answer the evaluation questions, RDA utilized a mixed-methods approach of data collection and analysis in order to: 1) assess the roles and expectations for CROs and CRTs; 2) examine how CROs and CRTs further the goals of Measure Z; and 3) identify challenges and barriers that may hinder the successful implementation of Measure Z.

RDA gathered qualitative data through interviews with OPD leadership and through focus groups with Measure Z-funded officers and sergeants. RDA also conducted extensive field observations of CROs and CRTs, participating in 120 hours of ride-alongs with the officers over the evaluation period. RDA also reviewed Measure Z legislation, the OPD 2016 strategic plan and other documents related to Measure Z to understand the activities of CROs and CRTs and the goals of the legislation. The document reviewed served to identify where Measure Z strategies and goals align and differ with other OPD priorities and how discrepancies may impact the roles and responsibilities of the CRO and CRT officers.



Evaluation Findings

-
- FINDING 1.** Violent crime is trending down in Oakland.
-
- FINDING 2.** Across patrol areas, there is an inverse relationship between the violent crime rate and the number of CRO projects. Area 2 has the lowest crime rates and the highest number of CRO projects. Area 5 experiences the highest rate of violent crime and has lowest number of CRO projects.
-
- FINDING 3.** Over the last year, OPD worked to improve community relationships by increasing communication and fostering engagement with stakeholders.
-
- FINDING 4.** Community relationships are a priority for CROs and valued by OPD leadership, and there are opportunities for OPD to continue strengthening community ties throughout the whole organization.
-
- FINDING 5.** OPD continues to embrace an intelligence-led, geographic, and community-oriented approach to policing—from leadership to line staff.
-
- FINDING 6.** OPD has worked to improve internal collaboration and communication among units, but there are opportunities to better coordinate ground operations, particularly between CROs/CRTs and Ceasefire.
-
- FINDING 7.** CROs and CRTs perceive frequent and abrupt changes to shift schedules, and report that this negatively impacts morale and retention.
-
- FINDING 8.** Staffing and deployment data were unavailable for evaluation as originally planned.
-
- FINDING 9.** Since the implementation of Measure Z, CROs have supported hundreds of community-oriented CRO projects designed to resolve neighborhood problems.
-
- FINDING 10.** Existing data collection tools and data reporting practices do not capture the full extent of CRO work and their impact on communities.
-
- FINDING 11.** CRTs are successfully collaborating with CROs within the same patrol area and are also collaborating with CROs/CRTs in bordering patrol areas.
-
- FINDING 12.** OPD provides internal and external training opportunities to CRTs, but CRTs report challenges accessing them.
-
- FINDING 13.** CRTs are not systematically tracking their activities or efforts, which makes it difficult to measure and evaluate their performance.
-



Conclusion

Overall, it is clear CROs/CRTs and OPD leadership are committed to a proactive policing approach aimed at preventing and responding to crime without compromising the trust and health of the public. In particular, CROs and CRTs embrace community policing methods that are well-aligned with the approaches and values outlined in Measure Z. For example, throughout our data collection, CROs conveyed the importance of community engagement and providing the best “customer service” they can. Along the same lines, CRT officers expressed a commitment to minimizing policing footprints in communities through targeted, data-driven efforts. Despite these strengths in leading community-oriented and intelligence-led operations, there are steps OPD could take to better ensure the successful implementation of Measure Z. With due consideration given to the challenges the department faces, RDA provides the following recommendations:

Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION 1. Continue to broaden the community policing philosophy more widely within the department by initiating regular internal communications that highlight community policing successes from all sworn personnel.

RECOMMENDATION 2. Assign an analyst to review data including CRO/CRT scheduling and re-scheduling patterns, deployment and redeployment trends, and criminal activity trends to improve the predictability and notification windows for scheduling and more efficiently deploy resources.

RECOMMENDATION 3. Because CRTs, CROs, and Ceasefire units all work toward the same goals, OPD should look for ways to improve operational coordination and communication.

RECOMMENDATION 4. Establish performance measures and reporting structures that ensure alignment between CRO projects and Measure Z goals.



Introduction

The City of Oakland contracted with Resources Development Associates (RDA) to provide a multi-year process and outcome evaluation of the Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act of 2014 (Measure Z) funded policing services, specifically, Oakland Police Department's (OPD) CROs and CRTs. This report provides an assessment of OPD's implementation of Measure Z, describes where there are institutional or other challenges to implementing the legislation, and lays out some ideas for how the implementation process might be strengthened to better advance Measure Z objectives.

In the following section, we provide a summary of the Measure Z legislation with a focus on policing services, before moving into an overview of our research methods. We then move into a discussion of the larger context in which Measure Z-funded policing services are implemented, including the policing frameworks that exist within the Oakland Police Department. Lastly, we discuss our evaluation findings and recommendations. The following figure provides an overview of the report and what is discussed in each section.

Figure 1. Overview of Report

| | |
|---|---|
| Measure Z Legislation | Summary of the legislation, its history, and how it relates to policing services in Oakland. |
| Evaluation & Methodology | Overview of RDA's multi-year evaluation and description of this year's evaluation approaches, including questions and methods. This section includes a description of data collection activities and evaluation limitations. |
| Oakland Police Department & Measure Z Services | Description of the local context in which Measure Z exists, with a specific focus on how OPD's organizational structure and policing approaches relate to Measure Z policing services. This section also provides an in-depth description of two core positions funded through Measure Z – CROs and CRTs. |
| Patrol Area Analysis | Analysis of CRO projects from SARANet database and crime trends, citywide and by patrol area. |
| Key Findings & Recommendations | Discussion of key findings and recommendations based on this year's data collection and analysis. |


Measure Z Legislation

Beginning in 2004, the Violence Prevention and Public Safety Act of 2004 (Measure Y) provided \$13 million in annual funding to support community policing and other violence prevention services in Oakland. This legislation was a community response to increasing violent crime in Oakland and staffing shortages in OPD. In 2014, the Measure Z ballot initiative succeeded Measure Y. Measure Z, like Measure Y, aims to reduce violent crime and improve first responders' response time. This new legislation provides funding to OPD for geographic and community policing services.

Goals and Strategies of Measure Z

The Measure Z legislation describes three goals aimed at reducing violent crime in Oakland and outlines four strategies to address these goals. As shown in Figure 2 below, the legislation's goals are to: 1) reduce violent crime, including homicides, robberies, burglaries, and gun-related violence; 2) improve emergency response times for police, fire, and other emergency services; and, 3) interrupt the cycle of violence and recidivism by investing in violence prevention and intervention strategies that support at-risk youth and young adults.

Figure 2: Measure Z Legislative Goals and Strategies





Key Terms

Throughout this report, there are frequent references to the terms and acronyms in the table below.

Table 1. Definitions


| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Ceasefire | Oakland’s Operation Ceasefire strategy is a violence reduction strategy coordinating law enforcement, social services, and the community. The major goal is to reduce gang/ group-related homicides and shootings. Ceasefire seeks to combine the community, social services, and strategic law enforcement to reduce gun violence. |
| CRO Projects | CRO Projects, based on the SARA (Scanning, Analysis, Response, and Assessment) model, are proactive problem-solving efforts to prevent crime before it occurs by identifying and addressing specific issues associated with criminal activity. This is a core principle of the community-policing model and an evidence-based practice implemented by OPD. CROs record information and details about their project activities in a database called SARAnet. |
| Flex Pay | Flex pay provides additional compensation for officers who are required to adjust their schedules on a semi-routine basis to address the evolving nature of operations. |
| Flex Schedule | Measure Z provides OPD the flexibility to deploy CROs and CRTs as needed which sometimes requires a temporary change of schedule. |
| Measure Z | The Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act of 2014. |
| Measure Z-funded Officers | Measure Z-funded officers refers to Community Resource Officers (CROs) and Crime Reduction Team (CRT) officers. |
| Neighborhood Councils | Neighborhood Councils are a citywide and neighborhood-specific community policing effort that allows assigned CROs to meet regularly with local community members to hear residents’ concerns and solve problems that can lead to crime. |
| Part 1 Offenses¹ | Murder, assault with a firearm, rape, robbery, and burglary. |
| Part 2 Offenses | Simple assault, curfew offenses and loitering, embezzlement, forgery and counterfeiting, disorderly conduct, driving under the influence, drug offenses, fraud, gambling, liquor offenses, offenses against the family, prostitution, runaways, sex offenses, stolen property, vandalism, vagrancy, public drunkenness, and weapons offenses. |
| Patrol Area | Oakland Police Department has subdivided the city into 5 “areas” called patrol areas. Patrol areas are different from the City Council Districts. |
| Patrol Beat | Each patrol area is broken down into smaller areas called patrol beats. There are 35 patrol beats in Oakland, and each beat requires a CRO assignment. |
| SARAnet Database | The SARAnet Database is a web-based data collection and reporting tool used to capture CRO projects and activities in support of OPD’s community policing efforts. |
| Violent Crime | A subset of Part 1 offenses, including murder, aggravated assault, rape, and robbery. |

¹ Part 1, Part 2 and violent crime definitions are used by OPD, the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and most police departments throughout the nation.

Evaluation & Methodology

This report presents findings from RDA's second year of evaluation activities. In the first year of evaluation—in 2017—RDA reported on the progress of Measure Z-funded policing services, highlighting 1) OPD's commitment to the goals and objectives of Measure Z; 2) the activities conducted by CROs and CRTs; and 3) progress in implementing geographic policing and engaging the community in local problem-solving projects. The 2017 report also identified challenges the department faced, including staff retention, concerns about internal and external awareness of OPD's community policing efforts, and unclear departmental expectations around the role of CROs and CRTs. To build upon these findings, RDA designed evaluation questions for the second year to gain a more nuanced understanding of the Year 1 findings and to assess OPD's continued progress in advancing the goals of Measure Z. The current year's evaluation questions are shown in Figure 3 below.

Figure 3. RDA's Year Two Evaluation Questions



Methods and Limitations

To answer the evaluation questions, RDA utilized a mixed-methods approach of data collection and analysis that captures a wide range of perspectives and indicators. Our research methods aimed to 1) assess the roles and expectations for CROs and CRTs; 2) examine how CROs and CRTs further the goals of Measure Z; and 3) identify challenges and barriers to implement the goals of Measure Z.

Limitations

As with any evaluation process, limitations to data collection and analysis exist. There are three key limitations that readers of this report should consider. First, it is essential to recognize that this report is a snapshot of Measure Z services taken during a specific time period, from June through October 2018. OPD has been working towards addressing key department-wide challenges and barriers that impact Measure Z services. However, during the period of data collection and writing of this report, some changes either had not yet been implemented or were in such early stages of implementation that their impact was not yet discernable by respondents or the research team. Second, field observations were conducted in only two of the five patrol areas, meaning our findings may not capture all the variation that exists across geographic areas in the City. Finally, there were challenges with the quantitative data requested. These ranged from limited data reliability to lack of access to data.



Qualitative Data

RDA gathered qualitative data through interviews with OPD leadership and through focus groups with Measure Z-funded officers and sergeants. RDA also conducted extensive field observations in which the team observed the activities of CROs and CRTs during ride-alongs for 120 hours. During these ride-alongs, RDA used structured data collection protocols, accompanying officers during their shifts to observe their daily activities, their interactions with residents, and the kinds of challenges CROs and CRTs encountered. RDA also leveraged responses from OPD's internal survey of CROs to strengthen thematic findings.

Table 2. Qualitative Data Collection Activities

| Activity | Source | Areas of Inquiry | Quantity |
|--|---------------------|--|--|
| Interviews | OPD Leadership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What changes were implemented this year? What are leadership's expectations of CRO and CRT roles and responsibilities? What is the alignment between CRO and CRT responsibilities, Measure Z objectives, OPD objectives, and day-to-day assignments? | 5 interviews |
| | Program Manager | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is Measure Z funding for OPD (e.g., full time employees, training, and equipment)? | 1 interview |
| Focus Groups | CRT & CRO Sergeants | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What coordination, support, and training are being provided to CROs and CRTs to reduce violence and increase community policing? | 1 focus group with 4 sergeants |
| | CROs and CRTs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What responsibilities, challenges or barriers, strengths and opportunities, and levels of job satisfaction do CROs and CRTs have? What changes have they experienced this year? | 1 focus group with 8 CROs, and 1 focus group with 8 CRTs |
| Extensive CRO & CRT Observation | CRO and CRTs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What activities do CROs and CRTs engage in? How do they interact with citizens? What operational changes or challenges occur over the course of a shift? | CRT: 40 hrs (5 shifts) CRO: 80 hrs (10 shifts) |
| Survey | CROs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What barriers or challenges do CROs encounter? How satisfied are they with their role and assignment? | 56 respondents |

Quantitative Data

RDA analyzed quantitative data including City of Oakland population data, crime data, SARANet Database and OPD administrative data to evaluate staff and community demographics, crime rates and SARANet project trends by geographic area.

Table 3. Quantitative Data Collection Activities

| Source | Areas of Inquiry |
|--|---|
| OPD administrative data (CRT/CRO staffing & personnel) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are CRO and CRT demographics by area? |
| OPD crime data (Part 1 & Part 2) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the key crime trends in Oakland? |
| OPD SARANet Database | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are CROs capturing data during their project activities? What activities and projects are CROs engaged in? |



Documentary Data

RDA reviewed and analyzed Measure Z legislation, the OPD 2016 strategic plan, and other documents related to Measure Z to understand the activities of CROs and CRTs and the goals of the legislation. The document reviewed served to identify where Measure Z strategies and goals align and differ with other OPD priorities and how discrepancies might impact the roles and responsibilities of the CROs and CRTs.

Table 4. Documentary Data

| Name | Areas of Inquiry |
|--|---|
| Measure Z Legislation | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are the objectives and requirements for use of funds as laid out in Measure Z? |
| OPD Strategic Plan 2016 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are the organizational goals and strategies OPD aims to achieve? |
| OPD Draft CRO/ CRT Policy Procedures Manual | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of CROs and CRTs? |
| OPD Annual Report 2016 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are the accomplishments and challenges of OPD? |

Oakland Police Department & Measure Z Services


The following section is intended to provide a closer look into the Department's structure, as well as some of its leading priorities and other factors that may influence departmental performance and outcomes. It is important to note that the Department has been undergoing significant change over the past five years and is continuously working toward addressing factors and barriers that impact organizational excellence.

Organizational Structure

The Department has 1,185² budgeted positions operating out of several sites across the City of Oakland. OPD divides operations into 5 geographical divisions called patrol areas and, as of August 2018, the department employed 738 sworn personnel and 391 civilian employees.³ Figure 4 shows the OPD organizational structure and the way it divides operations among the Office of Chief of Police, Bureau of Field Operations 1, Bureau of Field Operations 2, Bureau of Investigations, and Bureau of Services.

The Measure Z-funded CRT and CRO units are parallel to regular patrol units and are embedded within each patrol area, whereas Ceasefire, also funded in part through Measure Z, is situated under the supervision of the Assistant Chief of Police as show in Figure 4.

Figure 4. OPD Organizational Chart, 2018




² August 2018 OPD Staffing Report

³ Ibid.

Source: OPD

Figure 5 illustrates the organizational structure within a patrol area. As the figure shows, one Captain is assigned to each patrol area, with the responsibility to design strategies and oversee responses to criminal activity within that area. Serving directly under the captain, are three lieutenants, two of whom oversee the area's patrol functions and one of whom oversees the specialized units in the area, including the CROs and CRTs. Under the Lieutenant assigned to Special Resources are two Sergeants, one that oversees the CRO units and the other that oversees the CRT units within the patrol area.

Figure 5. Organization by Patrol Area



Organizational Priorities and Challenges

As noted in previous RDA reports, OPD's Measure Z-funded services are just one component among a range of OPD initiatives and priorities. In addition, the services are being implemented within the context of a unique set of challenges that OPD faces related to community engagement, staffing and retention. While Measure Z services complement and reflect a broader conversation taking place in Oakland and nationwide around 21st Century Policing, the evaluation team remains mindful of the ways in which competing priorities and institutional challenges may affect consistent implementation the services. Below, we briefly touch upon a few of these priorities and challenges and the ways in which they complement or conflict with Measure Z service delivery.

Strategic Priorities

In 2016, OPD formally released a comprehensive strategic plan to revise their values, mission, vision and goals. This plan was built upon a series of research, reports, and policy analysis that had been commissioned over the prior three years, including President Obama's *Task Force on 21st Century Policing* report. The goals laid out in OPD's 2016 Strategic Plan closely align with the goals and objectives described in Measure Z from 2014 and Measure Y from 2004. One main commonality is the focus on the relationship between strengthening community trust and reducing crime. The strategic plan has three overarching goals and six pillars listed below:

Figure 6. OPD Strategic Plan Goals and Pillars

| | |
|---|---|
| OPD Goals | 1) Reduce Crime |
| | 2) Strengthen Community Trust and Relationships |
| | 3) Achieve Organizational Excellence |
| 21st Century Policing Task Force Pillars | 1) Build Public Trust and Legitimacy |
| | 2) Policy and Oversight |
| | 3) Technology and Social Media |
| | 4) Community Policing and Crime Prevention |
| | 5) Training and Education |
| | 6) Officer Wellness and Safety |



Leading Challenges

In addition to the other strategic goals and priorities OPD emphasized during the evaluation period, it is also important to note a few of the key challenges the Department has faced as an institution. A significant challenge faced is their fraught relationship with the local community and, in particular, with local communities of color. OPD's history with the community has involved considerable tension and civil unrest going back decades. In the 1960s, for example, the Black Panther Party was formed in Oakland with a primary focus of monitoring the behavior of OPD officers and challenging police brutality. More recently, the Riders Case,⁴ has contributed to a deep mistrust of police in many Oakland communities, particularly communities of color.

Over the past decade, OPD has increasingly focused on community policing in an attempt to rebuild trust with the community, and department leadership were cognizant of the hurdles the department faced in establishing positive relationships in some communities. As a challenge and as a priority, though, the improvement of community relationships is undoubtedly a leading concern within the department. And while it is outside the scope of this report to assess the department's success in this area, we do provide findings related to community outreach efforts in the *Key Findings* section.

Separate from its challenges related to community engagement, OPD has also faced other significant staffing challenges for a number of years. According to the FBI Uniform Crime Reporting data, in 2016, OPD had about 18 sworn officers per 10,000 residents. These numbers are slightly below the national average⁵ for cities with 200,000-500,000 residents (Oakland has 425,195 residents) and well below the average for cities with 500,000 or more residents⁶. It is important to note that OPD also has the highest number of violent crimes handled per officer in the nation. According to OPD data, the rate of violent crimes was 7.42 per officer in 2017. Based on data provided by OPD, as of August 2018, the department was authorized to have 794 sworn staff, but only 735 positions were filled.

⁴ December 2000 - Delphine Allen et al. v. City of Oakland (Riders Case) was a civil rights lawsuit regarding police misconduct in OPD that involved 119 plaintiffs. The plaintiffs alleged that four veteran OPD officers, known as the Riders, kidnapped, planted evidence and beat them, while OPD turned a blind eye to the misconduct. In 2003, the parties entered a financial settlement for the plaintiffs and requirement of the ODP to comply with 51 reforms.


⁵ The average is 19 officers per 10,000 residents.

⁶ The average is 24 officers per 10,000 residents

Oakland Police Department's Approaches to Policing

This section provides a brief overview of key policing concepts and descriptions of how OPD applies them to prevent and address violence, deploy officers efficiently, and cultivate relationships with the City's many diverse communities and neighborhoods.

Figure 7. Contemporary Policing Approaches



The authors of both Measure Y and Measure Z based their legislative efforts on principles aligned with the four approaches detailed in Figure 7, believing that OPD can and should work simultaneously to both reduce violent crime using data and to restore community trust in the department through community building. Measure Z states that investing in “a coordinated system of early intervention, community policing, and violence-prevention efforts before injury occurs will reduce economic and emotional costs and will be a fiscally responsible use of taxpayer dollars.” OPD has sought to implement these goals in a few specific ways which are the focus of this

report; but all of its efforts exist as part of a broader approach to policing that aims to 1) move services and crime response closer to the local community by de-centralizing core services to five area hubs throughout the city; 2) utilize data and intelligence to detect patterns and prevent crime rather than simply respond to it; 3) enlist community support and trust through local problem-solving projects and a focus on customer services; and 4) prevent violent crime through initiatives and strategies such as Ceasefire. Each of these approaches are briefly discussed in turn in this section; for comparison, we have also provided a brief description below of a more “traditional” policing framework.

“Traditional” Policing

Under the “traditional” model of law enforcement, the police department is a highly centralized, hierarchical organization responsible for several key jobs: responding to 911 calls, apprehending and arresting suspects, completing crime reports, and filing documents to move cases into the court system. There is not necessarily a strong emphasis on prevention or on strategic deployment intended to interrupt criminal activity; the use of data and intelligence systems and community engagement are limited.

While these traditional policing responsibilities remain standard for any contemporary police force, in and of itself this model is outdated. It does not accurately represent the entirety of the work performed by most mid-to-large size police departments that leverage information and data for a range of purposes that help address crime. OPD embraces the four contemporary, data-driven practices in law enforcement described in detail in the following pages.

Geographic Policing

OPD uses geographic information, including population and crime trends, to deploy resources effectively. Geographic policing aims to move Department services closer to the community in order to establish stronger relationships between community members and their local police officers. The idea is that a city can be subdivided into a set of “zones” or “areas,” and that Department initiatives, projects, deployments, and strategies can thus be directed according to the particular needs of each local area.

Figure 8. OPD Patrol Areas




Figure 9. Oakland Patrol Beats




Figure 8 shows OPD’s five geographic patrol areas, and Figure 9 shows the patrol beats within each area. As mentioned previously, patrol officers and CROs/CRTs are organized in each patrol area.

Intelligence-Led Policing

Many major police departments, including Oakland, have increasingly placed emphasis on using sophisticated data collection and analysis procedures – including human intelligence, technology, and software systems – to track local crime trends, neighborhood characteristics, and criminal networks. “Intelligence-led policing” certainly refers to a broad category of police work, but common elements include the use of data sharing between police and other public agencies; in-depth analysis of local, state, and national crime trends; and crime projections, predictions, and patterns that may not emerge from service calls and crime reports alone.

“We want all officers to be as precise as possible. Random efforts produce random outcomes. If you go into a community without knowing what the problem is, that can lead to the issue of over-policing.” – OPD Leadership



Intelligence-led policing activities supplement, rather than replace, standard policing procedures for collecting crime-scene evidence and cultivating human intelligence with witnesses, informants, and community collaboration. The “intelligent” aspect is that these connections and activities are utilized at nearly every stage of the deployment, patrol, and investigatory process.

Traditional policing is imprecise by nature. An historic consequence of imprecise policing is that specific communities – especially Black and Latino communities – are disproportionately over-policed. As outlined in OPD’s Strategic Plan, and through the use of the strategies described above, OPD is institutionalizing an intelligence-led approach to reduce the disparate impact on historically over-policed communities and to improve community relationships. Figure 8 highlights key strategies OPD has implemented in recent years to strengthen intelligence-based policing efforts.

Figure 8: OPD’s Intelligence-Led Policing Strategies

| | |
|--|--|
| Crime Analysis Section | To strengthen the Department’s ability to perform crime and intelligence analysis effectively, a centralized Crime Analysis Section was established. This increases the Department’s capacity to support units such as Ceasefire and Patrol with dedicated crime analysis including social network analysis beyond homicide and aggravated assault cases. Other supports include temporal reporting, hot spotting, identification of crime patterns and series, and potential suspects and recommendations on enforcement action. [Source: OPD Strategic Plan 2016] |
| Intelligence Unit | The Intelligence Unit is responsible for gathering information from all sources in a manner consistent with the law in support of efforts to provide tactical or strategic information on the existence, identities, and capabilities of criminal suspects and groups. The Intelligence Unit disseminates the information received to anticipate, prevent or monitor criminal activity. [Source: OPD Annual Report 2016] |
| Professional Development Trainings - Stop Data | In 2016, the OPD Office of Inspector General (OIG) established an in-service training regarding aggregate stop data trends and patterns for all commanders and supervisors. This training was designed to evaluate stop data statistics, outcomes, and trends in line with the Department’s mission, goals, and values. This class was offered to all officers in 2017. OIG is also continuously working towards addressing potential organizational influences that may lead to racially disparate results. [Source: OPD Annual Report 2016] |
| Shooting Review | OPD instituted a weekly shooting review with commanders and other key staff directly involved in reducing violent crime. Shooting review is facilitated by the Ceasefire commander and focuses on gathering and disseminating actionable intelligence. Shooting review is also an opportunity to resolve duplicative efforts, address conflicts, and improve operational communication. Up to 40 people individuals attend each weekly shooting review, including representatives from the Criminal Investigation Department (CID), Crime Lab, DEA, District Attorney’s Office, Oakland Housing Authority, and BART Police Department. [Source: Qualitative Data Collection] |
| Intel-Based Stops | Through RDA’s qualitative data collection process, specifically within the CRO unit, the evaluation team noted officers were instructed by leadership to reduce non-intel led stops such as equipment stops and instead focus on intel-based stops. OPD defines intel-led stops as “officers possess knowledge, which can be linked to an articulable sources, leading to the initiation of a stop. The source may be very specific such as a named person, or information about a recent crime trend or pattern tied to a specific location or area”. [Source: Qualitative Data Collection] |



Community Policing and Problem-Oriented Policing

At its core, Measure Z is intended to articulate the citywide priority that OPD should carry out enforcement and violence reduction operations in a way that is responsive to community needs and that uplifts local communities through an emphasis on service and problem-solving. This vision is representative of a broad trend in policing toward “community policing” and “problem-oriented policing.” These distinct but related philosophies both emphasize the importance of building strong bonds between the police department and the community. These bonds are achieved by developing more neighborhood relationships and focusing more attention on solving the kinds of local problems that can give rise to crime (e.g., blight, inadequate lighting, “hot spots” for drug sales or gang conflicts that have the potential to escalate), rather than focusing solely on enforcement. The theory is that a proactive problem-solving focus will interrupt the behaviors and activities that can escalate to crime. The stronger bonds that result from focusing on developing trusting relationships with community members lead to greater cooperation reporting and investigating crimes and ultimately, safe neighborhoods.

OPD describes **community policing** as a strategy and philosophy that places a high value on responses that are preventive in nature, that are not dependent on the use of the criminal justice system, and that engage other public agencies and the community.

“We are more cognizant of enforcing crimes that are serious and working collaboratively with the community and partners to come up with solutions.” – OPD Leadership

Over the last three decades, consensus has increased around what constitutes “best practices” in community policing. In a 2013 report, RDA and the Warren Institute detailed key components of these best practices to provide the City and OPD with recommendations regarding the implementation of Measure Y. These broad guidelines still hold true in 2019 and later sections of this report will describe ways that OPD is presently operating in alignment with these goals as well as current areas for improvement. These best practices are outlined in Figure 9 below.

Figure 9: Best Practices in Measure Y Implementation (2013, Warren Institute and RDA)




SARA (Scanning, Analysis, Response, Assessment) Model & Database

The SARA model is a common approach to implementing principles of community policing and problem-oriented policing. SARA is an acronym of the four steps, outlined in Figure 10 below, for solving localized crimes while also addressing the particular local conditions or problems that gave rise to those crimes in an area. OPD has embraced this approach, and sees it as a vital component in the work that CROs and CRTs are doing, as well as the Department as a whole.

The **SARAnet Database** is a web-based data collection and reporting tool used to capture CRO projects and activities in support of OPD's community policing efforts.

Figure 10: SARA Model



Within OPD, CROs apply the SARA model through beat-based projects (referred to as CRO projects) they initiate, manage, and close. CROs are required to have two ongoing CRO projects at any given time. One project must address specific, identified issues related to an OPD priority while the other must address a community priority. Community priorities are areas or issues of concerns identified by community members that OPD can address or support such as blighted property, series of auto/business burglaries, or nuisance. Typically, community priorities are generated by attendees of the Neighborhood Councils,⁷ however they can also come from a variety of sources such as email messages and discussions with community members. OPD's SARA model ensures projects serve a larger set of members of the patrol beat rather than just one individual.

As the SARA model states, projects must be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time bound with set due dates or evaluation dates. Since 2009, CROs have used SARAnet, a data system designed to track CRO projects and the steps taken to address them. SARAnet is further discussed in the *OPD's Measure Z Services: CROs & CRTs* and *Patrol Area Analysis* sections.

⁷ See [Table 4](#) for more information



Ceasefire Strategy

Finally, there are a broad array of coordinated law enforcement and violence prevention efforts all over the country that utilize the name “Ceasefire.” The Ceasefire model was developed in Boston in 1996 in response to high levels of gun violence and gang activity. Like the Boston Gun Project (Ceasefire’s original name), Oakland’s Ceasefire brings together a network of law enforcement officials, youth service providers, clergy and street outreach workers with the goal of developing a unified strategy for combating violent crime. A key part of the approach involves the sharing of perspectives on the causes and consequences of violent crime in order to generate a spirit of trust and collaboration. Working group members also share information about individuals known to be involved in gangs and/or at high risk of committing gun violence. In almost all variations of the Ceasefire models in place today, a standard element of the approach is the “call-in,” where identified individuals considered to be disproportionately responsible for violent crime (who are also often at the highest risk of becoming victims of violent crime) are brought together in a safe and neutral space. Once in this space, these individuals receive the message that they have been identified for their criminal contacts and/or behavior, that there are a range of support services waiting for them if they choose to take advantage of them, and that they will be aggressively prosecuted if they instead choose to participate in violent criminal activity.

“We have a Ceasefire unit but it is a department-wide strategy. It’s a concept of how do you focus on individuals that are likely or at risk of being victims of violent crimes or committing them.” – OPD Leadership

The Boston Gun Project and subsequent studies of Ceasefire models have shown the coordinated violence prevention efforts to be tremendously successful when well-implemented.⁸ Variations of the Ceasefire model have been replicated in many cities around the country. OPD has devoted substantial resources to support and institutionalize its own Ceasefire strategy. Four units (Special Investigations Unit 1, Special Investigations Unit 2, Ceasefire, and Gang and Gun) work fulltime on the most active individuals within gangs/groups that have been identified through data and analysis to be the most involved in shootings and homicides. Unlike CROs and CRTs, these enforcement teams are not limited to a beat or police district. Instead, they move throughout the City to focus on these active individuals within gangs/groups.⁹ Ceasefire also facilitates the weekly shooting review (see Figure 8 for more details) that allows different units within the department to collaborate and exchange data and strategies to ensure minimal duplicative and/or conflicting efforts and maximize use of resources.

⁸ In 2017-18, Oakland’s Ceasefire was evaluated with a focus on gun homicide and non-fatal shootings in the City of Oakland. The study concluded that Ceasefire was associated with a 32% reduction in citywide shootings that seemed distinct from trends in most other California cities. <http://www2.oaklandnet.com/w/OAK071457>

⁹ OPD 2016 Annual Report:

<http://www2.oaklandnet.com/oakca1/groups/police/documents/webcontent/oak066735.pdf>



OPD's Measure Z Services: CROs & CRTs

The CRO and CRT officer positions are unique within OPD. They are the two of three OPD strategies funded through Measure Z that reflect two interrelated approaches to policing and police legitimacy. The idea behind CROs places community trust as the starting point for reducing crime; the idea behind CRTs places crime reduction as the starting point for building community trust. CROs emphasize the development of positive, trusting relationships with community members as a means to reduce crime; CRTs emphasize the interdiction and reduction of crime as means to increase community trust in OPD's ability to keep residents safe.

This section offers a brief, high-level description of the role of Community Resource Officers (CRO) and Crime Reduction Team (CRT) officers. Measure Z explicitly mandates these positions, so it is essential to understand how the roles are described in the legislation, envisioned by the department, and carried out in the field. The examples in *A Day in the Life: CRO* and *A Day in the Life: CRT* sections are drawn from observations in two patrol areas, but key identifying details have been removed due to the sensitivity of ongoing operations.

While CROs and CRTs each have distinctive roles within OPD, there is substantial overlap in their day-to-day activities and collaboration. During the evaluation focus groups, CRTs said that they often leverage CRO support in their operations and consult with them to support their investigation work, because they view CROs as the community experts on their beats. Similarly, CRTs offer support to CROs, assisting with their CRO projects – especially when CROs are short staffed. RDA did not observe patrol officers; therefore, this section does not discuss similarities and differences between CROs/CRTs and patrol officers.

CRO/CRT Scheduling and Compensation

Measure Z provides OPD the flexibility to deploy CROs and CRTs “as needed” which sometimes requires a temporary change of schedule, which we will refer to as redeployment. Due to this flexible scheduling need, CROs and CRTs are paid a premium, referred to as flexible pay, over patrol officers. Unlike patrol officers, these roles require considerable schedule flexibility, particularly for CROs, and commitment to designing and cultivating long-term, neighborhood-specific projects.

It is important to note that throughout the data collection process, CROs and CRT officers and leadership staff shared that because of the flexible scheduling allowance in their positions, they sometimes experience abrupt redeployment. CROs and CRTs suggested to RDA that this unpredictability in their schedules has a detrimental effect on their morale and on staff retention. Furthermore, Measure Z officers and leadership, specifically CROs, shared that they are sometimes redeployed to meet staffing needs such as crowd management, violence reduction or similar patrol-related activities, which they feel impedes their ability to successfully address community concerns and complete longer-term neighborhood-focused projects.



Role of the Community Resource Officer (CRO)

Measure Z is the successor to Measure Y, which provided funding for similar services. Measure Y required the Department to assign officers to geographic-based “problem-solving” roles known as Problem-Solving Officers (PSOs). OPD only required PSOs to serve residents of their assigned beats. The Measure Z legislation re-envisioned and re-established the PSO position as the Community Resource Officer (CRO) with an expanded set of responsibilities.

CROs engage in problem-solving projects (CRO projects), attend Neighborhood Council meetings, serve as liaisons with city service teams, provide foot/bike patrols, answer calls for service if needed, lead targeted enforcement projects, and coordinate these projects with CRTs, patrol units, and other sworn personnel.

Department Expectations

As this report was being drafted, OPD was in the process of developing a Community Resource Officer Deployment Policy and Procedure, finalizing the policy that governs the job of CRO. According to publicly available draft of the policy, the specific expectations and responsibilities for CROs include, but are not limited to the following:¹⁰

- Build community support for OPD through positive customer service;
- Be visible to and engage with the community;
- Assist their assigned Neighborhood Councils in establishing appropriate priorities based on crime data;
- Research and identify three locations generating the highest calls for service on their Community Policing beat and, as appropriate, open projects aimed at reducing these calls for service;
- Identify the most critical problem property on their Community Policing Beat; open a project aimed at abating problems associated with property;

These responsibilities may change once the policy is finalized, but are included here to provide a sense of the way OPD outlines job expectations, objectives, and standards for CROs. In addition, the Department also expects CROs to assist each other with onboarding and transitions into the job; to maintain ongoing knowledge of local crime hot spots; to organize and present at a range of community meetings; and to facilitate coordination with an array of other city agencies and community service providers.

RDA also learned many of the informal expectations of CROs through reviewing OPD’s CRO survey, conducting focus groups with Measure Z-funded officers, and conducting interviews with Department leadership. For example, CROs are expected to be familiar with and engage business leaders and key community leaders in their assigned beats. CROs are also expected to demonstrate extensive professional skills supporting their community-building work, including social-emotional skills to help them successfully

¹⁰ Department leadership stressed that the policy language they are working on is intended to go beyond the basic legislation in order to lay out procedures toward the broader goals of improving police-community relations, enhancing citywide problem-solving efforts, reducing violent crime, and enhancing the community’s sense of safety.



engage with communities during monthly presentations at Neighborhood Council meetings and other community interactions. Staff and leadership shared that these “soft” skills are job expectations for CROs,

“I don’t care about the number of arrests [CROs] make and citations they make. I care if I go into a business and they don’t know [the CRO]. Then we have a problem.” – OPD Leadership

who are required to attend community events at least once a month.

Training & Personal Development

As part of ongoing efforts to strengthen the professional development and skills of CROs, OPD provides formal Measure Z-funded training for all CROs. According to the draft policy RDA received, CROs are expected to complete trainings on each of the following subjects:

- ❖ CRO-specific responsibilities
- ❖ Problem-orientated or problem-solving training using SARA model
- ❖ Search warrants
- ❖ Undercover and crime reduction operations
- ❖ Ceasefire notifications
- ❖ Community relations and customer service
- ❖ Tactical training
- ❖ Procedural justice

Earlier this year, OPD reinstated CRO-specific training referred to as the CRO school with curriculum tailored to the professional development needs of CROs. Officers expressed satisfaction with the CRO School, stating that it assisted with onboarding into their new roles as CROs. The CRO School also helped to clarify job expectations from OPD leadership as well as expectations from their assigned beats and neighborhoods. Despite the reinstatement of the CRO School, some CROs expressed the need for additional training opportunities and a standard, comprehensive onboarding process to strengthen community engagement approaches. Some CROs reported to RDA that they receive weeks of shadowing and mentoring on a new assignment, while others reported that they receive none. Starting in 2018, OPD anticipates offering CRO School regularly.

CRO School is dedicated training time for CROs to further develop their skills. The school took place in the winter and fall of 2018 with total instruction time of 24 hours. The topics that were covered range from improving police efficacy and building community trust, to best practices for CRO projects and the SARA process.

SARAnet

As mentioned in earlier sections, CROs utilize the SARAnet Database to track and manage CRO projects. However, in RDA’s focus groups and observations over the evaluation period, many CROs shared that SARAnet’s design does not allow them to track and record all of the information they view as being important to their communities. OPD designed this system to record and measure evidence-based

community policing work, but some CROs noted that the system does not allow them to capture important crime prevention activities if those activities are not connected to their official CRO projects. OPD looks at performance data, including the numbers of projects that have started and completed. CROs shared that this performance metric encourages some officers to prioritize entering projects that are shorter and can be more easily closed, rather than longer (and potentially more impactful) community projects. To the degree that this is a widespread practice among CROs, existing data collection processes and database tools for community policing cannot fully capture the work OPD is doing to advance the goals of Measure Z.

As shared with RDA, CROs are expected to input daily updates in SARAnet to capture project progress. While nearly all staff appreciate the value of using data to drive decision-making, some CROs perceive the data entry as burdensome. For example, some CROs do not consistently annotate their project work in SARAnet. These data input practices impact data reporting and the ability to accurately highlight the projects and activities performed by the CROs. These inconsistencies and limitations are further discussed below.

On the Ground

Based on observations and focus groups, it was evident that CROs overall understand their responsibility of engaging with their local community and solving problems important to community members and that may give rise to crime. Many CROs expressed their commitment to improving community relations by addressing community members' concerns and providing what they described as "good customer service." In fact, many interviews with OPD leadership described CROs as OPD's "community-facing officers" and the first point of contact with community members. As noted during the evaluation observations, CROs activities and interactions were focused on developing and maintaining positive relationships with community members and businesses as well as identifying solutions to issues that satisfy both community members and OPD standards. For example, a CRO shared that one of their project goals was to reduce the frequency of shoplifting within a business district. To meet this goal, the CRO said that they conduct regular check-ins with often-burglarized business owners. In particular, the CRO discussed the importance and process of reporting such incidents to OPD with these business owners.

RDA's discussions with staff from all levels of the department made clear that the CRO community work is highly valued. Department leadership shared that all officers—not only CROs—are expected to foster positive community engagement and establish cooperative and trusting relationships with key stakeholders, but that CROs often go "above and beyond" their requirements by, for example, using their own time and money to support community events and do things like coach youth sports.

A Day in the Life: CRO

As part of the data collection process, two members of the RDA evaluation team shadowed a different CRO for one full shift, for an entire work week (Monday through Thursday). Each evaluation team member observed each CRO in the unit for a total of 80 hours of observations. The goal of the observations was to obtain a deeper, on-the-ground understanding of the types of activities CROs engage in, how they interact

with community members, changes in officer operations over the course of the shift and any challenges encountered. Team members also attended daily area meetings (also known as lineups) in which leadership discussed instructions and priorities for CROs. The following section provides a description of the activities and interactions the evaluation team observed throughout the week. Activities are synthesized to highlight what typical activities CROs engage in.

Based on the observations, the following graphic highlights a typical day.

1:00-1:30 pm

Shift Begins

The review and briefing session, also known as the joint lineup, takes place in the Oakland Police Administration Building (PAB) with area officers. Leadership shares the priorities for that week, including increasing the Department's presence in coffee shops to deter laptop robberies, planning for the upcoming First Friday and National Night Out events, and sharing information on suspects to be on the lookout for and vehicles that are known to have been involved in recent robberies. The group is informed of upcoming training opportunities, reminded of procedures for filing project information in SARANet, and told by either their sergeant or lieutenant that they may be called in to support a gang-related investigation in the coming week.

1:30-2:30 pm

Admin/Emails

After line-up, the CROs respond to emails and conduct research needed for their SARANet projects or for following up on the line-up discussion. As the observation took place on a Monday, the CROs noted that their admin work was particularly heavy since they needed to catch up on email messages that had come in over the weekend.

2:30 pm

Beat Patrol & Investigations

Beat patrol occupies most of a CRO's day and generally begins with a security check on beat hot spots. Most of these locations had open CRO projects associated with them. Examples from this Monday included a check on a parking lot where robberies are common and a check on a local homeless encampment.

When they were not conducting follow-up work on various projects or conducting ongoing area patrols and outreach, CROs would respond to calls for service or file reports. However, if a member of their unit called for support or if a patrol officer was unable to respond to a crime within their beat, CROs ensured they responded to the request or called for service. Throughout the day, CROs would also actively search for identified suspects, check license plates of vehicles with identified association with either a suspect or crime. During observations, CROs took minimal breaks.

9:00 pm

End of Shift

CROs stop patrolling the streets around 9:00 pm to allow time to complete administrative duties before concluding work for the day. Once CROs arrive back at OPD, they finish incident reports for the day and complete SARANet data entry. The sergeant holds a quick debrief about activities of the day with the unit.

Throughout the field observations, the RDA team noted how CROs engage in various activities that pertain to their CRO projects and activities that do not. Activities that were not directly related to their CRO projects were typically in response to calls for service or other law enforcement needs.

CRO Project Activities

- **Homeless Encampment Checks.** In Area 2, homeless encampments are an ongoing concern. During one shift, a CRO shared that community members had reported a man in a local encampment who was violent toward community members. The CRO conducted a routine check-in. During the observations, the CRO checked in but the man was not there. During another shift with a different CRO, the CRO shared they have a CRO project focused on clearing a homeless encampment in a community park. During observations, the CRO was instructed to clear the encampment. However, the CRO was unable to clear the encampment due to time constraint (CRO had a scheduled community event). CROs identified those present and issued them a warning.

- **Respond to Nuisance Report.** CROs typically respond to nuisances reported by community members within their beats. During a shift with a CRO, the CRO shared there is a resident who complains repeatedly about a group of older males drinking and smoking in public. As a response to the resident's complaint, CRO shared that they would drive by the area to ensure the activity was not ongoing. During observations, the CRO spotted the group of men drinking and spoke to the men about the complaints. CRO shared since this was not the first time they discussed the complaints with the group, they were cited. CRO shared this reported nuisance is a CRO project due to its continuity.

- **Business Burglary.** In Area 2, business burglaries are a top concern for community members and OPD. During a shift with a CRO, the CRO shared that they have CRO projects focused on businesses frequently burglarized. Project activities focus on the prevention of future burglaries and identification of suspects. During the shift, the CRO wanted to collect more information about a suspect who regularly steals from a local store. CRO engaged with the manager and attained photos taken from surveillance videos. Although there have been multiple incidents, only one report has been filed because the business manager felt the police were not helpful. As observed, the CRO discussed with the manager about the importance of filing a report.

- **Neighborhood Council Meeting.** CROs are required to attend monthly Neighborhood Council meetings. During a shift, the team observed a CRO attend their beat's Neighborhood Council Meeting. During the meeting, the CRO introduced themselves, discussed what they do, reviewed beat priorities and local crime stats, and asked if any priorities should be added or changed. Meeting participants discussed current concerns and concluded the current priorities were accurate.

CRO Patrol Activities

- Robbery.** During a shift, a CRO responded to a robbery in another beat due to proximity of location. Since a vehicle was identified, the CRO patrolled the nearby area.
- Cover Staffing Shortage.** During the observations, there was no CRO assigned to one specific beat so throughout the week, all CROs took turns patrolling the area. During a shift, the CRO shared that a beat priority in that area is speeding cars, so the CRO pulled over and monitored traffic.
- Call for Back-Up.** CROs respond to calls for service when deemed necessary. During the week of observations, CROs were called in to support other CROs or patrol officers. During a shift, a CRO received a call to help handle a situation with a man bothering a film crew at OPD. Upon arrival, the man was no longer in sight. Officer filed an incident report.
- National Night Out.** Every year, CROs participate in the citywide community events, National Night Out, as an opportunity to familiarize themselves with their area. National Night Out took place during the week of observations. CROs stopped by several block parties to engage with community members. Officers introduced themselves and discussed important issues in that community with community members. Across all areas, CROs spent five hours of their shift participating in this event.
- First Friday.** During line-up, OPD leadership shared that the safety of First Friday participants and businesses is a top priority. During a shift with a CRO, the CRO engaged with business owners that are involved in or impacted by First Friday. Business owners shared concerns regarding rampant drug dealing that occurs during First Friday around their businesses.
- Civilian Support.** During a shift, a CRO noticed three vehicles stopped in the street and blocking street lanes. One needed to get jumped so other cars were parked to try to help the vehicle. The CRO redirected traffic and pushed the vehicle to a safer location.

Role of the Crime Reduction Team (CRT)

Crime Reduction Teams are sworn police personnel strategically and geographically deployed to investigate and respond to violent crimes in hot spots.

Similar to CROs, the roles and expectations for CRT officers are formally laid out in the department's policies and procedures; and as with the CRO position, the CRT position policy language was under revision as this report was being drafted. Early versions reflect that CRTs are expected to 1) develop and carry out both department-wide and area-specific crime reduction plans; 2) conduct investigations; 3) serve arrest warrants and make arrests; and 4) conduct crowd-control efforts requiring flexible schedules.¹¹

In addition, these staff are specifically required to file weekly reports documenting their activities, record the number and type of arrests made and investigations conducted, and provide general descriptions of other activities (such as intelligence-led stops, operations, and crowd management incidents.)

CRT officers also receive premium compensation for the shift flexibility required of them and for their expanded job duties. CRTs are expected to perform directed enforcement and operations, to conduct basic to intermediate-level investigations, to administer search and arrest warrants, to locate and arrest suspects, and to respond to crowd management events. Snapshots of the daily work of CRTs are detailed in the following section.

Department Expectations

Similar to CROs, CRTs respond to emerging crime patterns and trends. However, unlike CROs, CRTs do not have CRO projects. Instead, CRTs develop Crime Reduction Plans that aim to address criminal activity within their area. These plans drive intelligence-based projects that CRTs conduct in collaboration with their unit, Area CROs, and/or with other Area CRTs. CRTs shared that they are also supported by the Criminal Investigations Division (CID) and other divisions within the department. During the data collection process, CRTs described some of their activities as involving surveillance such as social media tracking, investigation of shootings, and arrests of suspects.

Training & Professional Development

Currently, CRTs are required to receive the following training:

- ❖ Undercover operations
- ❖ Basic narcotics enforcement
- ❖ Advanced procedural justice
- ❖ Search warrant
- ❖ Crime reduction field operations

¹¹ CRT officers are required to attend one community event every three months. Patrol officers have been recently required to engage in one community building project per squad per year, as well as host and attend community events and living room meetings.

On the Ground

RDA's observations and direct conversations with staff throughout the organization revealed that there is a shared understanding of the Department's objectives for CRTs. As one officer put it, "[CRTs] do a lot of intel-based projects. [CRTs] do surveillance in certain areas, base projects on what is currently happening in crime and by locations too. [CRTs] also talk to people for investigations which is intel-based or help out other cases and investigations and identify people involved in crimes."

"We develop plans, see it through, and write a search warrant. If we get who we're looking for that is what success is."- CRT

During the week of observations, CRTs engaged in several operations and other activities that support the goals of Measure Z. Operations are centered on the approach of targeted enforcement and require a level of knowledge and understanding of the area in which they are conducted. Similar to CROs, CRTs are familiar with the composition of their assigned area, including community members and leaders. CRTs also described engaging with Confidential Informants (CIs). CIs in the community are used frequently to support investigations or planned operations.

A Day in the Life: CRT

As part of the data collection process, a member of the evaluation team shadowed a CRT unit for one full shift, for an entire work week (Monday through Thursday). CRTs were observed in the field for a total of 40 hours. The goal of the observations was to attain a deeper, on-the-ground understanding of the types of activities CRTs engage in, how they interact with community members, the kind of operational changes that occur over the course of the shift, and the kind of challenges officers typically encounter. Team members also attended daily meetings (also known as lineups) in which leadership discussed instructions and priorities for CRTs. During the week of observations, CROs also participated in the lineups. The following section provides a description of the activities and interactions the evaluation team member observed throughout the week. Activities are synthesized to highlight what typical activities CRTs engage in.

Based on the observations, the following graphic highlights a typical day.

12:15-1:00 pm

Shift Begins

The shift on this day begins with a joint lineup with area CROs to review priorities, discuss recent shootings, and review names and information on suspects. Multiple incidents (club and gang-related shootings and robberies) had occurred over the previous week, so the bulk of the discussion was focused on identifying and finding suspects. Oftentimes, investigators from the Criminal Investigation Division (CID), such as members of the Homicide Section or the Robbery, Burglary & Felony Assault Section, participate in the lineups to inquire about any information officers may have on suspects. CRTs spend the first part of their shift completing administrative investigative tasks, such as gathering information about identified gang members that were tied to recent shootings.

Ongoing

Area Patrol

Unlike CROs, CRTs take an area-wide approach. Activities of CRTs depend on the priorities of the week, including planning and carrying out operations. Throughout the day, CRTs focus on patrolling different gang territories and hot spots for violent crime. Officer presence in known gang territories increases when there is a gang-related incident such as a shooting or homicide. CRTs typically ride with a partner for safety and call in for backup whenever an arrest is conducted.

Ongoing

Joint Operations

During the week of observations, a joint operation with CROs was conducted. The joint operation involved a week-long investigation in which CRTs gathered information on a suspect involved in the sale of illegal weapons. The CRTs and CROs strategized and reviewed the details of the operation including scenario planning. Other activities included communicating with the suspect and requesting a search warrant. After retrieving a search warrant, officers began searching for illegal weapons at the suspect's home and associated locations. However, the operation was called off due to it becoming dark outside.

11:00 pm

End of Day Debrief

Similar to the CROs, CRTs typically report to the PAB to debrief with the unit and complete administrative tasks such as paperwork and incident reports. Sergeants also use this time to share announcements with the team. For example, during the week of observations a schedule change was shared with the officers.

CRT Observed Activities

- **Back up:** Typically, officers call in for support when conducting a search or arrest to ensure officer safety. For example, during observations, an officer was called in to support another unit conducting a search of a vehicle that was pulled over because it had no license plates. The car owner was on probation so he was cited and released. In another instance, an officer called in for a female officer to conduct a search on a female suspect.

- **Search Warrants/ Suspect Search:** CRTs are asked to look out for individuals with arrest warrants within their areas. Information regarding search warrants are disseminated through the joint lineups or communication from leadership such as Sergeants and Lieutenants. However, based on current projects or operations, a CRT may also request a search warrant. In some instances, if the suspect is on probation or parole, CRTs will reach out to the probation or parole officer for information and collaboration. Throughout the week of observations, CRTs actively searched for identified suspects such as a youth associated with a robbery in the area as well as a drug-dealing suspect involved in another investigation. CRTs gathered and analyzed intel from various sources to support investigations. One of these investigations led to an arrest.

- **Arrests:** While CRTs do conduct arrests, felony drug arrests must be approved by the unit's Sergeant. During the observations, an officer had to confirm and receive approval from the Sergeant. In a few instances, the evaluation team observed stops that led to arrests either due to issued arrest warrants or violations of probation. For example, officers arrested a female on probation who violated the terms of her supervision for possession of narcotics and paraphernalia.

- **Dispatch Calls:** CRTs activities also include response to real-time crime that occur in their area. During the week of observations, a unit received a call regarding a potential shooter at a youth center. Officers responded to the scene to investigate. After searching the center and surrounding area, it was determined there was no presence of a potential shooter.

- **Increased Patrolling:** Officers are instructed to increase their presence following a violent incident. During the week of observations, a gang-related homicide occurred inside an apartment complex known to be gang-affiliated, so CRTs were instructed to increase police presence and maintain strong police visibility around the area. CRTs patrolled the impacted area throughout the week.

Patrol Area Analysis

This section discusses OPD’s progress toward the crime reduction and community engagement goals of Measure Z. First, we present data on crime trends citywide. Then, we provide a count of the current number of CROs and CRTs by area. We move on to offer brief profiles of each of the five patrol areas. Crime trends, specifically trends for violent crime, are used to illustrate progress toward crime reduction, while an analysis of CRO projects in the SARANet Database is used to communicate the levels and intensity of community engagement. While these analyses cannot capture the totality of OPD’s actions toward advancing Measure Z goals, they do provide helpful context and highlight how crime reduction and community engagement efforts are deployed across the patrol areas.

CROs/CRTs Across the Department

In June 2018, the time in which the ride-alongs took place, there was a total of 37 CROs and 33 CRTs. The table below provides a breakdown of how many CROs and CRTs were assigned to each patrol area during this time period. Note that this data is captured from a point in time and may reflect a different count from other months during 2018.

Table 5. CROs and CRTs by Area

| Area | CROs | CRTs |
|--------|------|------|
| Area 1 | 9 | 7 |
| Area 2 | 7 | 7 |
| Area 3 | 8 | 6 |
| Area 4 | 6 | 6 |
| Area 5 | 7 | 7 |

Crime Trends

Overall, violent crime is on the decline in Oakland. Between 2014 and 2017, there was an 11% overall reduction in violent crime citywide (see Figure 11). Rates of Part 1 and Part 2 crimes decreased slightly during this same period. Part 1 crime occurred more frequently across all areas compared to Part 2 crime. Although violent crime has decreased citywide, rates fluctuate among the patrol areas (see

Figure 12). Area 5 (the Southern part of East Oakland furthest from Downtown) consistently experienced the highest rate of violent crime each quarter and Area 2 (Uptown and North Oakland) experienced relatively lower crime rates, including both Part 2 crime and violent crime.

Figure 11. Crime in Oakland by Type, 2014-2017





Figure 12. Violent Crime in Oakland by Patrol Area, 2014-2017



Source: OPD


In 2017, crime trends remained consistent as the previous years. Violent crime decreased from 2016 (with decreases observed across three of the five areas), while Part 1 crime overall increased slightly. Part 2 crime remained relatively consistent. Notably, one of the most significant changes in violent crime was in the number of robberies. Robbery decreased in 2017, dropping by 23% from 2014. However, other violent offenses such as aggravated assault have steadily increased between 2014 and 2017.

CRO Projects Analysis

RDA analyzed project data available through the SARAnet Database to identify both the number of projects and trends among project types across areas. However, as RDA noted in the Year One evaluation report, there is both limited and inconsistent use of SARAnet among CROs. Therefore, this SARAnet analysis is limited in terms of how well it captures the full extent of community engagement activities. See Appendix A for the coding analysis that was used to classify project types. Figure 13 below shows CRO projects by count and patrol area. As the figure shows, both project counts and project types vary by area,

with the most projects initiated in Area 2 (n=147) and the fewest in Area 5 (n=85). Common project types include patrol, blight, and encampment.¹²

Figure 13. Project Counts by Type and Patrol Area, 2014-2018



Areas 1 and 5 had the fewest CRO projects but the most projects related to police operations, such as surveillance, arrests, and undercover operations. Areas 2 and 4 had the highest number of traffic-related

¹² Only projects with a “Project Goal,” “Project Task,” or both entered as part of the project description in SARAnet are included in the analysis. For this reason, the analysis figures may not reflect all projects CROs have worked on. See Appendix A for more detail on the kinds of activities coded under each category.



Oakland Measure Z Policing Services

2018 Annual Evaluation

projects, and Areas 1 and 2 had the highest number of projects related to homeless encampments. Area 5, which is the part of East Oakland furthest from Downtown, had the fewest number of projects overall in a single year. Citywide, there was a slight dip in the number of CRO projects in 2017, but generally the trend has remained consistent; the number of projects initiated so far in 2018 is on track with 2014-2016 levels.

Area 1: Downtown and West Oakland


Figure 14: OPD Area 1



Table 6. CRO Projects, Area 1

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Blight | 21 projects |
| Homeless Encampments | 19 projects |
| Operations | 15 projects |
| Patrol | 14 projects |
| City Agency/ Other Collaboration | 11 projects |
| Community Outreach/ Engagement | 8 projects |
| Intelligence Gathering | 8 projects |
| Nuisance | 4 projects |
| Business/ Property Inquiries | 3 projects |
| Robbery/ Burglary | 3 projects |
| Traffic | 2 projects |

Figure 15: Area 1 Annual Crime Rates, 2014-2017



Area 1 consists of downtown and West Oakland. In June 2018, there were 9 CROs and 7 CRTs. Compared with the city overall, crime in Area 1 is relatively high. In particular, this part of the city faces challenges with larceny, simple assault, vandalism, drug crimes, and other Part 2 crimes. Figure 15 above offers a snapshot of the average annual crime rate in Area 1 over the analysis period of 2014-2017. As the figure shows, Part 1 and Part 2 crime is slightly higher than the city average, with violent crime roughly equivalent to the citywide average

From 2014-2018, projects related to blight and homeless encampments were the most common. Blight-related projects typically involved towing of abandoned vehicles, deterrence of illegal dumping, removal of trash, and alleviation of loitering and squatting. The majority of encampment projects focused on reducing or removing homeless encampments. These types of projects typically involved conducting security checks, increasing patrol presence, and collaboration with other city agencies such as Public Works and the Homeless Outreach Unit.

Area 2: Uptown and North Oakland

Figure 16: OPD Area 2





Table 7. CRO Projects, Area 2

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Patrol | 30 projects |
| Homeless Encampments | 20 projects |
| Blight | 18 projects |
| Traffic | 15 projects |
| Community Outreach/Engagement | 14 projects |
| City Agency/ Other Collaboration | 13 projects |
| Robbery/ Burglary | 10 projects |
| Operations | 8 projects |
| Business/ Property Inquiries | 7 projects |
| Intelligence Gathering | 6 projects |
| Nuisance | 6 projects |

Figure 17: Area 2 Annual Crime Rates, 2014-2017



Area 2 consists of Uptown and North Oakland. In June 2018, there were seven CROs and seven CRTs. Compared with the city overall, crime in Area 2 is the lowest in the city, with the biggest problems in this area taking the form of larceny, fraud, forgery and counterfeiting, and vandalism. Figure 17 above offers a snapshot of the average annual crime rate in Area 2 over the analysis period of 2014-2017. As the figure shows, Part 1 crime is slightly higher than the city average (driven in large part by high larceny rates compared with the rest of the city), but Part 2 crimes and violent crimes are below the city average.

Patrol-related projects were the most common, followed by projects focused on homeless encampments. Most patrol-related projects entailed conducting security checks on homeless encampments or properties recently burglarized/robbed as well as increasing police presence to deter auto burglaries. Projects focused on homeless encampments described using Operation Dignity (provides mobile street outreach and linkages to supportive services) and collaboration with Public Works.

Area 3: San Antonio, Fruitvale, and the Lower Hills


Figure 18: OPD Area 3



Table 8. CRO Projects, Area 3

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Patrol | 22 projects |
| Community Outreach/Engagement | 20 projects |
| Blight | 17 projects |
| Nuisance | 14 projects |
| Traffic | 13 projects |
| City Agency / Other collaboration | 11 projects |
| Operations | 9 projects |
| Business/ Property Inquiries | 7 projects |
| Intelligence Gathering | 5 projects |
| Robbery/ Burglary | 5 projects |
| Homeless encampment | 3 projects |

Figure 19: Area 3 Annual Crime Rates, 2014-2017



Area 3 consists of San Antonio, Fruitvale, and the Lower Hills. In June 2018, there were eight CROs and six CRTs. During the analysis period, crime in Area 3 approximated the citywide average. Violent crime in Area 3 was slightly above the city average, with robbery and rape rates in particular being relatively high compared to the rest of the city. Table 10 above shows the average annual crime rate in Area 3 over the analysis period of 2014-2017. Both Part 1 and Part 2 crime rates are slightly below the city average, and the violent crime rate is slightly above the city average (Figure 21).

Similar to Area 2, patrol-related projects were the most common in Area 3. Unlike Areas 1 and 2, projects related to homeless encampments were the lowest in Area 3. Most patrol projects in Area 3 involved proactive policing to reduce illegal activity such as burglaries. Other patrol projects focused on enforcement activities such as citing and arresting individuals. Most of the projects coded as community outreach/engagement were focused on educating business owners on how to prevent burglaries of their businesses. Other CRO projects included educating community members on public safety precautions, how to report prostitution activity, vehicle burglary prevention, and traffic safety.

Area 4: East Oakland, Mills, and Leona

Figure 20. OPD Area 4





Table 9. CRO Projects, Area 4

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Patrol | 34 projects |
| Blight | 26 projects |
| Business/ Property Inquiries | 15 projects |
| Operations | 11 projects |
| Traffic | 11 projects |
| Community Outreach/ Engagement | 10 projects |
| City Agency / Other collaboration | 8 projects |
| Nuisance | 8 projects |
| Intelligence Gathering | 6 projects |
| Homeless encampment | 3 projects |
| Robbery/ Burglary | 3 projects |

Figure 21: Area 4 Annual Crime Rates, 2014-2017



Area 4 consists of the northern part of East Oakland, Mills, and Leona. In June 2018, there were six CROs and six CRTs. Crime in Area 4 during the analysis period was fairly close to the city average, with violent crime rates slightly above average and Part 1 and 2 crime rates slightly below (Figure 23). Compared with the rest of Oakland, Area 4 has particular challenges in the form of robberies, motor vehicle theft, simple assault, weapons and drug crimes, and runaway minors. Table 9 shows the average counts for each crime type in Area 4 over the analysis period of 2014-2017.

From 2014-2018, Patrol and Blight were the most common project types in Area 4 and homeless encampment projects were the least common project type. Most patrol-related projects focused on traffic enforcement and safety (i.e. sideshow¹³) followed by narcotic activity. The majority of blight projects involved towing abandoned vehicles, elimination of illegal dumping, and the removal of squatters.

¹³ "Sideshow" is reckless driving within large crowds of spectators, often involving the discharge of firearms.

Area 5: East Oakland and Knowland Park


Figure 22. OPD Area 5



Table 10. CRO Projects, Area 4

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Patrol | 15 projects |
| Blight | 12 projects |
| Business/ Property Inquiries | 12 projects |
| Community Outreach/ Engagement | 10 projects |
| Intelligence Gathering | 9 projects |
| City Agency / Other collaboration | 6 projects |
| Nuisance | 6 projects |
| Operations | 6 projects |
| Homeless encampment | 3 projects |
| Robbery/ Burglary | 3 projects |
| Traffic | 3 projects |

Figure 23: Area 5 Annual Crime Rates, 2014-2017



Area 5 consists of the southern part of East Oakland and Knowland Park. In June 2018, there were seven CROs and seven CRTs. Area 5 experienced the highest violent crime rate in the city during the analysis period and higher than average Part 1 and 2 crimes (Figure 25). Among other challenges, Area 5 faces particular problems with weapons violations, offenses against family and children, simple and aggravated assault, burglary, and motor vehicle thefts.

In Area 5, patrol, blight, and business/ property inquiries were the top project types while homeless encampments, robbery/ burglary and traffic projects were the least frequent. Similar to Area 4, patrol-related projects involved security checks to deter illegal activity and reduce the calls for service. Most of blight-related projects were described as having the goal to reduce the sale of narcotics and other illegal activities by towing abandoned vehicles and removing trash/debris. As with Area 4, business/property-related projects aimed to remove squatters from abandoned properties.

Key Findings

Following the framework of OPD's Strategic Plan, our key findings and recommendations are organized around OPD's overarching goals: 1) Reduce crime; 2) Strengthen community trust and relationships; and 3) Achieve organizational excellence. By organizing our key findings and recommendations this way, OPD has an opportunity to align its ongoing efforts (as laid out in the Strategic Plan) with our recommendations.

Crime Reduction

FINDING 1. Violent crime is trending down in Oakland.

Citywide crime decreased by 11% between 2014 and 2017. Across the full analysis timeframe (January 2014 – September 2018), violent crime peaked in the third quarter of 2015 and hit a low in the third quarter of 2018. While violent crime is down across the City,¹⁴ actual rates fluctuate among patrol areas.

FINDING 2. Across patrol areas, there is an inverse relationship between violent crime and the number of CRO projects. Area 2 has the lowest crime rates and the highest number of CRO projects. Area 5 experiences the highest rate of violent crime and has lowest number of CRO projects.

RDA observed an inverse relationship between the rates of violent crime and the rates of CRO projects within each patrol area. As noted earlier in Figure 13, Areas 2, 3, and 4 have the most CRO projects documented, whereas Areas 1 and 5 have the fewest. Area 2 experiences the lowest crimes rates of all the patrol areas, including both Part 2 crime and violent crime, and Areas 3 and 4 have lower crime rates than Areas 1 and 5. RDA's observation shows an inverse correlation but, and this is important to note, the relationship is not necessarily causal; there are many factors impacting CRO projects.

Fostering Community Relationships

FINDING 3. Over the last year, OPD worked to improve community relationships by increasing communication and fostering engagement with stakeholders.

In alignment with a recommendation from RDA's Year One Evaluation Report, OPD has improved community outreach and engagement activities in 2018. The Department's broad-based communication strategy with external stakeholders highlighted positive stories through social media and other channels, focusing on relationship-building within the community. OPD has worked to improve social media connections within the Oakland community, publishing positive stories about police/community collaboration and projects. In support of this goal, OPD provided social media training to some of its officers.

¹⁴ According to the Pew Center, violent crime in the U.S. has fallen sharply over the past quarter century. Based on FBI numbers the violent crime rate fell 49% between 1993 and 2017. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/01/03/5-facts-about-crime-in-the-u-s/>

FINDING 4. Community relationships are a priority for CROs and valued by OPD leadership, and there are opportunities for OPD to continue strengthening community ties throughout the whole organization.

OPD is making efforts to incorporate community policing goals into all public-facing assignments to effectively implement Measure Z goals. CROs and CRTs spend most of their time in their assigned communities, which means they hold deep neighborhood connections and understand both current and evolving neighborhood-level needs. CROs demonstrate extensive professional tools to support their community-building work, including soft social-emotional skills that help them successfully engage with communities during monthly presentations at Neighborhood Council meetings. Staff and leadership shared that these soft skills are job expectations for CROs, who are required to attend community events at least monthly. CRT officers are required to attend one community event every three months – and patrol officers have been recently required to engage in one community building project per squad per year, as well as host and attend community events and living room meetings. In addition, all OPD personnel are completing two phases of procedural justice training. To be the most effective, it is best practice for community policing and relationship building to permeate all aspects of departmental operations and leadership.

Organizational Excellence

FINDING 5. OPD continues to embrace an intelligence-led, geographic, and community-oriented approach to policing—from leadership to line staff.

OPD continues to embrace many core principles of intelligence-led policing, geographic policing, and community-based policing. Tenured staff noted that OPD’s approach today is considerably more strategic, coordinated, and responsive to community needs than it has been in the past. For example, CROs and CRTs use several data sources to triangulate information – including crime statistics, social media, community intelligence, and technology to locate gun shots – when making strategic decisions. Several stakeholders who spoke with RDA attributed OPD’s improved precision during operations to these intelligence-led and geographic policing approaches. Improving precision reduces the “policing footprint” in neighborhoods that have been historically over-policed. OPD leadership shared that these strategies reflect their efforts to improve police/community relationships.

FINDING 6. OPD has worked to improve internal collaboration and communication among units, but there are opportunities to better coordinate ground operations, particularly between CROs/CRTs and Ceasefire.

OPD is successfully working to improve internal communication, collaboration, and coordination in a variety of ways, including daily interactions between CRTs/CROs and robbery/homicide investigators and participating in the weekly shooting review meetings led by Ceasefire. These shooting reviews support intra-departmental coordination by providing a joint forum for all units to discuss departmental priorities and local issues in real-time. Despite these successes, CRO and CRT officers report barriers to effective

coordination with Ceasefire, such as inconsistent sharing of information between these units. Because CRTs and CROs rely on information-sharing to prevent local crime and help solve projects, this barrier to communication impedes their effectiveness. Officers report that some Areas once held joint line-ups with the Ceasefire units, but no longer do. According to staff on the ground, the lack of consistent communication has led to some conflicting and overlapping operations among different units.

FINDING 7. CROs and CRTs perceive frequent and abrupt changes to shift schedules, and report that this negatively impacts morale and retention.

CROs and CRTs reported frequent and unpredictable changes to both their assignments and their schedules, especially for special events like street festivals, concerts, sideshow, club detail, etc. OPD leadership shared that the Department aims to provide advance notice as early and as often as possible, but, at the same time, acknowledges that CROs and CRTs are the first personnel to be redeployed when operational needs evolve rapidly due to their position's flexible schedule. Officers and some OPD leadership agreed that unplanned assignment changes can impede CROs' and CRTs' ongoing, longer-term community work, especially when temporary re-deployment take officers into other patrol areas. Stakeholders also mentioned that workweeks stretching up to eight consecutive days can lead to physical and mental fatigue, and generally low morale.

Despite cited high levels of collaboration between CROs and CRTs, officers shared that abrupt scheduling changes limit the amount of overlap between CRO and CRT shifts within an area. This limits potential opportunities for joint activities, which affects the types of operations that an area pursues.

FINDING 8. Staffing and redeployment data were unavailable for evaluation as originally planned.

The Department was unable to provide the evaluators with access to staffing data such as reliable data to calculate retention and turnover for Measure Z staff. This limited the degree to which RDA could include staffing levels and retention analyses in the current evaluation. Furthermore, as described in other sections, OPD is not capturing redeployment data. Maintaining accurate, reportable staffing data is critical to this evaluation process as well as to organizational processes internally.

Role of Community Resource Officers

FINDING 9. Since the implementation of Measure Z, CROs have supported hundreds of community-oriented projects designed to resolve neighborhood problems.

CROs initiated and documented 503 projects between January 2014 and October 2018. CRO staff demonstrated deep knowledge of local needs and patterns of criminal activity in their assigned geographic communities. They successfully utilize this knowledge to assist and support local community members, which is a core part of the community policing model. CROs work on CRO projects that address community priorities and neighborhood-level needs. While CROs initiated and documented hundreds of community-oriented CRO projects, there are disparities in the number of projects implemented across each patrol area, as noted above in Finding 2.

FINDING 10. Existing data collection tools and data reporting practices do not capture the full extent of CRO work and their impact on communities.

Despite widespread buy-in for data-informed policing strategies, CROs are not consistently and thoroughly capturing their project and project activities in SARANet. During the analysis of SARANet data, RDA experienced difficulty analyzing all projects inputted in SARANet due to inconsistency across each component (Scanning, Analysis, Response, and Assessment) and incomplete fields. This led to the omission of a significant number of projects from this report’s analysis. RDA highlighted this finding in the Year One evaluation report. Without reliable information from SARANet about the successes of CRO activities, performance is difficult to evaluate.

Furthermore, the SARANet database currently does not capture all of CROs’ daily activities that are community driven and promote public safety. Some activities observed were not part of a project but contribute to meeting the goals of Measure Z. For example, during the observations, a CRO officer pulled over to assist a car that needed to be pushed out of the street. After supporting the civilian, the CRO shared with RDA the importance of promoting a positive image of officers through small actions.

Role of Crime Reduction Team Officers

FINDING 11. CRTs are successfully collaborating with CROs within the same patrol area and are also collaborating with CROs in bordering patrol areas.

CROs and CRTs within each patrol area have collaborative meetings on a weekly basis—called joint lineups—to discuss OPD priorities and coordinate their policing activities such as operations. These meetings are also opportunities to ensure that CROs and CRTs are not duplicating efforts or utilizing the same resources.

FINDING 12. CRTs are successfully collaborating with CROs within the same patrol area and are also collaborating with CROs/CRTs in bordering patrol areas.

CRT staff report that when there are planned trainings, squads frequently have the opportunity to send up to two officers. Because coverage needs on the ground prevent the entire unit from being able to attend the same training, officers use a “train the trainer” practice of reporting in order to transfer the new knowledge to the entire unit after a training. CRTs expressed appreciation for these opportunities, and also expressed a desire for more frequent opportunities to deepen their skill sets.

Officers shared that, previously, new CRT assignments would have mentorship opportunities from tenured staff. But, the current trends of low officer retention and high turnover mean fewer opportunities for this kind of onboarding support. Though Measure Z allocates funds specifically for training, some CRTs report that the process for requesting and accessing these resources is both unclear and challenging.

FINDING 13. CRTs are not systematically tracking their activities or efforts, which makes it difficult to measure and evaluate their performance.

Similar to CROs in Finding 10 above, CRTs demonstrated sophisticated knowledge of neighborhood histories, prominent community members, and networks operating in their assigned patrol area. This knowledge supports them in carrying out their operation activities effectively. Despite this observation, measuring and evaluating success is challenging because CRT units are not capturing CRT-specific activity reports. Shooting review provides OPD with the ability to track CRT activities connected to an ongoing shooting investigation. While some units shared that they maintain internal accounts of their “successes,” without a consistent record of activities or performance data, progress cannot be evaluated. Without clear performance metrics, the impact of CRT efforts are difficult to quantify and demonstrate.

Conclusion

Overall, it is clear CROs/CRTs and OPD leadership are committed to a proactive policing approach aimed at preventing and responding to crime without compromising the trust and health of the public. In particular, CROs and CRTs embrace community policing methods that are well-aligned with the approaches and values outlined in Measure Z. For example, throughout our data collection, CROs conveyed the importance of community engagement and providing the best “customer service” they can. Along the same lines, CRTs expressed a commitment to minimizing policing footprints in communities through targeted, data-driven efforts. Despite these strengths in leading community-oriented and intelligence-led operations, there are steps OPD could take to better ensure the successful implementation of Measure Z. With due consideration given to the challenges the department faces, RDA provides the following recommendations:

Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION 1. Continue to broaden the community policing philosophy more widely within the Department by initiating regular internal communications that highlight community policing successes from all sworn personnel.

According to the fourth pillar of the *President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing* report, community policing requires the active building of positive relationships with members of the community. RDA’s extensive observations suggest that OPD can continue to foster growth in this area by encouraging all personnel to develop stronger community relationships. As it is now, some OPD personnel revealed they understand community policing to be the work of CROs rather than a department-wide strategy to be employed by all officers. To develop a more holistic understanding of what community policing is, and to most effectively deploy its principles, OPD should establish an internal communication strategy that frequently highlights any community policing done by all sworn personnel – not just CROs.

RECOMMENDATION 2. Assign an analyst to review data including CRO/CRT scheduling and rescheduling patterns, deployment and redeployment trends, and criminal activity trends to improve the predictability and notification windows for scheduling to more efficiently deploy resources.

With an acknowledgement of OPD’s ongoing efforts to maintain predictability and regularity in CRO and CRT schedules, many of the officers in these roles connected abrupt scheduling changes directly to morale issues. Thematically, this emerged consistently throughout internal OPD survey responses as well as through focus groups and interviews. OPD should analyze existing information to identify ways to build more predictability around rescheduling and to minimize unnecessary use of the “flex” scheduling that draws these officers away from their community work. RDA recommends that the department not only review existing data to better predict resourcing needs, but also that leadership clearly communicate results to the CROs to improve perceptions and morale. Analyzing these data on a regular, ongoing basis

will allow leadership to make more informed deployments. Perhaps more importantly, this analysis will allow leadership to communicate to officers the steps being taken to reduce the abrupt scheduling changes impacting their morale.

RECOMMENDATION 3. Because CRTs, CROs, and Ceasefire units all work toward the same goals, OPD should look for ways to improve operational coordination and communication.

The weekly shooting review meeting is one vehicle for collaboration among CRTs, CROs, and Ceasefire. However, this meeting is narrowly focused on fostering effective communication to address shootings. OPD can build on the success of this collaborative meeting by streamlining communication among the units to ensure that both units have a clear understanding of ongoing area operations that are related to all violent crime (not only shootings.)

RECOMMENDATION 4. Establish performance measures and reporting structures that ensure alignment between CRO projects and Measure Z goals.

RDA's analysis of projects coded in SARAnet suggests that OPD can better target CRO projects to more explicitly advance the Measure Z goals of reducing violent crime and promoting stronger community relationships. One way to achieve this is by developing strategic communication that articulates in explicit terms how specific projects are intended to advance Measure Z goals.



Appendix A: SARAnet Project Coding Key

| Code | Key Words |
|--|---|
| Blight | Dumping, clean, tow, loiter, abandon, special enforcement, illegally parked, tag |
| Business/ Property Inquiries | Owner, employees, trespassing, business, property, squat, landlord, manager, illegal business, eviction |
| City Agency / Other Collaboration | Partnership, department, Caltrans, coordinate, homeless outreach unit, arrange, request, City, schedule, Operation Dignity, Public Works, signage, City Administrator's Office, Oakland Department of Transportation, work with |
| Community Outreach/ Engagement | Meeting, contact, educate, education, advise, disseminate information, outreach, communicate, awareness, CPTED |
| Homeless Encampments | Homeless, encampment, clean up, Operation Dignity, tent |
| Intelligence Gathering | Identify, learn, observation, statistical analysis, gather, inspect, evaluate, security video |
| Nuisance | Nuisance, excessive noise, drinking, disturbing the peace, loitering |
| Operations | Operation, surveillance, search warrants, drug/ narcotic, prostitution, undercover, gang |
| Patrol | Visible presence, patrol, security check, police presence, (code) enforcement |
| Robbery/ Burglary | Robbery, burglary, CPTED, street light |
| Traffic | Traffic, crosswalk, pedestrian, vehicle code, OPD traffic, CHP, stops, cyclists, sideshow |