



**CITY OF OAKLAND
PUBLIC SAFETY AND SERVICES
OVERSIGHT COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2022
6:30 PM
Via Teleconference**

Oversight Commission Members:

Sydney Thomas (D-1), *Omar Farmer (D-2)*, **Vice Chairperson:** Paula Hawthorn (D-3),
Yoana Tchoukleva (D-4), **VACANT (D-5)**, **Chairperson:** Carlotta Brown (D-6),
Billy G. Dixon (D-7), Michael Wallace (Mayoral), Beth H. Hodess (At-Large)

Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20, members of the Safety and Services Oversight Commission, as well as City staff, will participate via phone/video conference, and no physical teleconference locations are required.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Oakland Public Safety and Services Oversight Commission encourages public participation in the online board meetings. The public may observe and/or participate in this meeting in several ways.

OBSERVE: Please click the link below to join the webinar

You are invited to a Zoom webinar.

When: Oct 24, 2022 06:30 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Topic: Public Safety and Services Oversight Commission Meeting (SSOC)

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88382842868>

Or One tap mobile:

US: +16694449171,88382842868# or +16699009128,88382842868#

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 669 444 9171 or +1 669 900 9128 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 719 359 4580
or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 386 347 5053 or +1 564 217 2000 or +1 646 558 8656 or
+1 646 931 3860 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 309 205 3325 or +1 312 626 6799 or
+1 360 209 5623

Webinar ID: 883 8284 2868

International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88382842868>

After calling any of these phone numbers, if you are asked for a participant ID or code, press #. Instructions on how to join a meeting by phone are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362663>, which is a webpage entitled "Joining a Meeting By Phone."

**CITY OF OAKLAND
PUBLIC SAFETY AND SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2022
6:30 PM
Via Teleconference**

PROVIDE PUBLIC COMMENT: There are three ways to make public comment within the time allotted for public comment on an eligible Agenda item.

- Comment in advance. To send your comment directly to the Commissioner's and staff BEFORE the meeting starts, please send your comment, along with your full name and agenda item number you are commenting on, to Tonya Gilmore @ tgilmore@oakland.ca.gov.

Please note that eComment submissions close one (1) hour before posted meeting time. All submitted public comment will be provided to the Commissioners prior to the meeting.

- By Video Conference. To comment by Zoom video conference, click the "Raise Your Hand" button to request to speak when Public Comment is being taken on an eligible agenda item at the beginning of the meeting. You will then be unmuted, during your turn, and allowed to participate in public comment. After the allotted time, you will then be re-muted. Instructions on how to "Raise Your Hand" are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/205566129>, which is a webpage entitled "Raise Hand In Webinar."

- By Phone. To comment by phone, please call on one of the above listed phone numbers. You will be prompted to "Raise Your Hand" by pressing STAR-NINE ("*9") to request to speak when Public Comment is being taken on an eligible agenda item at the beginning of the meeting. Once it is your turn, you will be unmuted and allowed to make your comment. After the allotted time, you will be re-muted. Instructions of how to raise your hand by phone are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362663>, which is a webpage entitled "Joining a Meeting by Phone."

If you have any questions about these protocols,
please e-mail Tonya Gilmore, at tgilmore@oaklandca.gov.

**CITY OF OAKLAND
PUBLIC SAFETY AND SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2022
6:30 PM
Via Teleconference**

*Each person wishing to speak on items must raise their hands via ZOOM
Persons addressing the Safety and Services Oversight Commission shall state their names and
the organization they are representing, if any.*

ITEM	TIME	TYPE	ATTACHMENTS
1. Call to Order	6:30 PM	AD	
2. Roll Call	5 Minutes	AD	
3. SSOC – AB 361 Resolution	5 Minutes	A	Attachment 3
4. Approval of Meeting Minutes A. July 25, 2022 B. September 26, 2022	5 Minutes	A	Attachment 4 A & B
5. Open Forum	15 Minutes	I	
6. A Public Access to Oakland Police Department Data - Rik Belew Review and Discussion of Reimagining Public Safety Taskforce Recommendations #54 and #55 summaries on p. 193-194 - "Rethinking Public Safety" https://www.oaklandca.gov/documents/reimagining-public-safety-task-force-report-and-recommendations-public-safety-committee-4-13-21	30 Minutes	I	Attachment 6
7. Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Committee – Update Commissioner Farmer	30 Minutes	I	Attachment 7
8. Vote for SSOC Chair and Vice Chair	15 Minutes	A	
9. Schedule Planning and Pending Agenda Items	10 Minutes	I	
10. Adjournment	1 Minute	A	

**A = Action Item I = Informational Item AD = Administrative Item
A* = Action, if Needed**

Do you need an ASL, Cantonese, Mandarin or Spanish interpreter or other assistance to participate? Please email tgilmore@oaklandca.gov or call (510) 238-7587 or (510) 238-2007 for TDD/TTY five days in advance.

¿Necesita un intérprete en español, cantonés o mandarín, u otra ayuda para participar? Por favor envíe un correo electrónico a tgilmore@oaklandca.gov o llame al (510) 238-7587 o al (510) 238-2007 para TDD/TTY por lo menos cinco días antes de la reunión. Gracias.

你需要手語, 西班牙語, 粵語或國語翻譯服務嗎? 請在會議前五個工作天電郵 tgilmore@oaklandca.gov 或 致電 (510) 238-7587 或 (510) 238-2007 TDD/TTY.

**OAKLAND PUBLIC SAFETY AND SERVICES
OVERSIGHT COMMISSION**

RESOLUTION NO. 10-24-22 1

RESOLUTION RENEWING AND CONTINUING THE PUBLIC SAFETY AND SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION'S DETERMINATION THAT CONDUCTING IN-PERSON MEETINGS OF THE [PUBLIC SAFETY AND SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION] AND ITS COMMITTEES WOULD PRESENT IMMINENT RISKS TO ATTENDEES' HEALTH, AND ELECTING TO CONTINUE CONDUCTING MEETINGS USING TELECONFERENCING IN ACCORDANCE WITH CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e), A PROVISION OF AB 361

WHEREAS, on March 4, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom declared a state of emergency related to COVID-19, pursuant to Government Code Section 8625, and such declaration has not been lifted or rescinded. (See <https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/3.4.20-Coronavirus-SOE-Proclamation.pdf>); and

WHEREAS, on June 17, 2022 Gavin Newsom issued Executive Order N-11-22 reaffirming that a State of Emergency exists in California as a result of COVID-19. (See <https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/6.17.22-COVID-EO-Rollback-signed.pdf>); and

WHEREAS, on March 9, 2020, the City Administrator in their capacity as the Director of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC), issued a proclamation of local emergency due to the spread of COVID-19 in Oakland, and on March 12, 2020, the City Council passed Resolution No. 88075 C.M.S. ratifying the proclamation of local emergency pursuant to Oakland Municipal Code (O.M.C.) section 8.50.050(C); and

WHEREAS, City Council Resolution No. 88075 remains in full force and effect to date; and

WHEREAS, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) continues to recommend physical distancing of at least six (6) feet whenever possible, avoiding crowds and poorly ventilated spaces, particularly for people who are not fully vaccinated or who are at higher risk of getting very sick from COVID-19. (See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>); and

WHEREAS, the CDC recommends that families with children under 5 and unvaccinated household members continue to take steps to prevent COVID-19 infection including distancing. (See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/groups/families-covid-19.html>); and

WHEREAS, the CDC continues to caution that older adults remain more likely to get very sick from COVID-19. (See <https://www.cdc.gov/aging/covid19/covid19-older-adults.html>); and

WHEREAS, the CDC, the California Department of Public Health, and the Alameda County Public Health Department all recommend that people experiencing COVID-19 symptoms or who have tested positive for COVID-19 stay home. (See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/steps-when-sick.html>); and

WHEREAS, the CDC still finds that COVID-19 vaccines are highly effective at preventing severe illness, hospitalizations and death and continues to recommend that all eligible persons get vaccinated for COVID-19 and stay up to date on their COVID-19 vaccines. (See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>); and

WHEREAS, vaccinated persons may still get COVID-19 and can spread the virus to others. (See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/effectiveness/why-measure-effectiveness/breakthrough-cases.html>); and

WHEREAS, anyone infected with COVID-19 can spread the virus, even if they do not have symptoms. (See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/how-covid-spreads.html>); and

WHEREAS, the City's public-meeting facilities are indoor facilities not designed to ensure circulation of fresh/outdoor air, particularly during periods of cold and/or rainy weather, and were not designed to ensure that attendees can remain six (6) feet apart; and

WHEREAS, holding in-person meetings would encourage community members to come to City facilities to participate in local government, and some of them would be at high risk of getting very sick from COVID-19 and/or may live with someone who is at high risk; and

WHEREAS, in-person meetings would tempt community members who are experiencing COVID-19 symptoms to leave their homes in order to come to City facilities and participate in local government; and

WHEREAS, attendees would use ride-share services and/or public transit to travel to in-person meetings, thereby putting them in close and prolonged contact with additional people outside of their households; and

WHEREAS, on 10-25-21, the Public Safety and Services Oversight Commission adopted Resolution No. 10-25-21-1 determining that conducting in-person meetings would present imminent risks to attendees' health, and electing to conduct meetings using teleconferencing in accordance with California Government Code section 54953(e), a provision of AB 361; and

WHEREAS, by making these findings that conducting in-person meetings would present imminent risks to attendees' health, and by making an election to conduct meetings via teleconference, the Public Safety and Services Oversight Commission may elect to continue to meet via teleconference by adopting subsequent resolutions, at least every 30 days, as part of a broader Public Safety and Services Oversight Commission agenda, and need not do so on a single-subject agenda; now therefore be it:

RESOLVED: that the Public Safety and Services Oversight Commission finds and determines that the foregoing recitals are true and correct and hereby adopts and incorporates them into this Resolution; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: that, based on these determinations and consistent with federal, state and local health guidance, the Public Safety and Services Oversight Commission renews its determination that conducting in-person meetings would pose imminent risks to the health of attendees; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Public Safety and Services Oversight Commission firmly believes that the community's health and safety and the community's right to participate in local government, are both critically important, and the Public Safety and Services Oversight Commission is committed to balancing the two by continuing to use teleconferencing to conduct public meetings, in accordance with California Government Code section 54953(e), a provision of AB 361; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Public Safety and Services Oversight Commission will renew these (or similar) findings at least every thirty (30) days in accordance with California Government Code section 54953(e) until the state of emergency related to COVID-19 has been lifted, or the Public Safety and Services Oversight Commission finds that in-person meetings no longer pose imminent risks to the health of attendees, whichever is occurs first.

SAFETY AND SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

SSOC created by the Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act of 2014

DRAFT REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, JULY 25, 2022 - 6:30 PM

VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING

ITEM 1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 6:32 by Chair Brown

ITEM 2. ROLL CALL

Present: Chairperson Carlotta Brown
Commissioner Omar Farmer
Commissioner Michael Wallace
Commissioner Sydney Thomas
Commissioner Tchoukleva

Excused: Commissioner Nikki Dinh - Excused
Commissioner Billy Dixon - Excused
Commissioner Beth Hodess – Excused
Vice Chair Paula Hawthorn - Excused

3. SSOC - AB 361 Resolution – Roll Call – All Approved

4. Open Forum – 1 Speaker – A. Olugbala –
Concerned about Ceasefire – how effective if the perpetrators are not from Oakland. How does DVP outreach occur if they are not from Oakland?

5. MACRO – Update / Introduction
Elliott Jones, Program Manager, MACRO, Oakland Fire Department provided an overview of the MACRO program from April to July 2022 and reviewed the slide deck included in the Agenda and Materials packet. Commissioner Thomas asked about LA Familia, Commissioner Tchoukleva asked about the pilot program and the funding received – State Grant - \$10 Million - \$6 to \$8 Million from Council, \$800,000 from Padilla. Commissioner Farmer confirmed the number of calls, staff and the hours of availability – 4 teams 75 to 110 calls at current level 7am to 3pm.

SAFETY AND SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

DRAFT REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, JULY 25, 2022 - 6:30 PM

Public Speaker – A. Olugbala – who monitors the care received; Is racial equity a priority; is the unhoused community served? E. Jones responded yes to all.

Public Speaker – Reisa Jaffee – tell the City Council what is needed to continue/improve the program.

6. OPD – Ceasefire

Rev. Damita Davis-Howard, Ceasefire Director provided an overview of the Ceasefire program and the steps taken to change/update custom notifications during the Pandemic. Provided information on the “Scorecard” used at weekly OPD meeting – aids in determining where to focus Ceasefire activities. Commissioner Tchoukleva asked about success rate – Rev. Davis-Howard responded that 34% is average – Life Coaching is the biggest indicator of success.

Public Speaker – A. Olugbala – asked about services, resources, treatment and what are the numbers? Rev. Davis-Howard responded that the slide deck notes the numbers.

7. League of Women Voters of Oakland –

An Assessment of Oakland Oversight Bodies: Progress, Gaps, and Recommendations for Improved Functions - Commissioner Hodess

Due to an excused absence for the meeting, the item will be continued to the next regular meeting of the SSOC in September.

8. Update on the status of Verified Response System –

Commissioner Farmer – no new information to report.

9. Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Committee – Update - Commissioner Farmer

No new information – committee meetings scheduled for August.

10. Nominations for SSOC Chair and Vice Chair –

due to excused absences, the item will be continued to the next regular meeting of the SSOC in September.

11. Measure Z Evaluation Contract – OPD /DVP - Tonya Gilmore – Staff

Provided an update on the completion of the Professional Services Agreement with Urban Institute.

SAFETY AND SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

DRAFT REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, JULY 25, 2022 - 6:30 PM

- 12. Schedule Planning and Pending Agenda Items**
 - a. Verified Response System
 - b. Ad Hoc Committee Report
 - c. Expenditure Reports – OPD – DVP
 - d. Item #7 - League of Women Voters of Oakland
 - e. Item #10 - Nominations for SSOC Chair and Vice Chair

- 13. Adjournment – Motion to adjourn Chair Brown 2nd by Commissioner Tchoukleva @ 8:25pm**

SAFETY AND SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

SSOC created by the Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act of 2014

DRAFT REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2022 - 6:30 PM

VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING

ITEM 1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 6:35 by Chair Brown

ITEM 2. ROLL CALL

Present: Chairperson Carlotta Brown
Commissioner Omar Farmer
Commissioner Billy Dixon
Commissioner Beth Hodess
Vice Chair Paula Hawthorn
Commissioner Tchoukleva

Excused: Commissioner Sydney Thomas
Commissioner Michael Wallace

3. SSOC - AB 361 Resolution – Roll Call – All Present Approved

4. A. - Meeting Minutes from June 27, 2022 – motion by Vice Chair Hawthorn, 2nd by Commissioner Hodess - all approved

B. - Meeting Minutes from July 25, 2022 – no quorum – moved to 10-24-22 meeting

5. Open Forum - 4. Open Forum –Speaker – A. Olugbala –

Concerned about moving duties and responsibilities to the DOT and CPRA. And Updates on the Reimagining Public Safety Taskforce (RPSTF).

Speaker – R. Belew – audio not available – will discuss the two items from the RPSTF.

6. League of Women Voters (LOVW) of Oakland - An Assessment of Oakland Oversight Bodies: Progress, Gaps, and Recommendations for Improved Functions - Commissioner Hodess provided an overview of the report included with the agenda materials. SSOC was determined to be a Medium Oversight Body.

SAFETY AND SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

DRAFT REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 26, 2022- 6:30 PM

1 Public Speaker – A. Olugbala – noted concerns with LOWV and their support of items in the upcoming election. Commissioner Tchoukleva – suggested that Commissioner take notes on presentations during SSOC meetings to aid in recall of items of concern.

7. **Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Committee – Update** - Commissioner Farmer presented the proposed Strategic Plan and suggested a diverse set of objectives to aid in the work of the Commission and reviewed the schedule on how to implement the objectives.

Commissioners Hodess and Tchoukleva noted that a key duty of the Commission is to evaluate spending of Measure Z spending. Commissioner Hodess noted her concern that the Evaluation reports for OPD and the DVP are presented to the SSOC and no information is provided from the departments on addressing the recommendations or their implementation. She referenced a DVP presentation that some work performed by Grantees has been taken in-house and that was not an Evaluator recommended action. She also stated that the DVP is making determinations on their own and notifying the SSOC afterward.

Commissioner Dixon suggested that the item be moved to the October agenda.

Staff noted the item as an “Action” item in error Commissioner Farmer requested that the item should be informational. After discussion, Chair Brown moved to have the item return for discussion to the October 24, 2022, regular meeting, 2nd by Commissioner Hawthorn.

8. **Nominations for SSOC Chair and Vice Chair** - Vice Chair Hawthorn nominated as Chair, Commissioner Yoana Tchoukleva nominated as Vice Chair. Both accepted the nomination – vote to be held at the October 24, 2022, meeting.
9. **Measure Z Evaluation Contract – OPD /DVP** - Tonya Gilmore – Staff provided information on the progress of the Evaluations for OPD and DVP.
10. **Schedule Planning and Pending Agenda Items –**
- A. Election of Chair and Vice Chair
 - B. Evaluation update
 - C. RSPTF #54 and #55
 - D. Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Committee
 - E. Joint Meeting Presentation
13. **Adjournment – Motion to adjourn Vice Chair Hawthorn 2nd by Chair Brown @ 8:40pm.**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Public Safety and Services Oversight Commission (SSOC)
FROM: Tonya Gilmore, City Administrator's Office
DATE: October 19, 2022
SUBJECT: Review and Discussion of Reimagining Public Safety Taskforce Recommendations #54 and #55

SUMMARY:

Rik Belew, a community member, has requested that the SSOC review the Reimagining Public Safety Taskforce Recommendations number 54 and 55, which direct OPD to provide more detailed data on where, when and what types of crimes are being reported.

Mr. Belew points out that it is only in knowing that data that the SSOC can tell whether crime has decreased in the areas where there are functioning CROs.

Vice Chair Hawthorn Introduced Mr. Belew at the September 26, 2022, meeting and he was invited to attend the October 24, 2022, meeting to discuss these proposals and the role of the SSOC in support this effort.

The City Council decided these proposals were "actionable", to date, no action has been taken.

The link to more information is:

<https://www.oaklandca.gov/documents/reimagining-public-safety-task-force-report-and-recommendations-public-safety-committee-4-13-21>

Summaries can be found on pages 193-194 and are included.

ATTACHMENTS:

Pages 193 and 194 from Oakland Reimagining Public Safety Task Force
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Public Access to Oakland Police Department Data: Poor software is hampering OPD reporting transparency

24 September 2024

Richard K. Belew

Many citizens of Oakland believe more complete and accurate reporting of Oakland Police Department (OPD) data to Oakland citizens could provide transparency that can change the level of mutual trust both groups need desperately. Oakland's "Reimagining Public Safety" (RPS) effort in 2021 tried to think about Oakland's immediate and deep problems with increasing homicide rates and gun violence, OPD officer training and attrition, together with constructive solutions like MACRO, as parts of an integrated "Public Safety" policy.

This memo extends work done by the RPS Budget and Data Analysis Advisory Board to focus on issues with current OPD data reporting and internal information technology that underlies many aspects of public safety, from two perspective:

1. data produced by *future* software OPD, currently being planned by OPD and Oakland's Information Technology Department (ITD, which must be ensured will provide accurate and transparent data to the Police Commission, City Council and Oakland citizens; and
2. omissions in the data OPD is *currently* providing, which it has provided in the past, and which other comparable cities regularly provide.

This memo concludes with suggestions as to how Oakland's Police Commission and City Council can guide progress by OPD to improve mutual trust with the citizens it serves.

Development of "next generation" software to be used by OPD

The software OPD uses internally traditionally divides into two sub-systems, called "Record Management System" (RMS) and "Computer-aided Dispatch" (CAD). The versions of software used by OPD have been seen as obsolete since soon after they were implemented, in 2002. There have been multiple reports of on-going design activities between OPD and Oakland's Information Technology Department (ITD) towards new systems. These have been recently referenced in a [memo presented to Public Safety at their Sept 13 2022](#) meeting from Chief LeRonne L. Armstrong to City Manager Edward D. Reiskin:

The Oakland Police Department's (OPD) current record management system (RMS) is outdated and in the process of an upgrade. The Oakland Police Department (OPD) in partnership with the Information Technology Department (ITD) are in the process of implementing a new Motorola record management system (RMS) known as P1RMS.

Law Enforcement Agencies nationwide depend on their RMS – connected to the computer- assisted dispatch (CAD) systems for foundational record keeping of crime incidents and investigations. OPD relies on its RMS for day-to-day management of the tens of thousands of new cases, incidents and records created each year. OPD's current RMS allows for basic base- level record management; however, the system is outdated based on contemporary demand for complex records management and the need to develop new types of record keeping and file collaboration.

OPD, along with ITD is currently in the middle of a large and complex integration of a new Motorola P1RMS - Motorola's next generation RMS product. The new RMS is far more robust than the current RMS, particularly in its ability to be customized. A new case management system would need

to be connected to the RMS, as the RMS is the backbone record management system and record depository; case management systems need to ultimately refer to the incident numbers for data integrity as well as the need for accurate and correct police records.

In her appearance presenting this report to the Public Safety committee meeting, Dep. Chief Drennon Lindsay referenced the dependence of her analysis on broken existing RMS software, and of having to manually build “Excel” spreadsheets to get the statistics requested.

Searching thru Oakland records using [Legistar](#), the only mentions of “Motorola” in the last two years are:

- “OPD staff as well as staff from the City’s Information Technology Department (ITD) are working with Motorola Corporation on the installation of a new OPD Records Management System (RMS) with computer-assisted dispatch (CAD) for the OPD Communications Division (911 Dispatch).” [Report to City Council, July 19, 2022](#)
- “OPD has contracted with Motorola Solutions and has begun the implementation of a new CAD system.” [Public Safety meeting Mar 8 2022, Suppl2](#)

There are many mentions of Motorola software going back much farther:

- efforts *two years ago* as part of the [Information report on Grand Jury 911 report, Sept 4, 2020](#)

The existing CAD system is outdated and lacks many features common in today’s modern CAD systems. In 2015 the City issued an RFP for a new CAD system and in 2016 the contract was awarded to Motorola to build out a completely new CAD and Records Management System (RMS). Work on the new system began in 2018. ITD estimates that the new CAD system will be operational in 2021. To help speed the implementation and provide additional quality assurance, ITD contracted with additional resources to assist with the configuration of the CAD system to ensure that it is optimally configured and deployed.

- efforts *four years ago* to develop what was then called “PRIME 2.0” software to again modernize CAD support for OPD dispatch support and satisfy the Court mandated reporting required as part of Oakland’s Negotiated Settlement Agreement [Nov 13, 2019](#)

Negotiations on Phase 2 and Phase 3 contracts with Motorola were successfully concluded in October with deliverables scheduled for January 2020. Phase 3 of the project covers the ongoing Maintenance of the system upon completed implementation. It should be noted that the Phase 2 agreement contains provisions for implementation of a cloud-based CAD/RMS 911 (Computer Automated Dispatch/Records Management System) Disaster Recovery (DR) environment and supporting Motorola Managed Services to operate it. Inclusion of the DR environment is a major win for the residents of Oakland as it will facilitate continued operations of 911 and first responder dispatching in the event the City experiences a major disaster. Project completion for all phases of the project is tentatively estimated as the fourth quarter of 2020 or first quarter of 2021.

It is especially important to focus on the impact poor CAD software will have on efforts to implement and expand the MACRO program. According to the last [MACRO informational report, July 7, 2022](#):

MACRO responders have been self-dispatching “on-view”, meaning that MACRO responders identify an incident and intervene before it becomes a call into emergency services (police, fire, or medical).

MACRO leadership has worked closely with Fire & Police Communications to determine the appropriate timeline for transferring non-criminal, non-violent and non-emergent 911 calls to Fire

Communications for MACRO. The plan is to begin the transfer of certain categories of 911 calls to Fire Communications for MACRO dispatch by Monday July 18, 2022.

However, recent reporting shows that very few 911 calls are being dispatched to MACRO staff. MACRO program manager Edward Jones said in an [Oaklandside reports 15 August](#): "...for now [MACRO staff are] working only a 7 a.m. to 3 p.m. shift, as requested by dispatchers." MACRO gets only one dispatch-initiated call a day, [according to a KTVU report 19 Sept](#). According to another [KTVU report, 22 Sept](#), crippling staff shortages in Fire Department dispatch threaten MACRO and other Fire Department calls for service. Difficulties in staffing both OPD and Fire dispatch positions may be due to inadequate software support of them.

Going even back farther into the City Council records involving Motorola software for OPD is also interesting; cf. Figure 1. It reflects a continued pattern of apologetic excuses by ITD and OPD as to why Oakland's Police Commission, City Council, federal monitors, as well as Oakland citizens cannot get the requested reporting because of inadequate software, blamed on Motorola contracts.

In short, there is no reason to believe current work on "next generation" CAD and RMS software developed by the current Motorola, ITD and OPD design and implementation plan should be expected to lead to any different results than they have in the past. Oakland's Police Commission and City Council must act to ensure development of OPD software that serves them and Oakland much better than it has used for the last 20 years.

Inadequacies in current OPD reporting

As Chief Armstrong said (quoted above) "The Oakland Police Department's (OPD) current record management system (RMS) is outdated." One consequence of the aged system is the difficulty OPD has in providing public reporting.

OPD points to its currently available data resources on "OPD's Crime Data" page <https://www.oaklandca.gov/resources/police-incident-data>:

1. "Crime maps" is a link to a third-party vendor, CrimeMapping.com. Its primary flaws are that:
 - it provides only a limited (90 day) history of Oakland Crimes;
 - its classification of crime types does not capture the situation in Oakland; and especially
 - it is not possible to download data for analysis by community groups

A more complete evaluation can be found [here](#).

2. "Incident data" is a link to the ["CrimeWatch" page](#) part of the data.oaklandca.gov portal provided by Socrata. Its primary flaws are that:
 - it also provides only a limited (90 day) history of Oakland Crimes;
 - The incident reporting does not include Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) and California Penal Code attributes associated with the incidents that are critical to connecting this reporting to State of California and FBI reporting on crime and policing in Oakland, as well as tracking of these incidents through subsequent stages of criminal justice in Alameda courts.
 - the data flow from OPD through ITD servers to the Socrata resource has been significantly delayed and broken repeatedly over the last years. In response to multiple breakdowns in reporting reported by multiple community members, Chris Bolton (recently retired Deputy Chief of Police for OPD) described the situation in email (March 5, 2022): "Socrata is ITD. OPD does not maintain or control the feed or system. We make reports, enter into RMS, and use our own

systems to produce monthly and weekly reports by areas and citywide in addition to required state and UCR reporting.”

3. “Crime data reports” are OPD’s aggregation of major crimes, gunfire and ShotSpotter events. The primary flaws with this reporting are that:
 - These provide only WEEKLY SUMMARY statistics, not the details of individual incidents.
 - OPD publishes these reports as PDF, making any comparison with other data especially difficult.
 - They capture only UCR “Part 1” crimes, only about 10% of the volume of total incidents
4. OPD used to publish, from 2016 until October 2020, daily “patrol logs” that contained much information that was *not* provided anywhere else. In particular, the California Penal Code and UCR code associated with incidents was in the Patrol Logs but is not in the current Socrata data feed. The Patrol Logs also contain a great deal of information regarding these most serious crimes, for example including details on guns, victims, and items stolen. These logs have been provided for years and their drop has meant Oakland citizens have much less information about OPD operations. A public records request ([PRR# 21-5120](#)) was filed in an attempt to restart OPD publishing of patrol logs. OPD’s response was to publish a random set of daily reports from Oct-Dec 2020, and then closed the incident.
5. It is interesting to note that the other links at the bottom of “OPD’s Crime Data” [page](#), are redundant pointers to those just mentioned. That’s interesting, because the “Daily Logs” bullet remains but now points to the same Socrata data stream listed above; rather than removing the label, it is simply redirected.
6. Related issues involve the non-responsiveness OPD has had to public record requests (PRR). Mention of attempts to goad OPD into producing daily Patrol Logs has already been mentioned. In April, 2021 a state judge ruled that OPD has failed to produce documents in accordance with state and local transparency laws.(cf. [Oaklandside, April 7, 2021](#))

PRR requests used to be handled much differently, with detailed spreadsheets including important details like California Penal and UCR codes. A sample of earlier well-satisfied PRR includes:

- [RT-21121, May 17 2017](#): Despite what the NextRequest looks like now, this PRR generated *detailed* information (e.g, regarding the victim and suspect) on more than 500 crimes from 2005-2007. (This data can be made available if requested.)
- [RT-21044, May 12 2017](#): Similarly detailed information in *spreadsheet* format concerning almost 700 incident records from 2010-2017.
- [RT-7680, Jan 25, 2015](#), [RT-6313 Oct 13, 2014](#), [RT-5832, Sept 11, 2014](#) Similarly detailed information in *spreadsheet* format including statute/Penal Code and UCR data.
- [RT-1526, Dec 6, 2013](#) This much earlier request produced a much more forthcoming *spreadsheet* of more than 200000 incidents from 2007-2013. Critically, it did include Penal Code data!

In short, some time in 2017, OPD quit providing fully responsive requests to PRR’s. In 2020 they quit providing daily Patrol Logs. Over the last year even their reporting via Socrata has become more irregular. The system OPD uses for data reporting is getting worse.

Moving forward

Oakland’s efforts in 2021 to “Reimagine Public Safety” (RPS) were an effort by hundreds of citizens to move our city beyond OPD’s problematic past. The fledgling MACRO program that RPS helped to implement has given many parts of Oakland cause for hope. But it is important to think beyond this one program, to think about

Oakland's problems in 2022 with increasing homicide rates and gun violence, OPD officer training and attrition, together with MACRO progress, as parts of an integrated "Public Safety" policy.

One of RPS's primary recommendations was to institute a "Reimagining Public Safety Implementation Committee (RPSIC)" to ensure the wholistic RPS analysis lead to real progress. To date, there seem to have been no action to constitute such a committee.

More specifically-related to the data management and reporting issues addressed in this memo are Proposals 54 and 55 in the [Reimagining Public Safety report](#), summaries on p. 193-194, full recommendations attached. These proposals were developed by the RPS Budget and Data Analysis Advisory Board and received "Tier I," actionable scores by the RPS Task Force. They help to layout a more complete characterization of what truly "next generation" information technology would mean for OPD. These include:

- inclusion of the same California Penal Code and Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) codes in data provided to the public that attends reports to the FBI and California Department of Justice
- inclusion of additional data sources (e.g. the Department of Justice's [National Crime Victimization Survey](#)) supporting harm reduction, restorative justice, and trauma-informed approaches.
- agile, modernized data and records management tools, from smart-form field entry by sworn officers on mobile devices, to systems that interface well with data systems from the prosecutors' office
- building internal OPD data expertise rather than constantly depending on external vendors
- providing open interfaces that allow varied Oakland communities, from Neighborhood Crime Prevention Councils (NCPCs), to system-involved youth, to the elderly, to build their own tools suiting their special needs
- developing policies for and technologies implementing automated *redaction* of data (e.g., regarding sex offenses, minors) allowing more data to be shared with the public without requiring the manual attention of OPD sworn officers

Immediate action by the Police Commission and City Council is need to ensure more complete and accurate reporting by OPD both for Commission and Council oversight and to provide transparency for Oakland citizens trying to build mutual with our police.

Item #	Type	Status	File Created	Print	View	Info
22-0815	City Resolution	Passed	7/6/2022	7/15/2022		
22-0824	Report and Recommendation	In Council	6/8/2022	6/21/2022		
22-0836	Informational Report	Filed	1/27/2022	9/29/2022		
21-0592	Report and Recommendation	Passed	12/7/2021	3/10/2022		
21-0499	Informational Report	Filed	7/1/2020	9/15/2020		
18-0456	Informational Report	Filed	11/6/2019	12/10/2019		
18-1855	Informational Report	Filed	5/20/2019	6/25/2019		
18-1192	City Resolution	Passed	5/8/2019	5/21/2019		
18-1275	City Resolution	Passed	1/15/2019	2/5/2019		
18-1056	Ordinance	Passed	10/24/2018	6/4/2019		
18-1028	Informational Report	Filed	10/22/2018	12/4/2018		
18-0592	Informational Report	Filed	5/23/2018	4/25/2019		
18-0424	Informational Report	Filed	1/8/2018	5/15/2018		
12-0472	Report and Recommendation	Passed	9/5/2017	9/19/2017		
12-0403	Report and Recommendation	Filed	8/25/2017	9/12/2017		
15-1359	City Resolution	Passed	6/28/2017	7/19/2017		
15-1042	Informational Report	Filed	4/19/2018	1/16/2018		
15-1351	Report and Recommendation	Passed	6/26/2017	7/19/2017		
15-1348	Report and Ordinance	Passed	6/26/2017	7/19/2017		
15-1075	City Resolution	Passed	5/2/2017	6/9/2017		
15-0720	City Resolution	Passed	7/6/2016	7/26/2016		
15-0592	Informational Report	Filed	2/29/2016	3/17/2016		

Figure 1: Search for "Motorola" via Legistar

Public Access to Oakland Police Department Data Attachment 6

Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention
Oversight Commission (SSOC)

24 October 2022

- Summary of 24 September memo
- Action items

Memo summary

- Complete and accurate reporting of OPD data to Oakland citizens can provide needed transparency and increase mutual trust both groups need
- Continue momentum of Reimagining Public Safety (RPS) effort
 - Comm. Farmer, Hawthorn, Tchoukleva
- ***Two ways to improve the current situation***
 - 1) fix the existing problems***
 - Local groups (eg, NCPC neighborhoods, seniors, youth) need the ability to get data relevant to them
 - Daily patrol logs, available since 2016, disappeared in October, 2020
 - CrimeMapping.com solutions are sold to OPD, not for Oakland citizens
 - Publishing via data.oaklandca.gov (Socrata) is where it all should go
 - Lots of details in RPS Proposals 54 and 55
 - 2) make them right for the future***
 - *Design of “next generation” IT for OPD is going on **right now!!***
 - History of previous design efforts is dismal
 - impact of these issues on MACRO : “RMS” and “CAD” are part of a single system design
 - Reporting for Oakland citizens, but also for SSOC, Police Commission, City Council

What can SSOC do (itself)?

- Ask OPD regarding status of new system design
- Ask ITD regarding status of new system design
- Make use of FBI's Crime Victimization Survey
- NIBRS: FBI's National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)
 - UCR reporting retired in 2021!?
- Using “Verified Response” [Farmer & Holland] as a model

What can SSOC ask of others?

- Ask Police Commission re: ... (see above)
 - Rik has had good communications with Commission Inspector General Taylor and Chief of Staff Yun, esp. regarding missing daily Patrol Logs
- Ask OPD re: ... (see above)
 - Memo sent to Chief Armstrong and staff
- Ask Information Technology Division re: ... (see above)
 - Memo sent to Chief Info Officer Anton Batalla and Edward Reiskin and staff
- ***RPS Implementation Committee***: Ask Police Commission, City Council

Dream large!

- build internal OPD data management expertise
- Mobile data devices for OPD officers
 - with smart field completions: everybody wins
- *Redaction*: eliding sensitive data will continue to grow as a concern

RECOMMENDATION #54:

Recommendation Summary:

Proposal #54 focuses on modernization of IT within OPD. We recommend changes in IT procurement, staffing, and modernized data practices that will both improve internal OPD operations and support transparent data sharing with Oakland's City Council, administrators, commissions, the prosecutors' office, and the public.

Background and Statement of Need:

Oakland's IT administration has drafted weak Requests for Proposals that have gone into a slow procurement process, with contracts that commit to many years into the future. This has led to the purchase of systems that do not support the kind of policing that Oakland needs now. Worse, as need have changed, contract vendors have been unwilling to modify their systems, and OPD has also never invested in the internal expertise required to make these modifications. Oakland's DIT has attempted to help in some cases but cannot bring the policing expertise required.

OPD needs modernized data and records management tools. OPD must assess the best mechanisms to enable officers to easily, efficiently, and accurately file reports. These should go from smart form field entry and Calls for Service (CFS) data on mobile devices, through records management systems to effective delivery to the courts.

OPD must also invest in trained data scientists. In the past, OPD has employed unskilled staff unable to develop tools for data collection, integration, analysis, and sharing. Competent data specialists who can obtain information from sworn officers or other domain experts as required will ensure support for the data needs of the department and the City of Oakland as a whole.

Interfaces to these systems must support data communication with Oakland's City Council, administrators, commissions, the prosecutors' office, as well as affording public access. Redaction is emerging as an important process for modifying released data. State and federal law imposes

requirements (e.g., regarding sex offenses, minors) on the sorts of data that can be shared publicly. OPD must develop policies with clear guidance from the Police Commission and the City Attorney regarding any redaction they perform, including articulation of their implementation.

Related, [Recommendation #55](#) includes details regarding specific data to be published and the benefits of transparent data sharing.

[Link to more information.](#)

Estimated Timeframe:

Current IT contracts for OPD IT services expire Dec. 31, 2021. Preparation should begin immediately for effective procurement of software to replace them. Specification of interfaces and redaction processes can begin immediately. Hiring within OPD to support data analysis should happen at the first opportunity.

Estimated Cost:

Effective specification of useful IT systems within OPD, in contrast to the procurement process related by Mr. Peterson above, should sharply reduce wasted dollars that have been spent in the past. The primary new cost is that associated with a new data analyst position. Current salaries seem to range from \$65,000 to \$90,000 with 3 to 5 years of experience. Alameda has a position for a HR Data Analyst II at \$77,000.

Contact Information:

Rik Belew, rik@electronicartifacts.com, Budget, Data and Analysis, OPD Service Call Data and Analysis

RECOMMENDATION #55:

Recommendation Summary:

Proposal #55 addresses public access to information about OPD functioning. We recommend that OPD prioritize data management practices that ensure ongoing public access to specifically:

- Regular publishing of Calls for Service (CFS) and incident data
- Inclusion of contextual data regarding Oakland policing beyond what OPD chooses to share
- Open interfaces to OPD data that allow various community members to perform analyses of special concern to them

Background and Statement of Need:

Our working group's requests for data from OPD received delayed responses, incomplete responses to only portions of the request, or were not met at all. The CPSM report also makes it clear that OPD was willing to provide data (e.g., number of units/officers responding) to these consultants they would not share with the RPSTF. Yet as members of the RPSTF our ability to get data from OPD is far beyond what most Oakland residents can expect.

The 2019 CFS dataset was the first time this critical data has been made available to the public. OPD must make CFS data sharing a routine practice. Although OPD currently provides some **basic crime incident data** to the public (via Oakland's data.oaklandca.gov), these records are missing critical attributes (e.g., penal code, UCR codes) that make it impossible to reconcile with other reports OPD makes to the California DOJ and FBI. Including these attributes with incident data can and should be done immediately.

OPD's published data must be extended to include contextual information beyond what OPD chooses to release. The federal **National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)** surveys communities regarding their experience of crime, whether or not it has been reported to police. **California's DOJ** maintains records on civilian complaints and (RIPA) discretionary stops. OPD's **Slalom dashboard** maintains officer risk assessment data that the Police Commission, CPRA, and the CPAB can use to speed up accountability and the discipline process

to identify officers who, for example, engage in racial profiling. A report reconciling these other data sources with OPD's should be made to City Council quarterly.

Regular access to this data must be made via open data formats similar to those currently used for incident data, and not buried in PDF formatted documents. Using open standards and allowing programmatic (API) interfaces will allow Oakland's many community groups to build tools focused on questions especially relevant to them.

Proposal #54 focuses on modernization of IT within OPD that will support this recommendation. **Proposal #49** (cf. Recommendation 4) recommends a similar data analyst position, and on-going data oversight responsibilities.

[Link to more information.](#)

Estimated Timeframe:

Some changes can be implemented immediately. OPD should present a timeline to strengthen and institutionalize data transparency soon, and incorporate reconciliation with other data within one year.

Estimated Cost:

Proposed changes involve changed OPD data sharing practices and should not require additional budget.

Contact Information:

Rik Belew, rik@electronicartifacts.com

SSOC

Strategic Plan

(proposed)

DEC 2022 – DEC 2024

Table of Contents

1

Introduction

2

Mission

3

Overview

4

Purpose

5

Vision

6

Values

7

Goals

8

Parts I, II, III, & IV

9

Implementation

10

References

Introduction

In 2021, the SSOC presented at our joint public safety meeting a presentation entitled "The Efficacy of Measure Z". The presentation built upon several annual evaluations.

Similarly, this Strategic Plan builds upon prior evaluations and goals of the Ordinance. It aims to present a pathway for how the SSOC can better further the goals of Measure Z ("MZ") to:

1. Reduce homicides, robberies, burglaries, and gun-related violence
2. Improve police and fire emergency 911 response times and other police services
3. Invest in violence intervention and prevention strategies that provide support for at-risk youth and young adults to interrupt the cycle of violence and recidivism [12, 20]

Mission

To ensure that the Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Oversight Commission (“SSOC”) fulfills its duties under Measure Z in an effective and strategic manner, resulting in improved public safety, a more informed community, and a healthier quality of life for all Oakland residents. [1]

Overview

Through a coordinated effort in 2004 known as “Oakland Unite”, voters approved funding via Measure Y to augment essential police and fire services and to create violence prevention and intervention programs. When Measure Y expired in 2014, voters approved another measure, similar in scope, entitled the Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act, also known as Measure Z. It expires in 2024. [2]

MZ created the SSOC to oversee revenue spending by departments that receive funding and implement programs under the Ordinance: Oakland Police Department (“OPD”), Oakland Fire Department (“OFD”), and the Department of Violence Prevention (“DVP”). DVP wasn’t fully established until 2017 so it’s still in its early stages of development compared to the other departments.

More specifically, the SSOC is tasked with evaluating, inquiring, and reviewing the administration and coordination of strategies and practices mandated by the Ordinance.

In 2019, many of the aforementioned reasons for implementing both measures were exacerbated by the development of the COVID-19 pandemic, which still exists today. The pandemic has taken additional emotional and financial tolls on our public safety resources and the community at large. It also prevented requirements mandated through MZ from being completed, such as complete data collection for evaluations. [23]

This Strategic Plan will help us carry out our duties by:

- (1) assisting us with adapting to pre-existing, new, or evolving circumstances;
- (2) by highlighting where we've been, where we are now, where we want to be, and how we're going to get there

The scope of any recommendations made by us to the City Administration, City Council, or appropriate personnel, shall relate directly to the efficacy of strategies to achieve desired MZ outcomes, or to issues raised in evaluations. [3, 4, 5, 6]

Purpose

On April 25, 2022, the SSOC unanimously approved the creation of a Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Committee. [7]

While not a requirement, the SSOC has never had a strategic plan despite the fact that strategic planning is one of the fundamental duties of any commission. Strategic planning is a disciplined effort to produce decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization is, what it does, and why it does it. [8]

The specific purpose of the ad hoc was to create a strategic plan for the commission to adopt as a whole. The ad hoc convened bi-monthly from May 10th to September 14th.

Having a strategic plan will help the SSOC better serve the community through current and future challenges.

Vision

A flexible and adaptive Strategic Plan will assist the SSOC in establishing priorities and a roadmap for achieving its goals over the next two years or beyond.

The plan is not intended to be prescriptive: the objectives outlined in the plan are presented for consideration, not automatic implementation. The plan should also be able to adapt to new or evolving circumstances, such as municipal, state, regional, or national issues.

Most of the plan is designed to be planned and executed through reports presented during the monthly meetings of the Commission. This can happen through long and short-term agenda planning. Some of the items may need to be planned and initiated through ad hoc committees or outreach to the public, then reported on during monthly meetings.

It's also reasonable to expect some trial and error. A status report on the plan should be conducted at a minimum annually. The plan has been memorialized in writing so we can refer to it regularly and track our progress.

Values

Below are four core values that reflect this plan's intent and spirit. We hope these values will guide us in carrying out our duties and improving MZ outcomes.

- **RESPECT & COURTESY** create space for honest conversations, which fosters greater participation and rewards us with perspectives we may not have otherwise considered. [9]
- **EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION MAKING** requires us to consider quantitative and qualitative data before making decisions. [41]
- **IMPACT-ORIENTATION** allows us to develop goals that build trust and confidence with the public and offer us the opportunity to be more effective.
- **TEAMWORK** can be directly linked to increased productivity because it inspires us to work together toward a common goal.

Goals: Parts I, II, III, & IV

Part 1

Financial Accountability & Transparency

Stemming from the Duty of the Commission to:

"Review fiscal and performance audits and evaluations" and "report issues identified", refine or create methods for clearly evaluating how MZ funds are spent on programs mandated by the Ordinance.

MZ Part I, Section 4A6(d)-(e) [14]

Part 2

Evaluation of Violence Reduction Measures

Stemming from the Duty of the Commission to:

"Evaluate, inquire, and review the administration, coordination, and evaluation of strategies and practices mandated by MZ." MZ Part I, Section 4A6a [18] [11]

Part 3

Community Outreach & Engagement

Stemming from the Duty of the Commission to:

"Conduct public informational meetings on the subject of public safety" and establish a structured way to consistently reach out to the public and discuss the efficacy of MZ. [MZ Part I, Section 4A5 & 4A6(f)] [12]

Part 4

Policies & Practices to Improve MZ Outcomes

Stemming from the Duty of the Commission to:

"Recommend ordinances, resolutions, & regulations to ensure compliance with the requirements and intent of the Ordinance." MZ Part I, Section 4A6(f) [13]

Part I: Financial Accountability & Transparency

Stemming from the Duties of the Commission to:

"Review fiscal and performance audits and evaluations" and "report issues identified", refine or create methods for clearly evaluating how MZ funds are spent on programs mandated by the Ordinance.

OBJECTIVE 1.1

Receive a report on issues identified in annual fiscal and performance audits that effect MZ resources.

OBJECTIVE 1.2

Receive an annual report from DVP on: (1) the estimated number of residents who are victims of Gender-Based Violence ("GBV"); (2) out of the 4,200 estimated residents DVP will be able to serve per year, what percentage are victims of commercial sexual exploitation, intimate partner violence, and sexual violence; and (3) how much is being spent per person per category.

OBJECTIVE 1.3

Receive a report from OPD on their ability to maintain sufficient resources to accomplish MZ geographic policing goals.

OBJECTIVE 1.4

Receive an annual report from the Special Victims Section (aka SVS) on geographic policing resources used to combat domestic violence, child abuse and the commercial sexual exploitation of children.

Part II: Evaluation of Violence Reduction Measures

Stemming from the Duty of the Commission to:

"Evaluate, inquire, and review the administration, coordination, and evaluation of strategies and practices mandated by MZ."

OBJECTIVE 2.1

Receive an annual Ceasefire MZ specific report that illustrates to the public the effectiveness of this violence reduction measure. [39]

OBJECTIVE 2.2

Receive an annual report on the percentage of time CRO's have spent conducting geographical policing activities, and request a metric to be created that measures how their work supports MZ goals or work with them to create one. [21, 32, 35, 37]

OBJECTIVE 2.3

Receive an annual report on the percentage of time OPS 1–3 personnel (aka CRTs) have spent conducting geographical policing activities, and request a metric to be created that measures how their work supports MZ goals or work with them to create one. [19, 36]

OBJECTIVE 2.4

Create a document that tracks all recommendations from Evaluations. This will help us gain a deeper understanding of the timeline for implementation on each recommendation and whether they are ultimately successful.

OBJECTIVE 2.5

Receive an annual update concerning diversity, recruitment and retention for MZ-funded positions. [28, 31, 38]

OBJECTIVE 2.6

Receive a report on success markers for OFD in relation to the three primary objectives of MZ, including analysis from OFD & OPD concerning their 911 response times. [18, 40]

Part III: Community Outreach & Engagement

Stemming from the Duty of the Commission to:

"Conduct public informational meetings on the subject of public safety" and establish a structured way to consistently reach out to the public and discuss the efficacy of MZ.

OBJECTIVE 3.1

Consider creating a community engagement committee to discuss the efficacy of MZ with members of the public that may benefit from this information.

OBJECTIVE 3.2

Create an SSOC annual report that includes work on Strategic Plan objectives, and present it at the joint meeting.

Part IV: Policies & Practices to Improve MZ Outcomes

Stemming from the Duty of the Commission to:

Recommend ordinances, resolutions, & regulations to ensure compliance with the requirements and intent of the Ordinance."

OBJECTIVE 4.1

Consider recommending Ordinances, Resolutions, or Regulations that support the three primary objectives of MZ. [13]

Objective Summary

- 1.1** Receive a report on issues identified in annual fiscal and performance audits that effect MZ resources.
- 1.2** Receive an annual report from DVP on GBV expenditures.
- 1.3** Receive a report from OPD on their ability to maintain sufficient resources to accomplish geographic policing goals.
- 1.4** Receive an annual report from the Special Victims Section on geographic policing.
- 2.1** Receive an annual Ceasefire MZ specific report.
- 2.2** Receive and annual CRO MZ specific report.
- 2.3** Receive and annual OPS 1-3 MZ specific report
- 2.4** Create a document that tracks all recommendations from Evaluations.
- 2.5** Receive an annual update concerning diversity, recruitment and retention for MZ-funded positions.
- 2.6** Receive a report on success markers for OFD + analysis of 911 times.
- 3.1** Create a community engagement plan.
- 3.2** Create an SSOC annual report and present it at the joint meeting.
- 4.1** Consider recommending Ordinances, Resolutions, or Regulations.

Implementation

The Strategic Plan has 13 total objectives that were designed to be implemented over the course of eleven to twelve months, predominantly through long and short-term agenda planning.

Alternatively, since starting in December there will be twenty-four months until the expiration of MZ, we have the flexibility to create new objectives or to spread out the implementation of these over the course of 18-24 months. Below is a breakdown of how each is designed to be initiated:

- 9 are reports we'll receive from other departments
- 2 involve new committees
- 2 involve policies or metrics we give ourselves the option of creating

All are designed to consistently track the efficacy of the ordinance, to educate the public, and to give ourselves the option of having more tools to deliver better outcomes.

Creating Objectives

The following scoring system will help guide us in creating or changing Strategic Plan objectives. The intent is to have a diverse set of objectives that cover the span of MZ goals.

Oversight actions described by the Ordinance for the SSOC to take, such as "evaluate, inquire, review, report, and recommend", can be used as starting points for creating or initiating new objectives.

A racial equity section is included to foster equitable outcomes. This will assist us in serving the population we represent.

- 1) Financial Accountability & Transparency 1 point
- 2) Emergency Response Times 1 point
- 3) Geographic Policing 1 point
- 4) Violence Prevention & Intervention 1 point
- 5) Community Outreach & Engagement 1 point
- 6) Policy Recommendation 1 point
- 7) Maintenance of Sworn Personnel 1 point
- 8) Fire Services Delivery or Training 1 point
- 9) Practice Recommendation 1 point

Racial Equity

- 10) Improves access to public safety services 1 point
- 11) Addresses systemic & institutional racism 1 point
- 12) Empowers disproportionately affected populations 1 point

Objective Scoring

TIER 1: <u>3.1</u> Create a community engagement plan. [1, 3, 4, 5, 12 = 5 pts]	TIER 1: <u>2.1</u> Receive a detailed annual Ceasefire report. [3, 4, 5, 12 = 4 pts]	TIER 1: <u>2.2</u> Receive and annual CRO MZ specific report. [3, 4, 9, 10 = 4 pts]
TIER 1: <u>4.1</u> Consider recommending Ordinances, Resolutions, or Regulations. [2, 4, 9, 6, 10, 12 = 6 pts]		
TIER 2: <u>2.6</u> Receive a report on success markers for OFD + analysis of 911 times. [2, 4, 8 = 3 pts]	TIER 2: <u>2.3</u> Receive and annual OPS 1-3 MZ specific report. [3, 4, 9 = 3 pts]	TIER 2: <u>2.5</u> Receive an annual update concerning diversity, recruitment and retention for MZ-funded positions. [3, 7, 11 = 3 pts]
TIER 2: <u>2.4</u> Create a document that tracks all recommendations from Evaluations. [1, 3, 4 = 3 pts]	TIER 2: <u>1.3</u> Receive a report from OPD on their ability to maintain sufficient resources to accomplish MZ geographic policing goals. [1, 6, 7 = 3 pts]	TIER 3: <u>1.1</u> Receive a report on issues identified in annual fiscal and performance audits that effect MZ resources. [1, 4 = 2 pts]
TIER 3: <u>1.4</u> Receive an annual report from SVS on geographic policing. [1, 4 = 2 pts]	TIER 3: <u>1.2</u> Receive an annual report from DVP on GBV expenditures. [1, 4 = 2 pts]	TIER 3: <u>3.2</u> Create an SSOC annual report and present it at the joint meeting. [5, 6 = 2 pts]

1st Quarter Agenda Example

December 2022	January 2023	February 2023
<u>3.1</u> Discuss creating a community engagement plan.	<u>1.4</u> Receive an annual report from SVS on geographic policing.	<u>1.3</u> Receive a report on OPD's hiring or retention practices concerning how they plan to achieve MZ geographic policing personnel goals.
Item 2?	<u>1.2</u> Receive an annual report from DVP on GBV expenditures.	Item 2?

2nd Quarter Agenda Example

March 2023	April 2023	May 2023
<u>2.1</u> Receive a detailed annual Ceasefire report.	<u>2.2</u> Receive and annual CRO MZ specific report.	<u>2.4</u> Create a document that tracks all recommendations from Evaluations.
Item 2?	<u>2.3</u> Receive and annual OPS 1-3 MZ specific report	Item 2?

3rd Quarter Agenda Example

June 2023	July 2023	Aug 2023 (retreat)
<p><u>2.5</u> Receive an annual update concerning diversity and recruitment for MZ-funded positions.</p>	<p><u>2.6</u> Receive a report on success markers for OFD + analysis of 911 times.</p>	<p><u>4.1</u> Discuss drafting or recommending Ordinances, Resolutions, or Regulations.</p>
<p>Item 2?</p>	<p><u>1.1</u> Receive a report on issues identified in annual fiscal and performance audits that effect MZ resources.</p>	<p><u>3.2</u> Create an annual report that includes the completion of Strategic Plan objectives, and present it at the joint meeting (start)</p>

4th Quarter Agenda Example

September 2023	October 2023	Nov or Dec 2023
<p><u>3.2</u> Create an annual report that includes the completion of Strategic Plan objectives, and present it at the joint meeting (finish)</p>	<p>Present objective <u>3.2</u> at Joint Meeting?</p>	<p>Present objective <u>3.2</u> at Joint Meeting?</p>

Thank you for listening!

References

1. MZ page 1, paragraphs 2 and 5, and page 2, Part 1, Section 1B
2. MZ Section 4A, page 7
3. MZ page 1 paragraph 6
4. MZ page 2 Part 1 Section 1(A)
5. MZ Section 4(A)6(a) page 8
6. MZ Section 4(A)6(b), page 8
7. SSOC 4/25/22 Meeting Items 7 and 10
8. Strategic Planning for Public & Nonprofit Organizations: A Guide to Strengthening & Sustaining Organizational Achievement (3rd edition), page 6
9. Oakland Board & Commission Member Handbook "Collaborating with the public" page 10
10. MZ section 4 "Planning, Accountability And Evaluation" page 7
11. MZ section 4A6(a)(b), page 8
12. Efficacy of MZ presentation 12/7/21
13. MZ section 4A6F, page 9
14. MZ section 4 "Planning, Accountability And Evaluation" page 7
15. MZ Part II, Section 4(B), page 14, and Section 5, page 15
16. MZ Part I, Section 3(A), page 3
17. MZ Part I, Section 3(C)2(c)(d), pages 4-5
18. MZ section 4A6(a)(b), page 8
19. SSOC 6/27/22 Meeting Items 6 and 7
20. MZ section 4A6F, pg 9
21. OPD 2020 Evaluation, page 2 paragraph 4, and last line on page
22. OPD 2020 Evaluation, page 3 2nd bullet item
23. OPD 2020 Evaluation, page 4, paragraph 1
24. OPD 2020 Evaluation, page 6, paragraphs 1 and 2
25. OPD 2020 Evaluation, page 6, paragraph 3
26. SSOC By-Laws, Article IX, page 7
27. Robert's Rules 11th Edition, page 328
28. OPD 2020 Evaluation, pages 10-12
29. OPD 2020 Evaluation Recommendation 2, page 25
30. OPD 2020 Evaluation Recommendation 3, page 26
31. OPD 2020 Evaluation Recommendation 4, page 26
32. OPD 2020 Evaluation Recommendation 5, page 26
33. OPD 2020 Evaluation Recommendation 6, page 27
34. OPD 2020 Evaluation Recommendation 7, page 27
35. OPD 2018 Evaluation Finding #2, page 42
36. OPD 2018 Evaluation Finding #13 page 46
37. OPD 2018 Evaluation Recommendation #4, page 48
38. OPD 2019 Evaluation Recommendation #6, page 29
39. Ceasefire Evaluation 2018, page 100
40. SSOC 6/27/22 Meeting Item 7
41. Oakland Board & Commission Member Handbook "Expressions of Personal Opinion" page 9

Public Safety and Services Oversight Commission (SSOC)

November 29, 2022

**Report to Joint Meeting of the
Oakland City Council, Police Commission and the
Community Policing Advisory Board**

Measure Z Mandated Duties of Commission

- 1) Evaluate, inquire & review the administration, coordination and evaluation of strategies and practices mandated in Resolution 85149 C.M.S.**
- 2) Make recommendations to City Administrator regarding scope of program evaluation**
- 3) Receive draft performance reviews before evaluator finalizes the report**
- 4) Report issues identified in the annual fiscal audit to the Mayor & City Council**
- 5) Review annual fiscal and performance audits & evaluations**

Measure Z Mandated Duties of Commission

- 6) Report in a public meeting to the Mayor & City Council on the implementation of MZ and recommend ordinances etc to ensure compliance with the requirements of MZ**
- 7) Provide input on strategies: at least every 3 years each head of a department receiving funds from MZ shall present a spending plan for the funds received from MZ**
- 8) Semi-annual progress reports shall be received by Commission from the departments receiving funds updating their progress toward desired outcomes.**

Evaluate, inquire & review the administration, coordination and evaluation of strategies and practices mandated in this Ordinance

- **SSOC has received & reviewed reports from OPD, Ceasefire and the DVP**
- **Fire Department does not have separate MZ accounting**

Make recommendations to City Administrator regarding scope of program evaluation

- Commissioner Beth Hodess represented SSOC on the RFP Panel for DVP evaluation

Receive draft performance reviews before evaluator finalizes the report

- Does not ever happen

Report issues identified in the annual fiscal audit to the Mayor & City Council

- Has not ever happened

Review annual fiscal and performance audits & evaluations

- Reviewed reports from the Fire department, OPD and DVP

Report in a public meeting to the Mayor & City Council on the implementation of MZ and recommend ordinances etc to ensure compliance with the requirements of MZ

- Commissioner Omar Farmer is working on a proposal regarding fire alarm response

Provide input on strategies: at least every 3 years each head of a department receiving funds from MZ shall present a spending plan for the funds received from MZ

- Fire dept does not account for MZ funds separately; SSOC reviewed DVP spending plan and is awaiting OPD Spending Plan

Semi-annual progress reports shall be received by Commission from the departments receiving funds updating their progress toward desired outcomes.

- This does not happen. Instead, the results of the evaluations are reported
- Evaluations (mandated by MZ) are done by outside experts. The contract for evaluations of Ceasefire and DVP were delayed in getting renewed, so there were no evaluations received in the last 12 months.

Conclusion

- SSOC had a quorum for each meeting this year, which is a success given that most of the time we are down a member or two due to people not being appointed.
- SSOC was informed of the dissolution of the CRTs and the CRTs being absorbed into the new VCOC after the fact
- SSOC was informed of the reorganization of DVP after the fact