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I. INITIATIVE WIDE FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2009-10 evaluation of the Measure Y initiative was designed to determine the impact of Measure Y funded Community Policing and Violence Prevention Programming. Each section of the report provides the results of this year’s evaluation. The following is a summary of key findings and recommendations:

Community Policing Findings & Recommendations

This year’s evaluation focused on documenting trends in problem solving among Problem Solving Officers (PSOs) funded by Measure Y and examined progress in implementing 2008-09 evaluation recommendations. Among the most important findings:

1. Full implementation of Measure Y staffing levels has been sustained since 2008.

2. The Department has instituted a new data system for tracking problem solving activity (the SARA database), which means that information is available on the number and type of problems solved.

3. The Department has made progress towards further articulating its vision of community policing throughout the Department through its strategic plan, community oriented policing manual, and PSO performance appraisal system.

4. Close to half of opened projects were solved, with quality of life concerns achieving the highest closure rates.

5. Inconsistent and uneven usage of the SARA database limits the availability of accurate data on the level of problem solving activity across all beats. There are significant variations in the number of problems solved per beat.

6. While turnover has improved, interruptions in service due to temporary reassignment and loans continue to interfere with problem solving efforts in some beats. The personnel tracking system does not appear to accurately track certain types of leave.

The City of Oakland is now in its fifth year of implementing Measure Y. The evaluation makes the following recommendations:

1. Continue to strengthen reporting and tracking systems, in particular the SARA database. Develop procedures and protocols for entering and closing projects into the database, including clarifying what does and does not constitute a “project.” Continue to refine the system so that data entry is user-friendly and so that it has the capacity to generate meaningful reports to PSOs, their supervisors, and Department leadership.

2. Build on recent efforts to articulate a vision of community policing by defining the percent of effort PSOs should dedicate to each of their assigned duties. Incorporate principles of adult learning into PSO trainings and
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activities. Strengthen management and accountability systems for PSOs.

3. Develop Department procedures to provide consistent coverage to each beat should a temporary reassignment occur. Create a process to transfer beat information between problem solving officers.

Violence Prevention Program Findings & Recommendations

This year’s initiative evaluation of Violence Prevention Programming examined the outcomes of clients who both received sustained and ongoing services and consented to participate in evaluation activities. Among the most important findings:

1. Probationers and parolees experienced decreased in recidivism after receiving Measure Y services. Retention of participants in group and individual services appears to be yielding rich results in terms of decreased recidivism among youth and adults. Work experience and vocational training were associated with fewer violations of probation.

2. Measure Y youth experienced improved attendance and reduced suspensions after enrollment in Measure Y. Group services were found to positively impact attendance, behavior, and academic performance indicators.

3. While Measure Y clients reported improved employment and confidence in finding a job after receiving Measure Y services, a very small percentage of clients were able to retain employment beyond six months. Despite the challenges with the reporting of employment outcomes, placing and retaining clients in long term employment appears to be an issue.

4. While the analysis of case managed youth found that more intensively case managed youth are higher risk, case management showed no impact on the indicators examined here.

5. Measure Y clients reported strengthened resiliency and improved protective factors after receiving Measure Y services.

Given these findings, the evaluation makes the following recommendations:

1. Measure Y should explore case management models that have proven to be effective with the reentry population and identify opportunities to strengthen the use of evidence based case management models.

2. Measure Y should expand the use of a validated risk assessment tool for all clients, to ensure that individuals are receiving an appropriate type and level of intervention and service based on their level of risk for recidivism. Without such information, it is difficult to determine whether different outcomes by service type were an effect of programming or differences in client risk factors.

3. Measure Y should prioritize programming that offers clients the opportunity to participate in group activities, as retention in group services yielded positive outcomes.
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4. Measure Y should develop a uniform system utilizing the CitySpan Information System to track employment placement and retention, which would enable more specific data on employment related-outcomes to be collected and analyzed. Further, the Department of Human Services should work with programs and evaluators to better align the monitoring and evaluative functions of the CitySpan database.
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I. INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the 2009-10 evaluation of the Community Policing Neighborhood Services (CPNS) component of Measure Y. The primary focus of this year’s evaluation is on the implementation of Community Policing, with a particular emphasis on problem solving. This report also provides information on the services provided by Measure Y-funded Youth and Family Services Division officers and revisits the 2008-09 recommendations outlined in the first evaluation report, providing an update on their implementation over the past year.

The following evaluation questions provide the framework for the 2009-10 evaluation:

**Evaluation Questions:**
1. Is Oakland implementing a model of community policing that adheres to the principles of Measure Y and its applicable resolutions?
2. Are Problem-Solving Officers solving problems of concern to residents in their beats?
3. Did Youth and Family Services Division Units funded by Measure Y deliver services as expected?
4. Has the Oakland Police Department made progress in implementing the recommendations from the 2008-09 evaluation?

II. METHODS

A number of qualitative and quantitative methods were used to answer the questions outlined above, including key informant interviews, analysis and audits of the problem solving database (SARA), ridealongs, observations, and analyses of Oakland Police Department documents and materials. Significant progress was made this year in creating the conditions that are necessary for conducting an in depth evaluation of community policing in Oakland. This year was the first year in which data from the the SARA database was available for analysis.

**SARA Database Audit and Analysis**

SARA is the method that problem solving officers (PSOs) use to address issues and concerns in their beat. The SARA database is the primary source of information about problem solving. A web-based system, the SARA database was developed in 2008 in order to track problem solving activity. PSOs enter information on each problem they are working to solve (known as projects) and the steps they have taken to solve them. A supervisor must review and sign-off on each solved project in order for it to be registered as “closed.” The SARA database provides the evaluation with information about how problems were identified, the nature of problems, comparisons across beats, and the level of overall PSO efficiency in relation to problem solving. Beginning in January 2010, evaluators conducted monthly audits of the SARA database to assess usage by PSOs and to document trends in problem solving. Results of audits were shared with the Police Department leadership to facilitate more consistent usage across the Department. At the end of the year, problem solving data was analyzed to understand the number and type of problems opened and closed, problem...
solving trends across the city, and the sources of problem origin/identification.

**Ridealongs**
Seven ridealongs were conducted in the highest stressor beats in each of the three police service areas. Ridealongs provide evaluators with the opportunity to observe the range of duties and activities that make up a problem solving officer’s day. Using structured protocols to record ridealong observations, evaluators accompanied PSOs as they went about their daily work for a two hour period. The ridealongs included observations of police line-ups, police/resident interactions, problem solving activities, patrol of the beat and collaboration with other department units and community partners. Observation records were entered into a database and analyzed for key themes.

**Key Informant Interviews**
Evaluators conducted ten key informant interviews with police services staff from the management and leadership levels of the Department. Interviews were conducted with two Deputy Chiefs, three Captains, four Lieutenants, and one Sergeant and explored topics related to problem solving, PSO duties and responsibilities, performance measures and systems of accountability, perceived impact of Measure Y funded services, and progress in implementing the recommendations of the 2009-10 year. Evaluators met with police department leadership several times over the course of the year to request information and share results of the SARA database audit.

**Observations of PSO Trainings**
Evaluators observed PSO trainings in order to gain an understanding of the preparation that PSOs received to perform their work in the community. Training materials, such as PowerPoints and handouts were also reviewed.

**Review of OPD Documents & Data**
The evaluation included review and analysis of relevant OPD personnel, planning, and operational documents to explore the extent to which 2008-09 recommendations had been implemented and to gain a better understanding about the ways that community policing is being integrated into Department practices. Personnel documents were reviewed to determine whether or not staffing levels were sustained. The following documents were reviewed:
- Personnel recruitment materials
- Performance appraisals
- Personnel and assignment data
- Oakland Police Department Strategic Plan (Draft)
- Community Oriented Policing Manual (Draft)
- Youth and Family Services Division Deliverable Reports

---

**III. COMMUNITY POLICING IN OAKLAND**

**Community Policing Neighborhood Services Funded by Measure Y**
Measure Y funding to the Oakland Police Department covers the personnel costs of 63 officers, as well as related training and equipment costs. The bulk of funding pays
for a PSO in each of Oakland’s 57 beats.¹ PSOs represent the key agents of the Department’s community policing effort. Their primary role is to solve problems of concern to residents in their assigned neighborhood beat. Measure Y funds also cover six crime reduction team (CRT) officers, who are responsible for proactively addressing sources of criminal activity in their police service area. Three units in the Youth and Family Services Division receive the remainder of funding to cover the costs of eight investigative officers assigned to the Domestic Violence, Special Victims, and Vice/Exploitation Units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Y Expenditures: 2009-10²</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>2009-10 Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 PSOs</td>
<td>$8,076,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 CRTs</td>
<td>$1,211,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 YFSD Officers</td>
<td>$1,818,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$254,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>$16,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$11,377,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Role of the Problem Solving Officer in Implementing Community Policing
In some cities problem solving and community policing approaches are integrated throughout the Police Department, where all officers are charged with its implementation.³ In others, including Oakland, community policing exists as a separate unit or initiative within the Police Department, where a specific group of officers are responsible for carrying out its key activities. In the Oakland Police Department, PSOs are each assigned to a neighborhood beat and work collaboratively with Neighborhood Crime Prevention Councils (NCPCs) to address community-identified problems. PSOs have a myriad of roles and responsibilities—law enforcement, community organizing, public relations, problem solving, crime analysis and investigation, and collaboration with city agencies and staff. They are also responsible for developing in depth information about the assets, neighborhood and community based groups and organizations, crime trends, and sources of criminal activity that impact the quality of life and safety in their beat. They are charged with mobilizing and educating residents about their role in making their communities more livable, as well as garnering city and community resources to solve problems. They represent a bridge between the Department and residents in their beat; interactions with residents can strengthen or weaken that bridge, the public’s trust in the Department, and ultimately, how safe residents feel in their neighborhood.

---

¹ Measure Y Covers the cost of 49 PSOs (including officers and sergeants); 13 additional PSOs are paid through the General Fund.
² Source: Oakland Police Department, Fiscal Services. 2009-10.
³ Problem solving is frequently used interchangeably with community policing. Community policing is an orientation or approach, whereas problem solving is a strategy that is frequently a key element to successful implementation, but can be implemented independently from community policing.
The Role of the NCPCs
In Oakland, the Neighborhood Crime Prevention Councils (NCPC) are the primary vehicle for stakeholders to make their communities safer and more livable, though neighborhood watch programs, resident involvement in reporting and identification of sources of criminal activity, and community education programs are additional avenues for residents to get involved. PSOs are charged with working on at least three NCPC priority problems at a time, attending NCPC meetings, and reporting back on their progress.

Linkages/Collaboration with Other City Services
Effective community policing connects communities with needed city resources (e.g., Public Works, Planning, etc.), and also results in stronger partnerships between residents and local government leadership (e.g., city council representatives), neighborhood schools, small businesses, churches, and other agencies working towards common goals. Linkages with other city services are frequently made at NCPC meetings, through the Neighborhood Services Department staff and programs (in particular, the Neighborhood Services Coordinators), through the Service Delivery Systems, and through the offices of City Council members. Working closely with Neighborhood Services Coordinators, PSOs bring together the resources and response required to solve community problems.

Geographic Organization of Services
Oakland’s current force is organized geographically at the command area, district and beat level. Organizing the force by geography is considered a best practice in community policing and is a strategy for distributing police services more equitably throughout the city. Geographic organization of services also facilitates police-community relationships and strengthens accountability.
Problem Solving in Oakland
The key deliverable of a problem solving officer is a successfully solved problem. The table below outlines the key phases of problem solving, from the identification of a problem to the successful closure of a problem.

Phases of Problem Solving: from Identification to Closure

- **Problem Identification**
  - NCPC Meeting/Priority: Identified at NCPC meeting as a problem
  - City Agency: Service Delivery System, City Council, Code enforcement, Other city agencies
  - OPD: Patrol officers, PSO observation, Drug Hotline, Calls for Service, Department Priority

- **Problem Solving**
  - PSOs use the SARA Model. They collaborate with city agencies, community based organizations, specialized units within the Dept., and other stakeholders to bring successful resolution to the problem

- **Reporting to the Community**
  - PSOs provide an update on resolution of the problem to the community and educate residents about next steps and resources to prevent and address certain kinds of problems. This typically occurs at NCPC meetings

Problems and Projects
A “problem” refers to any issue of concern that occurs within a specific neighborhood beat. Problems may include those associated with criminal activity (such as burglary, theft, assault, or homicides), as well as quality of life problems, such as graffiti, traffic, blight, or illegal dumping. A project refers broadly to any problem that a PSO dedicates sufficient and ongoing attention to solve. Typically, the top three NCPC identified priorities qualify as projects. PSOs may also open projects on problems that they, their supervisors, the Department or other stakeholders have observed to be significant sources of criminal activity or negatively impacting the overall quality of life in the beat. In general, a problem becomes a “project” when a PSO opens a file on it in the SARA database. Problems that do not require sufficient effort to solve, are not prioritized by the NCPC, or fall within the purview of other parties to solve do not become elevated to the status of “projects.”

---

4 The evaluation found that no clear definition of what constitutes a project exists. In general, PSOs and supervisors agree that it must require some minimum amount of ongoing effort to solve.
Each PSO generally works on at least three projects at a time. Projects may take anywhere from less than a day to up to a year to solve. The PSO relies on significant collaboration with other police units, Neighborhood Services staff, NCPCs, city agencies, community leaders and organizations, and/or residents to successfully close projects. The diversity of neighborhoods in Oakland accounts for a significant amount of variation in PSO workload, overall efficiency, and number of problems solved across beats. For example, dealing with a blighted property involves ongoing collaboration with other agencies and can take several months to a year to solve, while addressing illegal parking may be simply a matter of increasing enforcement. The chart below outlines the different types of problems that a beat may face.

Problems in Oakland Beats

**Low Level**
- Problems such as illegal dumping, abandoned vehicles, loitering, or low-level criminal activity.
- Problems with traffic and parking.
- PSOs primary role is educating residents about accessing city resources and strengthening prevention. Usually do not become elevated to a "project."

**Quality of Life**
- Problems such as blight, foreclosed homes that are not maintained, sideshows, nuisance properties and businesses, traffic planning, and business district development and enhancement.
- PSOs collaborate with other city agencies to solve. Significant quality of life problems generally become "projects."

**Criminal Activity**
- Problems such as drug dealing, gang activity, prostitution, robberies, and violent crime that significantly impact public safety.
- PSOs collaborate with other police units & DA; rely on residents for reporting.
- Significant sources of criminal activity typically become "projects."
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The SARA Model
The Oakland Police Department uses the SARA model as its process for solving problems. The SARA model articulates a multi-step problem solving process for officers to follow after a problem has been identified and is considered an evidence-based practice in community policing. The SARA model includes the following steps:


The SARA database incorporates these steps into its design. When opening a project, a PSO must enter activities for each step outlined in the SARA model before being able to proceed to the next step. In order for a project to be registered as closed, a supervisor (Sergeant) must review and sign off on the project.

Other Measure Y Funded Officers:
Crime Reduction Team Officers
Measure Y provides funding for six Crime Reduction Team Officers. They are responsible for proactively addressing sources of criminal activity, such as narcotics and prostitution within their assigned police service area. The area commanders deploy Crime Reduction Team Officers to hot spots to conduct enforcement.

Other Measure Y Funded Officers:
Investigative Officers in the Youth and Family Services Division
Measure Y also provides funding for eight officers assigned to three units in the Youth and Family Services Division. Each of these units is focused on gathering intelligence in order to bring cases against perpetrators of crimes against women, children and other special victims. In order to connect victims with resources and support, each Measure Y funded Youth and Family Services division unit collaborates with the Family Violence Law Center and the District Attorney’s office. Each unit is described below:

Domestic Violence Unit: Two Measure Y funded officers are part of a ten officer unit that is tasked with investigating all domestic violence cases in the City of Oakland. In addition, officers also investigate cases involving physical elder abuse. Officers gather intelligence and prepare cases for submission to the District Attorney’s office.

Special Victims Unit: Measure Y funds three officers who are part of an eleven-officer unit tasked with investigating all cases involving sexual assault and child abuse in the City of Oakland. Officers investigate crimes perpetrated against minors and prepare cases for submission to the District Attorney’s office.

Vice/Exploitation Unit: Three Measure Y funded officers are part of a five-officer unit that is tasked with investigating all cases involving child sexual exploitation, e.g., child prostitution and technology facilitated
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exploitation of children, as well as Human Trafficking. Officers also prepare cases for submission to the District Attorney's office.

IV. FINDINGS

The findings for the 2009-10 evaluation of Measure Y’s Community Policing Neighborhood Services effort are outlined below.

Evaluation Question 1. Is Oakland implementing a model of community policing that adheres to the principles of Measure Y and its applicable resolutions?

Finding 1.1 The Oakland Police Department achieved a full complement of Measure Y funded officers in 2008 and sustained this staffing level throughout the 2009-10 fiscal year.

Evaluators analyzed personnel data available from 2009-10 provided by the Oakland Police Department and found that no Measure Y funded positions were vacant during the year. The following positions were staffed during the year:

• 49 Problem Solving Officers and Sergeants
• 6 Crime Reduction Team Officers
• 8 Youth Family Services Division Investigations Officers

Finding 1.2 While positions were technically filled, leaves of absence related to on duty injury, loan or special assignment resulted in interrupted service on several beats. Evaluators identified 10 beats (18%) that experienced an extended PSO absence.

Personnel assignment data was reviewed to determine whether or not PSOs provided consistent service to their beat throughout the year. The following absences were identified by evaluators through the course of evaluation activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leave Type</th>
<th># of PSOs 2009-'10</th>
<th>Average Length in Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Leave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Unit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On duty injury (ODI)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assignment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Assignment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel Tracking System: The personnel data provided to evaluators did not adequately capture which beats experienced extended PSO absences and which did not. The assignment data included updates documenting changes in assignment (i.e. when an officer officially leaves a position), but did not include reliable data on certain types of leave, such as special or transitional assignments. Evaluators became aware of the majority of loans and leaves outlined here during the ridealongs and key informant interviews. While police provided information on those positions identified by evaluators as having an extended PSO absence, they could not generate reliable department-wide data on these points. It is likely that additional leaves occurred during the 2009-10 fiscal year.
Reasons for Absence from the Beat:
Extended absences are typically due to medical leave, special assignment, or administrative leave. For example, an officer may be injured while on duty and ordered by a doctor to take medical leave. Officers may be placed on administrative leave while certain on-duty actions are investigated. They may be loaned to another unit or participate in a special operation (termed Special Assignment).

Coverage on the Beat during PSO Absences: The Department does not appear to have standard protocols or procedures for covering interruptions in service. Interviews with police revealed that in some cases PSOs from neighboring beats fill in, and in others, patrol officers step in. In some cases, the beat is effectively without a PSO when an extended leave occurs, though the position is still technically filled. There is no standard protocol for sharing information between an exiting and an incoming PSO on the current NCPC priorities and other open projects.

Work on Beat Business: PSO timelog information was not available electronically. The evaluation could not determine the percent of time PSOs spent on their beat or the percentage of time spent on problem solving activities. While the SARA database captures information on problem solving, it does not serve as a time-log for PSO activities on a daily basis.

Finding 1.3 The level of PSO turnover appears to have decreased since the 2008-09 year, with 84% of PSOs remaining in their beats during the past year. During the 2009-10 fiscal year, 16% of beats experienced one change in the PSO assigned to their beat; 12% of PSOs were assigned to their beat for at least two years.

The longer officers are assigned to their beat, the more likely they are to develop positive, collaborative relationships with residents of their beat. Over time they will likely develop deeper knowledge of the problems, potential resources, and key stakeholders in their beat. Frequent turnover reduces community trust in police and results in a decrease in the number of problems solved as the new officer becomes oriented. The 2008-09 evaluation found that PSO turnover negatively impacted the ability of communities and PSOs to solve problems. The Department appears to have made progress in this area, with most officers from 2008-09 remaining on their assigned beat. Officers may request a change in assignment once annually; according to personnel data, 16% of problem solving officers turned over during this re-assignment process.

Evaluation Question 2. Are PSOs solving problems of concern to residents?

Finding 2.1 PSOs are solving problems of concern to residents. According to data entered into the SARA database, almost half of opened projects (47%), or a total of 335 projects were closed during the 2009-10 year. On average 18 projects were closed per month.

The SARA database has been used over the past year to capture information on problems that require a minimum threshold of effort to solve. Such problems are
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referred to as “projects.” Because many projects require significant collaboration with other city agencies or police units and may involve complex legal proceedings, it is to be expected that projects will remain open for more than a year in some cases. Further, some projects are related to entrenched, criminal activity on a specific street, corner, or neighborhood that are very difficult to solve and may not be closed because the source of the problem continues to re-appear. The chart below outlines the number of opened and closed projects on a monthly basis from 2009-2010.

The chart illustrates low utilization of the database among PSOs during the beginning of 2009. Evaluators began auditing the system in January 2010 and worked with the Department to achieve more consistent usage.

- The decline in June 2010 was most likely due to the elimination of the Police Services component of the initiative.

**Finding 2.2 The number of problems solved during 2009-10 varies significantly by beat. The average number of problems solved per beat was 6. Some beats recorded no closed projects during the 2009-10 year, while others recorded more than 15.**

The chart below outlines the distribution of closed projects across Oakland’s 58 beats.

---

5 The SARA database is not a work or time log and does not capture problem solving activity requiring minimal effort or brief law enforcement intervention. Nor does it capture other PSO duties such as intelligence/information gathering, community mobilization, administrative work, and patrolling the beat.
A third of the beats solved between four and six problems during the fiscal year.

Another third solved between 1 and 3 problems each.

A fifth of beats recorded more than 10 problems solved each.

Four beats, or 7%, recorded no closed projects during the fiscal year.

There are several potential reasons for the variation in the number of problems solved by beat, with differences in officer usage of the SARA database most likely being the primary reason. This was the first year that officers began using the database and this information should be viewed as baseline data. An audit of the database revealed inconsistent usage during the fall of 2009. The number of problems solved may in fact be higher than reported on the SARA database. Additional contributing factors include:

1. Variations across beats are to be expected. Because Oakland is a diverse city, each neighborhood faces different problems which require their own unique set of resources and strategies to solve; PSOs are encouraged to use their own judgment in approaching problems. Some beats experience a large number of quality of life concerns, whereas others experience a smaller number of problems related to drugs and prostitution.

2. The Department lacks performance standards on the percent of effort PSOs should dedicate to each of their duties; problem solving is one of several duties PSOs are responsible for fulfilling. As a result, PSOs likely dedicate varying amounts of effort to problem solving.

3. The Department lacks a clear definition of what constitutes a project. Some officers have more expansive ideas, whereas others have narrower definitions, which likely leads to variations in the types and number of projects they open on the SARA database. A review of data on the origin of opened and closed projects found that some officers opened files on small problems such as removing an abandoned vehicle, which do not qualify as a “project.”

4. Beats with extended PSO leaves of absence most likely experienced a dip in problem solving while their PSO was on leave and a lower closure rate for the year.

**Finding 2.3** According to the SARA database, almost half (48%) of opened projects were closed during the 2009-10 fiscal year. Projects related to blight, abandoned auto, ABC violations, and alcohol had the highest closure rate, while projects related to narcotics, burglary, and suspicious person were solved at the lowest rate.

An analysis of projects that were successfully closed, based on information entered into the SARA database, revealed that PSOs are solving problems of concern to residents. Quality of life problems that were solved in collaboration with other city agencies, such as blight, abandoned autos, and ABC violations were solved at a higher rate than those projects that were solely related to criminal activity. Quality of life...
issues can frequently be addressed by accessing city agencies and resources, such as the Public Works Agency, CEDA, and the City Attorney, while problems related to criminal activity are typically within the purview of the Department and the District Attorney’s office. Further, problems related to narcotics, gang violence, and prostitution represent entrenched community problems in some neighborhoods that often re-appear even after a Police Department intervention. Considering these factors, a higher closure rate for quality of life problems is to be expected. The table below outlines the closure rate for each type of problem opened:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Type</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>% Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned Auto</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Violations</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned House</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blight</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbing the Peace</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Property</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious Person</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oakland Police Department SARA Database

Finding 2.4 The Department does not have clear performance standards about the percentage of effort that should be dedicated to each of the PSOs duties (e.g., problem solving, administrative work, investigative/intelligence gathering, community meetings, patrolling the beat etc.).

This year the Department made progress in developing a PSO performance appraisal system that is aligned with community policing objectives and actual PSO duties. However, the Department has not articulated performance standards around the percentage of effort PSOs should dedicate to each of their duties, nor has it outlined quarterly or annual deliverables related to the activities of a PSO. For example, there are no standards in relation

6 Qualitative data on problems solved is stored in the SARA database, but was not available for analysis this year.
Evaluation Question 3. Did Youth and Family Services Division Units funded by Measure Y deliver services as expected?

Finding 3.1 Measure Y funded officers in the Youth and Family Services Division are investigating and preparing cases for prosecution. The percent of cases charged in the Domestic Violence unit was 46%, 9% in the special victims, and 94% in the Vice/Child Exploitation unit.

Measure Y provides funding for eight officers in the Domestic Violence, Special Victims and Vice/Exploitation units. The table below depicts the data related to caseload and cases charged for the Measure Y funded units in the Youth and Family Services Division.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Caseload</th>
<th>Felony Cases Charged</th>
<th>Misdemeanor Cases Charged</th>
<th>Percent of Cases Charged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Victims</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice/Exploitation</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oakland Police Department, Bureau of Investigations 2009-10

It is important to note that the factors that influence whether or not a case is successfully charged are often outside officer control, such as a victim’s willingness to cooperate, unit backlog and/or availability of evidence. Comparisons across units are difficult to make given these factors.

- The Vice/Exploitation Unit which deals with cases related to human trafficking, prostitution or sexually exploited minors has experienced significant success in charging perpetrators of such crimes, with 94% of cases charged.
- The Domestic Violence Unit successfully charged almost half of all cases.
- The Special Victims Unit (SVU) charged about 9% of cases, which is most likely due to the nature of crime the unit is responsible for investigating. The SVU investigates
crimes related to child abuse and sexual assault. There is a significant amount of evidence that must be gathered in order to successfully charge a case.

Finding 3.2 Measure Y funded officers in the Youth and Family Services Division have contributed towards a reduction in the backlog of cases in their units.

While the Domestic Violence Unit still has a moderate backlog, they have made strides in cutting their caseloads by nearly 45% from this same time last year. The Special Victims Unit (SVU) has eliminated the majority of their backlog in this reporting period; reducing the average caseload per investigator from 125 in the previous period to about 38 for this one. As a result of this effort, the SVU was nominated for a Unit Citation.

Evaluation Question 4. To what extent have 2008-09 recommendations been implemented?

Finding 4.1 The Department has began implementing some of the recommendations from the 2008-09 evaluation report, particularly in relationship to training, performance standards, and best practices in Community Policing.

The 2008-09 evaluation report recommended that the Department better articulate its model of Community Policing, offer training more than once a year to orient PSOs new to the assignment, and provide PSOs with more specific information about their duties, responsibilities and approaches to problem solving. The Department has taken the following steps towards implementing these recommendations:

1. **Strategic Plan:** The Department developed a strategic plan outlining a vision and priority areas for the Department. The strategic plan includes Community Policing as an organizational approach.

2. **Community-Oriented Policing Manual:** The Department drafted a Community-Oriented Policing Manual. The manual outlines the history and key elements of different styles of policing and articulates an approach for community policing across the Department. The manual is intended to be distributed to all officers in the Department, with the aim of incorporating principles of community policing into regular police work. Plans include instituting performance standards for PSOs.

3. **Data System Upgrades to Improve Deployment:** Funded through a grant from the Department of Justice, the Department has purchased the Police Resource Optimization Software (PROS), a new deployment software to more strategically deploy and utilize officers. PROS provides information around where officers should be deployed based on calls for service and the level of staffing needed to meet current demand. Further, PROS will assist the Department in integrating community policing and problem solving approaches across the Department, by providing data on the amount of time.
patrol officers should have available to work on projects.

4. **PSO Performance Appraisal:** The PSO performance appraisal now outlines specific performance objectives specific to the actual roles and responsibilities of PSOs. The performance appraisal includes the key responsibilities of PSOs such as problem solving, collaboration with the community, proactive enforcement and intelligence gathering, and administration and reporting. The performance appraisal represents significant progress towards implementing the 2008-09 recommendation to better articulate specific performance measures that are aligned to the specific duties of PSOs. However, the performance appraisal does not outline the percentage of effort that PSOs should dedicate to each of their assigned duties.

5. **Additional PSO Trainings:** Though the Department did not offer the forty hour PSO training this year, the Department did add two additional PSO trainings during March and April, 2010. Each training lasted two days, covering policing approaches, key elements of community policing, the SARA database, and available community resources. The timing of the training was designed to prepare newly assigned PSOs for successful job performance. The Department reported that plans to offer the forty hour training later in the year were put on hold once changes in the police services component of Measure Y were announced. While the timing of trainings was an improvement over last year, the instructional approach did not integrate principles of adult learning theory.

Finding 4.2 The evaluation did not find evidence of Department progress in relation to the 2008-09 recommendations addressing procedures for transferring beat information during PSO transitions, incentives for encouraging PSOs to remain on assignment, and more transparent reporting.

1. **Procedures for Transfer of Beat Information:** The 2008-09 report recommended that the Department develop a specific protocol to transfer information between a departing and incoming PSO. Without specific procedures to transfer beat information when interruptions in service or PSO reassignment occur means that significant time is lost while incoming staff become oriented to the beat. A record of key beat characteristics, NCPC membership, NCPC priorities, status of current projects, and any other information pertinent to problem solving efforts would reduce the impact of personnel changes. The Department has not yet established such protocols.

2. **Incentives for Encouraging 2 Year PSO Assignment:** The longer a PSO is assigned to a particular beat, the greater opportunity he/she has to learn about the key problems, stakeholders, and sources of criminal activity in the

---

7 Annual re-assignment typically occurs in the Spring. Officers may request reassignment into or out of the PSO assignment.
beat, to build relationships with the community and to effectively address problems of concern to residents. Frequent turnover reduces public trust and results in delays in problem solving. Interviews with police staff indicate that supervisors encourage PSOs to remain in the position for 2 years, though no formal incentives exist. Interviews also revealed that uncertainty about the future of Measure Y meant that several PSOs opted to transfer out of the position during re-assignment, out of concern that the PSO positions would be cut.\(^8\) Officers who were transferred back to patrol after Measure Y cuts would have the last choice of schedule. Police service staff indicated that this served as a disincentive for PSOs to remain in their position during the 2010 reassignment period.

3. **Transparent Reporting Measures:** This year’s evaluation did not include a review of fiscal records. However, personnel records were reviewed. While they do account for the Measure Y funded personnel and their assignments, those that were provided to evaluators did not accurately track certain types of temporary or special reassignments.

\(^8\) All officers select their schedule during the re-assignment process based on their level of seniority. If positions are cut after the re-assignment period has ended, officers who were reassigned to other divisions would be able to choose their schedule based on the remaining available shifts.

---

**V. CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS**

This evaluation report identifies many encouraging signs. Among the more important:

1. Full implementation of Measure Y staffing levels has been sustained since 2008.

2. The Department has instituted a new data system for tracking problem solving activity (the SARA database), which means that information is available on the number and type of problems solved.

3. The Department has made progress towards further articulating its vision of community policing throughout the Department through its strategic plan, community oriented policing manual, and PSO performance appraisal system.

4. Close to half of opened projects were solved, with quality of life concerns achieving the highest closure rates.

The evaluation also points to areas that can and should be improved:

1. While turnover has improved, interruptions in service due to temporary reassignment and loans continue to interfere with problem solving efforts in some beats. The personnel tracking system does not appear to accurately track certain types of leave.

2. Inconsistent and uneven usage of the SARA database limits the availability of
accurate data on the level of problem solving activity across all beats.

3. There are significant variations in the number of problems solved per beat.

The evaluation makes the following recommendations based on the findings outlined in this report:

1. **Continue to strengthen reporting and tracking systems, in particular the SARA database.** Develop procedures and protocols for entering and closing projects into the database, including clarifying what does and does not constitute a “project.” Continue to refine the system so that data entry is user-friendly and so that it has the capacity to generate meaningful reports to PSOs, their supervisors, and Department leadership.

2. **Build on recent efforts to articulate a vision of community policing by defining the percent of effort PSOs should dedicate to each of their assigned duties.** Incorporate principles of adult learning into PSO trainings and activities. Strengthen management and accountability systems for PSOs.

3. **Develop Department procedures to provide consistent coverage to each beat should a temporary reassignment occur.** Create a process to transfer beat information between problem solving officers.
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I. INTRODUCTION

This outcome evaluation of Measure Y’s Violence Prevention Programs (VPPs) during 2009-10 examines the extent to which VPPs positively impacted factors correlated to community safety. Indicators include reductions in truancy, suspensions, and justice involvement, or increased employment. Evaluation activities were designed to address the following evaluation questions:

**Evaluation Questions:**

1. What services were provided to Measure Y clients? Were funds used efficiently?
2. Are Violence Prevention Programs serving their intended target population?
3. What was the impact of Measure Y on criminal justice related outcomes, such as recidivism and crime levels?
4. What was the impact of Measure Y on school related outcomes?
5. What was the impact of Measure Y on employment related outcomes?
6. Did Measure Y programming strengthen resilience and protective factors among the individuals served?

II. METHODS

Evaluation activities were designed to examine the impact of Measure Y programming on preventing and reducing violence at both an individual client and neighborhood level, where applicable. This evaluation prioritizes three important approaches: focusing on both intermediate and long term outcomes, measuring assets, individual strengths and resources, in addition to risk factors, and evaluating decreases in anti-social behaviors, beliefs, and attitudes (harm reduction). All of these factors are examined because they are important indicators of client change.

The effects of violence prevention interventions can be viewed along a continuum of short to long term outcomes. While it is often the hope of clients, family members, elected officials, and providers that outcomes such as reduced recidivism be achieved during the first year of service, we know that intermediate changes in attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and knowledge are often pre-cursors to such long term changes.9

Strengthening protective factors that promote resilience among young people can help to prevent and reduce violence. For example, if a young person with previous juvenile justice involvement begins to develop relationships with pro-social peer groups, he/she is less likely to engage in criminal behavior. Strengthened protective factors coupled with reductions in the severity, intensity or frequency of risky behavior can contribute towards positive long term outcomes, such as improved school engagement and employment, as well as decreased recidivism.10

---

The evaluation instruments and analysis were designed with these factors in mind. Pre/post tests were created to measure intermediate outcomes, including protective factors and risk taking behaviors. Criminal justice and school related outcomes were measured through a matched data analysis between Measure Y client data stored in the CitySpan Management Information System (CitySpan) and records from criminal justice agencies and Oakland Unified School District. Employment related outcomes were calculated through CitySpan service data records and pre/post test results. Each is described below.

**Pre/Post Tests**
Pre/post test surveys were designed using questions from validated instruments to measure outcomes specific to each strategy area. They included a five point scale; in general, the closer the score is to 5, the more positive the answer, and thus the more likely the respondents reported that they positively experience the attribute under question. For a few items, such as risk taking behavior, the closer the score is to 1, the better. It is hoped that after receiving services an individual’s score will improve.

VPPs who provided intensive and sustained services administered pre/post test surveys to their clients to measure intermediate changes in attitudes, beliefs, and risk-taking behavior. Pre tests were completed shortly after program enrollment. Post tests were administered three to six months later. Statistical tests were conducted to understand whether or not changes in attitudes, beliefs and behaviors were significant and attributable to Measure Y services. A total of 269 clients completed the pre/post tests. A comparison between the demographic characteristics of consented clients who completed the pre/post tests and those who did not was conducted to see if there were any significant differences between these two groups. None were observed.

**CitySpan Service Data**
Client service data stored in CitySpan was analyzed to understand who was served through Measure Y VPPs, how much and what type of service was provided, and how efficiently services were provided. CitySpan records were also used to identify employment related outcomes.

**Analysis of Matched Data**
A matched data analysis was conducted on consented clients who received sustained services. Records of services provided for individual clients were compared to data provided by the following sources:
- Oakland Unified School District (OUSD)
- Alameda County Juvenile Probation Department (JCPSS)
- Alameda County Department of Adult Probation
- California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation (CDCR)

Statistical tests were conducted to determine whether or not Measure Y services had a significant impact on school-related and criminal justice outcomes.

---

11Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System.
Street Outreach Crime Trend Analysis
Starting in July 2009, Measure Y-funded street outreach teams were deployed to seven “hotspot” locations in West, Central, and East Oakland. Hotspots are specific areas that have experienced a disproportionately high level of crime. Crime data from three of these hotspots, randomly chosen, one in each area of Oakland, were examined to see whether crime went down over the year. Evaluators also conducted an analysis to see if there was a relationship between crime trends and the number of hours of outreach in that particular hotspot. All crimes with addresses were included in the comparisons. Trends within hotspots were compared to the average crime in an Oakland beat (total crime divided by 57 beats) per month. Crime trends were also compared to the number of hours of street outreach dedicated to the hotspot per month.

Sample
Measure Y provides funding for a continuum of interventions designed to reduce individual and community risk factors associated with violence. Interventions range from conducting outreach and education at community venues and events to providing employment training and placement.

While Measure Y touches over 4,000 individuals annually, the sample for this evaluation includes only those 1,701 individuals who received ongoing services at a sufficient level for programs to achieve client level changes. Individuals who met each of the following criteria are termed “clients” and were included in the sample for this evaluation:

Consent: Clients who had a signed consent to participate in evaluation activities were included in the data analysis. Consent may be missing because clients decline to participate in evaluation activities, because a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult declines to participate or is not available to provide consent, and/or because programs face challenges in securing consent. Forty-four percent of the individuals entered into CitySpan have a consent on-file. (See Finding 2.2)

CitySpan Client Id & Service Data: Clients who were assigned a unique client identification number, had individual client information and service hours entered into the CitySpan service system were included in the evaluation. Those individuals who were not assigned a client id, or had no service hours entered into the system were removed from the sample. One employment program is contracted to provide services based on employment placement and retention milestones, as opposed to number of clients served; this program does not store client information in the CitySpan database. As a result, clients served through this program were not included in the sample.

Sustained & Ongoing Services: The sample includes clients who participated in programming where sustained and ongoing services were provided. Individuals that received brief interventions, received outreach only, or participated in one-time group events are generally not entered as clients into the CitySpan database. As a
result, they were not included in the sample.

This outcome analysis includes as its sample a total of 1,701 Measure Y clients who participated in services during 2009-10. The sample size or “n” is different for each outcome area because the analysis includes only those clients who received services designed to impact the specific outcomes and because of variations in the proportion of clients who were matched with the data source.

Appendix VI outlines the programs included in each analysis. However, the majority of clients included in the sample participated in programs in the Young Adult Reentry, Youth Comprehensive Services, and Oakland Street Outreach strategy areas because these strategies are designed to achieve individual client level outcomes. Young Adult Re-entry programs provide case management, employment-related services such as Project Choice, vocational training, work experience, and job placement to the young adult reentry population. Street outreach programs serve individual clients through intensive outreach and case management. Clients who participate in Juvenile Justice Center/OUSD Wrap Around Services (a strategy within Youth Comprehensive Services) receive school re-engagement, and case management.

Limitations
There are several important limitations to make note of. This evaluation only includes data on those clients who consented to participate in the evaluation. It is not possible to know whether or not the clients for whom consent was not obtained differed in significant ways from consented clients. Another limitation is the type of data available from the California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation (CDCR) and Adult and Juvenile Probation data limited the evaluation's ability to calculate a recidivism rate for Measure Y participants.

The quality of service data from the CitySpan database is also a limitation. The Department of Human Services (DHS) uses CitySpan for monitoring purposes; programs use the system to provide reports to funders and for their own monitoring purposes. CitySpan is the only data source available to the evaluation that tracks service provision. This year’s evaluation revealed inconsistencies in the ways that data is coded and stored across programs, which present challenges to the evaluation. For example, some programs enter certain types of services as an individual service, while others enter the same service as a group service. If data is not entered consistently across the initiative, it is difficult to reliably measure the impact of different services.

In regards to employment, employment related outcomes are stored in multiple locations on the CitySpan database and only certain programs are required to track certain indicators. For example, only one employment program is required to track...
the number of clients who retain 180 days of employment. Other programs may have helped clients achieve such milestones, but they are not tracked in the system. Employment related outcomes may in fact be better than reported in this evaluation due to these limitations.

Finally, the evaluation analyzed data entered into the CitySpan system through July 15, 2010, though DHS contracts allow programs until the end of July to enter data. The service data may not reflect the actual amount of service provided.13

III. FINDINGS

Data collected from the methods described in Section II were analyzed to answer each evaluation question. Major findings and recommendations relevant to each question are presented below. The findings are organized as follows:

- Services provided and clients served
- Criminal Justice Related Findings (Adult; Youth; Community)
- School Related Findings (Youth)
- Employment Related Findings (Adult & Youth)
- Resiliency and Protective Factors (Adult & Youth)

Evaluation Question 1. What services were provided to Measure Y clients? Are Measure Y services being delivered efficiently?

Finding 1.1 Measure Y provided $5,306,052 dollars in funding to support violence prevention programming in six service areas.

During 2009-10, the Department of Human Services allocated over five million dollars in funding to 30 community based organizations. Funds were allocated across six strategy areas. The table below outlines the total amount of Measure Y funds allocated by strategy area during the 2009-10 fiscal year.

| Measure Y Funds by Strategy14 | 
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Strategy                        | Allocated Funds | Total Funded Amounts |
| Family Violence Intervention    | $825,840        | $790,320            |
| Oakland Street Outreach         | $940,200        | $808,676            |
| School-Based Prevention Projects| $558,831        | $514,928            |
| Violent Incident/Crisis Response| $395,800        | $395,800            |
| Young Adult Reentry Services    | $1,389,720      | $1,253,080          |
| Youth Comprehensive Services    | $1,281,736      | $1,195,601          |
| Total                           | $5,392,127      | $5,306,052          |

13 Because of evaluation reporting deadlines, the data was extracted in mid-July. All programs were allocated additional time to complete data entry.

14 Allocated funds include the total amount allocated to each strategy. The total funded amount is the actual amount distributed based on program’s compliance with contract requirements during the 2009-10 FY. A list of programs by strategy is included in the Appendix.
Finding 1.2 The average cost per client was $2,239. The average cost per hour was $76. In general, these costs are comparable to the costs of similar prevention and intervention programs.

The table below outlines the average cost per client and per hour by strategy area. Programs that do not enter client information into CitySpan were not included in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Average Cost per Client</th>
<th>Average Cost per Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Violence Intervention</td>
<td>$1,023</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Street Outreach</td>
<td>$1,863</td>
<td>$127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Based Prevention Projects</td>
<td>$516</td>
<td>$88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Incident/Crisis Response</td>
<td>$1,377</td>
<td>$97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adult and Reentry Services</td>
<td>$3,751</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Comprehensive Services</td>
<td>$2,168</td>
<td>$77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,239</td>
<td>$76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- School-based prevention projects had the lowest cost per client, while Young Adult and Reentry had the lowest cost per hour.
- Young Adult and Reentry services had the highest cost per client. This is most likely due to the costs associated with subsidized employment and work experience, which increase programming costs.

While Oakland Street Outreach had the highest cost per service hour, it is important to note that Street Outreach’s primary deliverable is to provide outreach at area hot spots, which is measured as an “event.” This figure does not capture event hours.

While standards for reasonable costs for violence prevention programming have not been well established, evaluators did conduct a comparison with programs that serve a similar population (at risk youth and young adults) in New York City and found that Measure Y costs are in line with those programs. The table below outlines the average cost per client of New York reentry and employment programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Cost per Client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting Out and Staying Out</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY Young Adult Employment Programs</td>
<td>$6,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFE Transitions Program</td>
<td>$3,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MillionTrees Training Program</td>
<td>$7,813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 Street outreach cost per service hour figures include intensive outreach and case management hours provided to individual clients entered in CitySpan.
17 Because information on service hours was unavailable for these programs, a cost per unit of service analysis was not conducted.