

MEASURE Y: VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND  
PUBLIC SAFETY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES: March 21, 2011

**Oversight Committee Members**

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

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

**Present:**

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

**Absent:** QaidAqeel, Richard Carter, Nyeisha Dewitt, Nicole Lee

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

**Item 2: Open Forum:**

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

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

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

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

**Action:** Motion approved.

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

(This item was taken out of order)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Member J. Brown discussed with the Committee the time limitations of the report being available by May 3<sup>rd</sup>. Ms. Brown expressed concern over the Committee not having enough time to read over and make recommendations on the report before it went to Public Safety Committee. Ms. Bedford replied that the report would need to be submitted to the City Administrator by May 3<sup>rd</sup>. Shortly thereafter the report could be made available to the Committee, and review it in advance of the May 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chairperson Dorado offered to the group is requesting to get something out of the City Administrator's Office in a draft version, barring that they will look at what comes out at a signed copy from the CAO, for the meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup>. . There will be no special meeting in May prior to the

meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup> with the understanding that something will be provided at least 72 hrs in advance to read and review.

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

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

Motion was seconded by Member Barnett.

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

Member J. Brown accepted the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Action:** Motion approved

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

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

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

**Action:** Motion approved

**Item: 6** **Adjournment**

Moved by Dorado, seconded by Barnett.