



**VIOLENCE PREVENTION &
PUBLIC SAFETY
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
"SPECIAL MEETING"**

**Monday, January 24, 2011
6:30 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers, 3rd Floor
1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, City Hall
Oakland, California 94612**

2011 JAN 19 PM 4:33

**FILED
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
OAKLAND**

AGENDA

Oversight Committee Members: Qa'id Aqeel, Peter Barnett, Joanne Brown, Michael Brown, Jr., Richard Carter, Nyeisha DeWitt, Mark Forte, Nicole Lee, Brandon Sturdivant and Chairperson Jose Dorado

PUBLIC COMMENT: The Oversight Committee welcomes you to its meetings and your interest is appreciated. If you wish to speak before the Oversight Committee, please fill out a speaker card and hand it to the Staff of the Oversight Committee. If you wish to speak on a matter not on the agenda, please sign up for Open Forum and wait for your name to be called. If you wish to speak on a matter on the agenda, please approach the Committee when called, give your name, and your comments. Please be brief and limit your comments to the specific subject under discussion. Only matters within the Oversight Committee's jurisdictions may be addressed. Time limitations shall be at the discretion of the Chair.

- 1. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum**
- 2. Open Forum**
- 3. Approval of Draft Minutes from Meeting of December 20, 2010** (A)
- 4. Discussion of Public Safety and Violence Prevention Programming Strategy Topics and Assignments for Research Resulting in Advisory Reports to the Oakland Public Safety Committee and Oakland City Council** (A)
- 5. Agenda Building, "Special Meeting," Thursday, February 24, 2011 (Tentative Date)** (A)
- 6. Adjournment**

Measure Y Oversight Committee Agenda
"Special Meeting" January 24, 2011
Page 2

I = Informational Item
A = Action Item

Violence Prevention & Public Safety Oversight Committee meetings are wheelchair accessible. Please call Phone: (510) 238-3671 or TDD: (510) 238-3724 to request a sign-language interpreter. Five days notice is required.

The order of the items on the Agenda may be changed by the Chairperson.

VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND PUBLIC SAFETY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Regularly Scheduled Meetings for 2011

(These tentative dates are subject to approval by the Oversight Committee)

Meetings are scheduled on the 3rd Monday of each month. All meetings are held from 6:30 p.m.-9:00 p.m. in Hearing Room 1, located on the First Floor of City Hall (unless otherwise indicated by notice. Please confirm meeting location by checking meeting notice or website, www.oaklandnet.com/measurey.htm.)

January 10, 2011 (Special Meeting)

January 17, 2011 (Cancelled, Holiday)

January 24, 2011 (Special Meeting)

February 21, 2011 (Cancelled, Holiday)

March 21, 2011

April 18, 2011

May 16, 2011

June 20, 2011

July 18, 2011

August 15, 2011

September 19, 2011

October 17, 2011

November 21, 2011

December 19, 2011

**ITEM 3: APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINUTES, MEETING
OF DECEMBER 20, 2010**

**MEASURE Y: VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND
PUBLIC SAFETY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

DRAFT MINUTES: December 20, 2010

Oversight Committee Members

Qa'id Aqeel, City Council At-Large

Peter Barnett, District 5

Joanne Brown, District 1

Michael Brown, Jr., District 3

Richard Carter, District 2

Jose Dorado, **Chairperson**, District 4

Mark Forte, District 7

Vacant, District 6

Nicole Lee, Office of the Mayor

Brandon Sturdivant, Sr., Office of the Mayor

Nyeisha Dewitt, Office of the Mayor

City Hall

Dunakin Hearing Room

1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza

Oakland, California 94612

Item 1: Roll Call and Determination of Quorum:

Present: Members Aqeel, Barnett, J. Brown, M. Brown, Carter, Forte, Dewitt and Chairperson Dorado

Absent: Member Lee (excused absence), Member Sturdivant

Quorum was achieved for this meeting.

Item 2. Open Forum:

There was one speaker on this Item:

Sandjiv Handa, East Bay News Service:

Commented on "sticker shock" of new businesses in Oakland, e.g., water, sewer services, taxes, and the inability of the City and the Chamber of Commerce to provide basic support to new businesses, e.g., parking, public safety. Predicted many existing businesses will exit Oakland such as Nextel and soon to depart FEMA.

Item 3: Review and Approval of Minutes from the November 15, 2010 Oversight Committee Meeting

Motion: Member Forte made motion to approve Minutes of November 15, 2010. Member Carter seconded.

Action: Motion approved by consensus. Member M. Brown and J. Brown abstained.

Item 4: Discussion: The Status of the Violence Prevention and Public Safety Fund, Measure Y 2011 Moving Forward

Dan Lindheim, City Administrator, provided the overview. With the passage of Measure BB, funding for the violence prevention program and problem-solving officer programs will continue. There are a couple of important notes: Non-collection of the parking tax during the period of July 1 – November 2010, will result in the loss of between \$2.8 – 3 million dollars. These dollars can never be collected. Secondly, how is the City going to collect the parcel tax. One option being considered is “hand-billing,” (letters to property owners asking for payment) that will cost upwards of \$600 – 700 thousand dollars to implement. We expect less than a 50% return on this approach which would require a further step of placing and enforcing liens to collect the tax. A second option is placing the parcel tax on the 2011-12 property tax bill in September/October 2011. The problem is a “double” parcel tax bill for two years (2010 and 2011). In the interim, the City will fund Measure Y programming from other revenues. Since the City Council approved funding from the General Fund for M-Y violence prevention programming for the first six-months of 2010-11, we will replace these funds from M-Y revenues once collected.

What differentiates implementation of M-Y today from past years is that M-Y was predicated on having 803 police officers. Now we have 660 officers (and declining) and the 63 PSOs will come from this staffing level. It begs the question, what’s the best way to provide general police services. One difficulty in implementing M-Y is how to have both the 63 PSOs as well as sufficient officers to respond to calls for police services. It will require the Oversight Committee’s contribution to decide how to best do this.

Member J. Brown asked for the Administrator’s view of the Oversight Committee and its role in the decision-making process.

Mr. Lindheim responded that it is difficult for advisory committees to provide broad and continuing opinion making when you meet once every few weeks and the department operates every minute. The department will ensure representatives are present at Committee meetings and the Committee needs to stay aware of occurrences and engage the department and Administrator's Office as to the Committee's views.

Member Carter asked given the budget shortfalls, have decisions been made as to where program cuts will occur?

Mr. Lindheim responded that presently the City is trying to avoid making program cuts. How to make up the shortfall is not yet clear.

Member Aqeel referenced an earlier informal meeting on Measure BB attended by Mr. Lindheim, Chairperson Dorado and Members Lee and Barnett. Specifically, Mr. Aqeel asked whether outreach was conducted to include Member Forte, Member M. Brown, Member Aqeel or Staff person Baker in the informal meeting on Measure BB.

Mr. Lindheim responded he could not recall how the invited attendees were developed however one consideration was not to exceed quorum limitations.

Chairperson Dorado added that in the future attendance to all informal meetings with City officials will be discussed during Oversight Committee meetings.

Mr. Lindheim referenced a recent Appellate Court ruling that use of Measure Y funds in a police officer recruitment effort was consistent with the strictures of the Measure Y Initiative and an acceptable use of Measure Y funds.

Chairperson Dorado asked whether Mr. Lindheim was available for a regular meeting with members of the M-Y Oversight Committee.

Mr. Lindheim responded that he was willing to meet with members of the Oversight Committee as long as he is City Administrator.

Sara Bedford, Department of Human Services, provided the overview of violence prevention programming. Ms. Bedford noted that with the passage of Measure BB the violence prevention programming grant agreements were structured so that the agreements would go forward if the Measure passed. The Department was fortunate to receive a Cal-Grip grant, a \$2.3 million re-entry

employment grant from the State of California and an additional \$3.5 million in federal grants. The Department is busily expanding grant contracts and augmenting the violence prevention program work.

Member J. Brown questioned the capacity of re-entry violence prevention programming and the efficient use of grant dollars. Reference was made to the Re-Entry Specialist position and the difficulty of the Committee to determine what he did, how he did it, who he contacted, etc. In addition to the Measure Y money expended on such efforts, what is the rationale in dropping an additional \$2.3 million dollars in federal money on top of the type of effort that hasn't produced much?

Ms. Bedford responded the \$2.3M is over a three-year period and is CALTRANS dollars to run crew-base employment and transitional jobs modeled very closely on the Center of Employment Opportunities in New York City – that the City has been eager to emulate. The funding will be RFP'd out and not earmarked for any specific provider.

Member Aqeel asked for a follow-up to issues raised in earlier Oversight Committee meetings regarding Leadership Excellence and their contract deliverables as well as the date of the submittal of client data from the Mayor's Re-Entry Specialist.

Ms. Bedford responded that Leadership Excellence has not submitted a fourth quarter invoice and have not been paid for that period. Corrective action was requested by staff and is pending. The agency has elected not to continue the contract for the upcoming year. Regarding the Mayor's Re-Entry Specialist, Ms. Bedford will check the CitySpan System, determine whether the re-entry client data has been entered and report back to the Oversight Committee during its January meeting.

Chief Simon, Fire Services Agency, provided the overview. OFD has maintained 25 engines and 7 truck companies and expanded from the 24 paramedics to 26 paramedics and continue to provide respond for fire services – upwards of 60,000 per year. Additionally, OFD provides mentoring programs through youth services (in and outside of the Fire Stations), through school events, open houses, homework and tutoring at Fire Stations, OBFA classes to prepare persons for Fire training oral boards, funding for scholarships, the ice hockey program, mentoring programs through the YMCA, volunteer work at the

Boys and Girls Club, summer interns and many other program efforts – that touch somewhere 10-16 thousand youth each year.

Member Forte asked whether there are “measurables” for the mentoring effort, e.g., how many youth, the specific outcomes, etc., as well as the specific number of “interns” engaged by the Department.

Chief Simon responded were five interns with the Fire Agency last year. There are numerous mentoring and programming efforts by the Fire Agency and we haven’t created the opportunity to record the program outcomes. We have firefighters who provide homework and tutorial services on a daily basis to latchkey kids; mentor to burn children, Special Olympic participants, and many, many other youth with great results.

Member Barnett requested the Fire Service Agency report back to the Oversight Committee with a break-down of where the annual \$4M allocation is spent, e.g., fire suppression and other fire and mentoring services.

Chief Simon responded that the annual \$4M MY allocation keeps the 25 engines and 7 truck companies on the streets. The MY funds eliminates “brown-outs” and flexible station shut-downs. No money is provided for the mentoring component through Measure Y and the department absorbs all costs associated with the mentoring effort.

Member Barnett commented that this is an example where the City mandates a department to provide a service yet fails to provide adequate funding for the service, comparable to the mandate on the Police Department.

Chairperson Dorado noted the Measure Y and Measure BB Initiatives specifically included “mentoring” among programs the Fire Services Agency was to construct with funds provided by the Measures.

Deputy Chief Breshears, Oakland Police Department, provided the overview for the Oakland Police Department. The department is in the process of selecting problem-solving officers and conducting its “draw” for 2011 patrol positions. The starting point was seeking officers who were previously assigned as problem-solving officers and selecting them to the positions. Many were returned to the same position. However, some PSOs were laid-off and other officers were identified to occupy the problem-solving officer positions. An evaluation process was undertaken to ensure the department obtained a “good fit.” Six crime reduction officers were also selected. Funding from Measure Y

pays for about 45 of the 63 officers required by the Initiative. What is not included in the count is the supervisory and command positions required for the problem-solving officer program. A total of 75 officers are required: 63 are the problem-solving officers; there is a ratio of 1:8 sergeants per officer. There are 9 sergeants, 1 sergeant assigned to the crime reduction team and 3 lieutenants assigned as resource lieutenants. These additional positions are not funded through Measure Y. Additionally, Measure BB did not allow for the re-hiring of police officers – it allowed the department to reduce lay-offs; we lose officers through attrition rather than through lay-offs. Current officer staffing is 660 officers. We need a minimum of 925 officers in the department based on CAD calls for service. Measure Y staffing with 739 officers is different with Measure Y staffing with 660 minus 75 officers. Patrol staffing needs a minimum of 325 officers to handle patrol calls for service. The transition to the problem-solving program will further reduce patrol staffing to 284 officers. All crime reduction teams have been eliminated except for the one Measure-Y funded Crime Reduction Team. We've eliminated a motor/traffic squad. We currently have 14-15 traffic officers and we're dropping this to 1 sergeant and six officers in January. Essentially, in January the specialized units will include the 1 traffic unit of 6; the Measure-Y positions and a few other positions funded outside of the general fund.

Member Barnett asked if the Beat Officer and the Problem-Solving Officer police the same area and if so, why the distinction between the two?

Deputy Chief Breshears answered that there are restrictions as to what a problem-solving officer can do; the beat officer has much more freedom in where they can be deployed. PSOs have designed duties and do not regularly answer 9.1.1 calls. The "beat designation" has become more of a call sign – if I work patrol in Beat 13 my call sign is 5L13 – it doesn't mean I'm on that Beat all the time. A PSO is deployed within the assigned Beat.

Member Forte asked whether the selected PSOs have committed to remain in the assignment for an extended period?

Deputy Chief Breshears answered there is a commitment to the PSO positions and in the event of retirement, the officer will be replaced rather quickly.

Member J. Brown asked whether the attrition rate has risen to "9" officers a month from the average of "4?"

Deputy Chief Breshears answered that the attrition number is in the high "6's" rather than "9."

Member Carter asked whether the use of officers in the PSO program is a good use of officers given the reduction of force.

Deputy Chief Breshears responded that he is supportive of the PSO program and without the Measure Y/Measure BB monies the department would not have the availability of the officers, period. As a Deputy Chief in Field Operations, anything that limits the deployment of officers in Field Operations and their incorporation into a larger crime reduction plan is not as effective if there were free range of use of the officers. One of the things we are looking at is that Measure Y states that a PSO assigned to each community policing beat. What the Chief would like to do is to match the community policing beats with the patrol beats. If you collapsed the 57 community policing beats to the 35 patrol beats you would still have multiple PSOs assigned and the PSOs would have more flexibility to move around the larger beat area.

On a monthly basis, what information would you like from the Police Department to come to the meeting and speak with the Committee?

Member M. Brown responded that he would like to hear more reflections from the PSOs on the activities on the beat.

Member J. Brown responded that an update on the number of officers available on the date of the meeting as well as an update on use of the PSO database and whether that data can be shared with the Committee.

Deputy Chief Breshears responded that there is a database and use has peaked and dropped off with the elimination of the PSO program in July 2010. There are two parts to the system, a front end for the evaluation and a back end for supervision. We are looking to see whether we can build the back end of the system. So we can use the front end (evaluation portion) of the system and are waiting to see if the back end (supervision portion) can be constructed and used. Measure Y pays for about 45 officers and designates \$500,000 for training and equipment. The issue is whether the money is actually there for training and equipment given the number of PSOs and the amount of M-Y funds.

Chairperson Dorado asked whether Members of the Oversight Committee could participate in internal OPD strategy meetings. Secondly, can the department

provide the documentation that shows how the PSO applies the SARA problem-solving model to projects and is reporting out the results to the NCPs and the community at-large? Lastly, the Department should consider tapping into community resources to assist in problem-solving.

Deputy Chief Breshears answered that he is open to meeting with a small, non-quorum group of Oversight Committee members and has communicated with Claudia Albano to set up a process whereby the NSCs can compile beat information for use by the PSOs.

Mark Morodomi, Office of the City Attorney, provided the overview of legal issues and referenced documents contained in the agenda package. There were no questions from the Committee.

Jeff Baker, Assistant to the City Administrator, provided an overview of the evaluation component. My primary role is to ensure compliance with the strictures of the Initiative itself. It requires an "independent" evaluator be hired to evaluate our violence prevention programming and community policing efforts and that we perform an audit as to the number of persons served and the amount of crime and violence decreased in Oakland due to the program. This is our fifth year of Measure Y, part of my role is to serve as a critic and look at the money the taxpayers have provided and determine whether we have used it effectively. To date, we have spent \$100 million dollars. Of all of our previous speakers, none have mentioned this fact. We have spent \$100 million dollars. I ensure we stay focused on the task at hand – reduce crime and violence in Oakland. You have heard the term "community policing" bantered about a lot tonight, however few have focused on what it is: some will tell you it's a "philosophy," some a "strategy" – I'm relatively sure residents of Oakland were sure of two things when they enacted Measure Y in 2004. One, "community policing" prevents crime; it's a national best practice and a foregone conclusion to reduce crime. "Community policing" creates a force of "crime preventers" not "crime fighters." Police departments throughout the country are more than willing to maintain the "9.1.1, traditional policing model," reactive policing from call to call to call. The 21st Century demands we have a "proactive" police department. Each of you would readily agree that none of us want to be robbed, have our homes broken into or our cars burglarized. The reason voters passed Measure Y in 2004 is that they wanted "crime preventers." It's important we stay focused on the fact. The second fact is that community policing saves money. One of the largest costs within the City of Oakland is our public safety costs. I don't believe that the voters willy nilly decided to go with community policing because they didn't understand what was on the ballot. I think voters knew it was imperative to

reduce the cost of public safety in Oakland – and they were willing to tax themselves to do it.

In three weeks we should present the FY 2009-2010 evaluation for your review. We are awaiting comments on the final draft from DHS and the Police Department and should receive the final after the holidays. The second piece I wanted to speak about is the far-reaching impact of Measure Y. Though we speak here often about PSOs and violence prevention programming, we have an entire public safety apparatus in Oakland that is founded on the notion of problem-solving officers. Part of my responsibility is to measure the impact of the PSO in each beat. When I began this process in 2007, we checked with OPD on their problem-solving records and there were none. We managed to place a data collection system in OPD to provide the data we needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the PSO program. If a PSO is not responding to calls for service the data collection system should be overflowing. I can assure you it is not. Part of my role is to push OPD to ensure that we (1) have PSOs (2) who are working on projects and (3) that there is relevance between the project and crime in the beat. My role is to make a connection between it all. In addition, we have 26 Measure Y violence prevention programs in the City of Oakland and my role is to make sure there is a nexus between the 26 different programs and the PSOs. That is, when a PSO shows up and there is a problem: truancy, domestic violence, alcohol, drugs, violence; we have 26 different non-profit service providers funded through Measure Y and the PSO should reach into that Measure Y toolbox and use it to resolve the problem. It has nothing to do with bicycles or walking officers. How do we police Oakland in the 21st Century? How do we prevent crime and violence? Measure Y not only provides the officers, it provides the program tools to problem-solve. Part of my role is to bring all these resources together, to form a comprehensive violence prevention program answer. The \$64K question is whether the investment works – does Measure Y programming reduce crime and violence? Hopefully, the evaluation will inform whether our investment has been worthwhile.

Member Carter asked whether we have a good picture of the effectiveness of the PSO program?

Staff person Baker answered that his role is to evaluate the effectiveness of the PSO program. To accomplish this, you need data. Initially there was no PSO data. We put a data collection system in place. Now we can look to see whether during the course of a shift a PSO is meeting with the Neighborhood Council, the Neighborhood Watch group, folks in the school district, the local churches – then is the PSO taking away from the meetings identified problems and using the

SARA model to resolve the problems.

Member Barnett asked whether the role of the Committee is to evaluate the evaluation. To comment whether the evaluation meets certain criteria and comment upon that or is the role to conduct an independent evaluation to determine if the Measure Y programs funded serve the appropriate functions?

Staff person Baker answered that the Initiative mandates the Committee: the charge is to advise the City Administrator and City Council as to the implantation of the Fire, PSO and violence prevention programs. The evaluation can be a tool to focus your perception as to what the programs should be and to focus on how to resolve the issues of crime and violence. The role of the Committee is yours to define.

Chairperson Dorado emphasized that it is not just Measure Y funded programs that assist in problem solving, it includes resources from the County and State.

Member Forte asked whether the Committee should review the draft evaluation prior to publication of the final document.

Staff person Baker responded that often there are errors in data, analysis and presumptions made in the draft document; the process we have allows DHS and OPD to review the draft document internally to ensure there is no misinformation between the departments and the evaluator. To be fair to DHS and OPD we provide the draft and an opportunity to correct any errors prior to final publication. Our plan is to provide you a month to review the final document prior to public discussion.

There was one speaker on this Item:

Sandjiv Handa, East Bay News Service:
(Mr. Handa spoke for a total of 8 minutes.)

In six years \$124M dollars has been collected. With an additional \$1.6B dollars in federal aid to Oakland, is Oakland better off? I would say no. There are more persons on food stamps, more in poverty, more dropping out of school. During WWII when the freeways came in they took out thousands of homes and when BART came in and took out dozens of businesses on Broadway, they promised it would help downtown Oakland to grow. That was a lie; it stopped the expansion of Chinatown. The end result is that we now have two split districts. When Oakland went to district elections in the 1970s, the premise was that we

would have Council members accountable to a smaller constituency and you would not need to raise so much money with 7 council districts. It's the exact opposite that has happened. Council members figured out early that they didn't have to be accountable as a whole. They could make deals, horse trade votes and do whatever they wanted. So now you have the specter of Council members being in office for sixteen or twenty years or longer. This is something that ever happened prior to the 1970s and the district elections. For the first time we are getting a Mayor direct from the City Council. As I told Ms. Quan, one of the problems she faces is to undo some of the damages done during her time on the Council. Let's start with the police department. We got to a high of 772 officers during the Harris administration. Brown reduced the police department from 777 to 739 officers. On his third try, Brown was able to get money from the voters. Oakland has never looked at long-term creative solutions because of old arbitrator decisions and the old way of doing business. Several of the firehouses respond to 5-20 fire-related calls a year; the rest are paramedic services. San Francisco has paramedics in-house. Almost all Oakland firefighters are certified as paramedics. The end result is that you're running a \$700K - \$1M piece of equipment with four to seven firefighters. What if you converted to a system where you had less fire stations and more paramedics. The reason the fire fighters are not on the table for cuts within the Fire Department is because of Measure Y and the City Council agreed as a settlement that there would be no layoffs of firefighters until June 30, 2013. The police department went from 803 officers to 779 in six months. Ironically, as of November 14th it was 674. If you do the math, with 660 on the payroll, 70 are on injury leave, 7 more on limited light duty; that leaves 583 officers currently available. Minus the 75 going into Measure Y, that leaves 508; minus 27 in Internal Affairs and 6 command staff, that leaves you 475 officers available. Less than 50 of the officers laid off will not return. The rule of thumb in NCPCs is that the groups sets the priority for the beat. Therein lies the problem. 98% of the persons within the NCPC do not attend the NCPC meeting. The NCPCs are not in touch with the neighborhoods. On the issue of legal dollars, the city has a self-insured liability fund; at this point it is \$23M dollars in the hole. As it stands now, the fund has paid out \$770K dollars defending lawsuits on labor employment issues. It has paid out \$1M in conflict of interest lawsuits related to police officers. It has paid more than \$600K for "doff and don" for police officers taking on and off their uniforms. The last thing is that you have a \$50-55M deficit coming up. Then you have a City Council that is sitting on more than \$4M dollars, cash in undesignated spending that could bring back 24 police officers for one year. The money is used for political operations. You as a Committee have the ability to notice a meeting, discuss what you would have the City Council take up as a priority regarding spending and make presentation to the Mayor and City Council

during their budget session. It is an option to consider as an Oversight Committee.

Item 5: **Discussion: Public Safety and Violence Prevention
Programming Strategy Topics and Assignments for Research
and Advisory Reports to the Oakland Public Safety Committee
and Oakland City Council**

Motion: Member Forte made motion to put Item 5 over to next meeting. There was no second on this Motion.

Action: Motion failed.

Motion: Member J. Brown made Motion to convene a "Special Meeting" on January 10, 2011, to discuss strategy on going forward in a more productive manner in 2011. Member M. Brown seconded.

There was one speaker on the Item:

Sandjiv Handa, East Bay News Service:
Mayor-Elect Quan's first act was to hire a public relations firm. Your Committee is seen by the City Council as being an obstacle. When you raise an issue about crime or violence, it is usually negative and picked up by the blogs and the mass media all over the world. When you talk about the negative parts – it's a problem. When you have that type of context, I suggest your motion have a second part: What is your proposal for the specific discussions the City Council and Public Safety Committee should take regarding Measure Y funding and programs?

Action: Motion passed by consensus.

Item 6: **Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn. Seconded. Motion passed by consensus.

ITEM 4:

**DISCUSSION AND COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS:
PUBLIC SAFETY AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION
PROGRAMMING STRATEGY TOPICS AND
ASSIGNMENTS FOR RESEARCH AND
ADVISORY REPORTS TO THE OAKLAND
PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE AND
OAKLAND CITY COUNCIL**



Measure Y Violence Prevention Programs for 2009-12

Measure Y is a comprehensive effort to address the complex and multiple risk factors associated with violence in Oakland, California. Efforts build on positive assets and resilience in individuals, families and communities. Based on the Measure Y legislation, City Council approved the following best practice-based strategies for reducing violence:

Youth Comprehensive Services:

- **Juvenile Justice Center Wraparound** focuses on case management, mentoring and advocacy for youth leaving the Alameda County Juvenile Justice Center (JJC) and reconnecting with Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) or other educational institutions.
- **Restorative Justice** trains staff who work with young people on probation and parole to engage communities in dialogue with perpetrators of violence and find ways to heal.
- **After-School Job Training** helps high-risk youth acquire skills and make a small income.
- **Subsidized Summer Youth Employment** provides job placement for high risk youth in the Oakland's Mayor's Summer Jobs Program.
- **Safe Passages Middle School Model** provides assessment, case management and referrals, (including mental health) for high-risk students at OUSD middle schools.
- **Second Step Violence Prevention Curriculum** reduces suspensions and violence in Pre-K – 8th grades at all Oakland public schools and Head Start centers.
- **Gang Intervention** provides services and case management to gang involved youth at Oakland public Alternative Schools and parent education classes to school parents.

Services to Children and Youth Exposed to Violence:

- **Family Violence Intervention Unit** reduces the negative effects of exposure to domestic violence by providing victims with Family Advocates and Child Caseworkers.
- **Mental Health Services** are provided to young children (0-5) who witness violence.
- **Outreach to Sexually Exploited Minors** connects young women exploited by prostitution to the programs and support they need to get off the streets.
- **Alameda County Family Justice Center** provides a one stop location for all the needs of victims of family violence.

Diversion and Reentry Services:

- **Project Choice Model** provides intensive support both pre- and post-release for youth and young adults paroling to Oakland in order to reduce recidivism.
- **Pathways to Change** is a diversion program for repeat juvenile offenders on probation.
- **Reentry Training and Employment** for individuals on parole, including subsidized on-the-job training, reduces the allure of the underground economy.
- **The Mayors Office** receives funding for a Reentry Employment Specialist to link the formerly incarcerated to City and other public sector jobs.

Violent Incident/Crisis Response/Community Organizing:

- **Crisis Response and Support Network** provides first response, intensive support services and mental health to friends and relatives of homicide victims.
- The Youth ALIVE! **Caught in the Crossfire** program provides intensive support services to young gun shot victims under the age of 20 at Highland Hospital.
- **Street Outreach** provides neighborhood and "hot spot" specific street outreach in high-violence areas in order to reduce street violence.
- **City-County Neighborhood Initiative** uses community builders to support and organize neighbors to address issues impacting quality of life (e.g., blight and drug dealing).
- **Public Safety Districts** coordinated by the Mayor's Office focuses on communication and coordination of existing City services to prevent violence in neighborhoods.

I. Violence Prevention Programming Funded Through Measure Y:

Department of Human Services:

Youth Comprehensive Services:

Juvenile Justice Center Wraparound Program
Restorative Justice
After School Job Training
Subsidized Summer Youth Employment
Safe Passage Middle School Model
Second Step Violence Prevention Curriculum

Services to Children and Youth Exposed to Violence:

Family Violence Intervention Unit
Mental Health Services
Outreach to Sexually Exploited Minors
Alameda County Family Justice Center

Diversion and Reentry Services

Project Choice Model
Pathways to Change
Reentry Training and Employment

Violent Incident/Crisis Response/Community Organizing

Crisis Response and Support Network
Youth Alive! Caught in the Crossfire Program
Street Outreach
City-County Neighborhood Initiative

II. Fire Services Agency Programs Funded By Measure Y

Open Fire Stations, 25 Truck Companies and 7 Engine
Companies
Mentoring Services
Expanded Paramedic Services

Measure Y Violence Prevention Programming

Page 2

III. Police Department Services Funded by Measure Y

Each community policing beat shall have at least one neighborhood officer assigned solely to serve the residents of that beat to provide consistent contact and familiarity between residents and officers, continuity in problem solving and basic availability of police response in each neighborhood.

Crime Reduction Team: At least 6 officers to investigate and respond to illegal narcotic transactions and commission of violent crimes in identified violence hot spots.

School Safety: Supplement police services available to respond to school safety and truancy.

Domestic violence and child abuse intervention: Additional officers to team with social service providers to intervene in situations of domestic violence and child abuse, including child prostitution.

Officer training and equipment: Training in community-policing techniques, establishing police-social services referrals and equipping offices provided the total costs of which shall not exceed \$500,000 in any fiscal year.

IV. Evaluation: Office of the City Administrator

An “independent” evaluation of Measure Y programming including the number of people served and the rate of crime or violence reduction achieved.

Prospective Calendar of Reports:

Assigned to:

January _____	Adult Programs
February _____	PSO Staffing
March _____	Information Access
April _____	Committee Operations (staffing, quorums, by-laws)
May _____	Youth Programs
June _____	Annual Report
July _____	School-Based Programs
August _____	
September _____	Non PSO OPD Programs
October _____	Family Violence Programs
November _____	Re-Entry Programs
December _____	