



SAFETY AND SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (SSOC)
SSOC created by the Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act of 2014 (Measure Z)

Regular Meeting
Monday, April 22, 2024 at 6:30pm

1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Oakland, CA 94612
City Council Chamber, 3rd Floor

Oversight Commission Members:

*Kelly Cure (D-1), Chair: Omar Farmer (D-2), Paula Hawthorn (D-3),
Vice Chair: Yoana Tchoukleva (D-4), VACANT (D-5), Samuel Dawit (pending)*
(D6), Gloria Bailey-Ray, (D-7), Michael Wallace (Mayoral), Sonya Mehta (At-Large)

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

OBSERVE:

**You may appear in person on Monday, April 22, 2024, at 6:30pm at
1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Oakland, CA 94612 in Council Chamber**

OR

**To observe, the public may view the televised meeting by viewing
KTOP channel 10 on Xfinity (Comcast) or ATT Channel 99 and locating
City of Oakland KTOP – Channel 10**

**Please note: The ZOOM link and access numbers below are to view / listen
to the meetings only – not for participation.**

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88436690045>

Or One tap mobile :

+16694449171,84538741892# US
+16699009128,84538741892# US (San Jose)

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):
+1 669 444 9171 US, +1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose), +1 253 205 0468 US
+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma), +1 346 248 7799 US (Houston), +1 719 359 4580 US
+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC), +1 305 224 1968 US, +1 309 205 3325 US
+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago), +1 360 209 5623 US, +1 386 347 5053 US

Webinar ID: 884 3669 0045

International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84461212693>

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The Oversight Commission welcomes you to its meetings and your interest is appreciated.

- If you wish to speak before the Oversight Commission, please fill out a speaker card and hand it to the Oversight Commission Staff.
- 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 Commission 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 Commission’s jurisdictions may be addressed. Time limitations shall be at the discretion of the Chair.
- Comment in advance. To send your comment directly to the Commissioner’s and staff BEFORE the meeting starts, please send your comment, along with your full name and agenda item number you are commenting on, to Felicia Verdin at fverdin@oaklandca.gov.

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

If you have any questions about these protocols,
please e-mail Felicia Verdin at fverdin@oaklandca.gov.

Do you need an ASL, Cantonese, Mandarin or Spanish interpreter or other assistance to participate? Please email fverdin@oaklandca.gov or call (510) 238-3128 or (510) 238-2007 for TDD/TTY five days in advance.

¿Necesita un intérprete en español, cantonés o mandarín, u otra ayuda para participar? Por favor envíe un correo electrónico a fverdin@oaklandca.gov o llame al (510) 238-3128 o al (510) 238-2007 para TDD/TTY por lo menos cinco días antes de la reunión. Gracias.

你需要手語, 西班牙語, 粵語或國語翻譯服務嗎? 請在會議前五個工作天電郵 fverdin@oaklandca.gov 或 致電 (510) 238-3128 或 (510) 238-2007 TDD/TTY.

**Each person wishing to speak on items must complete a Speaker Card
Persons addressing the Safety and Services Oversight Commission shall state their names and the
organization they are representing, if any.**

ITEM	TIME	TYPE	Attachments
1. Call to Order	6:30 PM	AD	
2. Roll Call	1 Minute	AD	
3. Approve Meeting Minutes	1 Minute	A	Attachment
4. Open Forum – For items not listed on the Agenda	5 Minutes	I	
5. SSOC Dashboard – MACRO ad hoc discussion (Farmer)	20 Minutes	I	Attachment
6. SSOC Commissioners will review and take possible action on MACRO ad hoc recommendations (Farmer)	10 Minutes	A	Attachment
7. Former SSOC Commissioner Feedback: Link to Survey: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1Nv25BYSZO3Wf3C1UjD4LFgqbhfY7nFcDUX-22yIV5Mc/edit (Farmer)	20 Minutes	I	Attachment
8. Discuss the Oakland Community Violence Reduction and Emergency Response Act of 2024 as a potential SSOC Recommendation (Tchoukleva)	20 Minutes	A	Attachment
9. Ceasefire Progress Report Recommendation (Tchoukleva)	15 Minutes	A	Attachment
10. DVP Dashboard update (Tchoukleva)	15 Minutes	I	
11. Remote Participation (Tchoukleva)	5 Minutes	I	Attachment
12. SSOC Dashboard – (1) Initiatives, (2) CARE, (3) Strategic Plan Objective 2.4, Evaluation Summary (Tchoukleva/Farmer/Bailey-Ray/Cure)	20 Minutes	I	Attachment

13. Report from Staff – Schedule Planning	5 Minutes	AD	
14. New Business: SSOC Membership, etc	5 Minutes	A	
15. Adjournment	1 Minute	A	

A = Action Item / I = Informational Item / AD = Administrative Item /



SAFETY AND SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (SSOC)
SSOC created by the Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act of 2014 (Measure Z)

Regular Meeting Minutes - DRAFT
Monday, March 25, 2024 at 6:30pm

1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Oakland, CA 94612
City Council Chamber, 3rd Floor

Oversight Commission Members:

*Kelly Cure (D-1), Chair: Omar Farmer (D-2), Paula Hawthorn (D-3),
Vice Chair: Yoana Tchoukleva (D-4), VACANT (D-5), VACANT (D-6),
Gloria Bailey-Ray, (D-7), Michael Wallace (Mayoral), Sonya Mehta (At-Large)*

In attendance: Chair Omar Farmer, Vice Chair Yoana Tchoukleva, Commissioner Sonya Mehta, Commissioner Gloria Bailey Ray, Commissioner Kelly Cure

ITEM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Call to Order
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approve Meeting Minutes Motion to approve the minutes Commissioner Hawthorn, second by Vice Chair Tchoukleva. The minutes were approved unanimously.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Open Forum No public comment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presentation by Urban Institute on Measure Z Evaluation Chair Farmer requested an update from the Urban Institute on the Measure Z, OPD evaluation. Urban Institute presented a PowerPoint and background on the evaluation activities. Urban was awarded the contract in August 2022. They developed protocols and a process to collect data to write the interim report. The final report is scheduled to be completed by the end of the year and provide information on results and impact. The evaluation is being completed in partnership with the Urban Strategies Council in Oakland. The Commissioners asked a range of questions about the evaluation pertaining to the surveys and mentioning in the report that the Ceasefire evaluation is being completed through a separate contract.

Commissioners also requested additional information about accountability measures. The research findings will be communicated with the public in partnership with the City of Oakland and community partners.

Chair Farmer requested to have the report completed by the end of October to be completed in time for the joint meeting.

- **Update on New Measure Z by Oaklander's Together**
- A very detailed presentation was made on the new proposed Measure Z initiative by David Kakishiba. The Notice of Intent was included in the agenda packet. There is a citizen voter participation process and signatures are being collected and need to be submitted to the City Clerk. Alameda County will verify the signatures before the new measure is included on the November ballot. The Commissioners asked a series of questions in response to Mr. Kakishiba's presentation.

Public Comment: Mike Ubell

- **SSOC Dashboard – (1) Verified Response Item 4:**
https://oakland.granicus.com/player/clip/5962?view_id=2&redirect=true
(2) MACRO, (3) CARE, (4) SSOC & RPSTF (Farmer)

Chair Farmer that the Verified Response ordinance was passed by City Council and will improve 911 response times. This is an ordinance that was put forward by the SSOC.

The chair also provided an update on the MACRO program and indicated that he will request their attendance at the next SSOC meeting. The item will be discussed further next month.

The chair also provided an update on CARE and further community outreach is scheduled and a survey is going to be released to gather feedback on Measure Z.

The Reimaging Public Safety Taskforce recommendations are being tracked and included in the agenda packet.

- **SSOC members will review and take possible action on remote participation amendments to bylaws (Tchoukleva)**
- Vice Chair Tchoukleva provided an update on the revised bylaws to include a section on remote participation. The City Attorney's Office was

requested to review the proposed bylaws amendment developed by the SSOC. The Vice Chair requested feedback from SSOC members.

Commissioner Bailey-Ray made a motion to accept the proposed amendment for the SSOC bylaws as they are written and presented. Second by Commissioner Hawthorn.

The motion passed unanimously.

- **Ceasefire Update by the (Farmer/Tchoukleva)**

Chair Farmer and Vice Chair Tchoukleva made a presentation on the Ceasefire Program briefing by Reygan Cunningham to the chairs and vice chairs of public safety commissions in Oakland. Chair Farmer requested that the same presentation is made at the SSOC. Vice Chair Tchoukleva discussed the Ceasefire executive summary and the importance of the program. The City is reprioritizing the Program to ensure that it is fully implemented. Ceasefire is a proven strategy to reduce violent crime.

- **Report from Staff – Schedule Planning**

Staff did not have a scheduling update.

- **New Business**

It was discussed to invite the new chief and pro

- **Adjournment**

MACRO Development: Improves 911 response times by taking a portion of the 911 call volume					
Training	Status	Quantitative Analysis	Status	Transparency	Status
Develop 911 Dispatcher Curriculum	TBD? Awaiting comparable curriculums for comparison.	Percentage increase of diverted 911 calls per month.	Is that a part of their monthly report?	Launch public information officer position	In progress by OFD
Train dispatchers and MACRO responders on what their parameters are.	TBD?	Review stats from other organizations	Waiting to see their stats.	Create a direct phone number	COMPLETE. PUBLISHED as 510-44-MACRO in March 2024
Evaluate total scope of calls MACRO will ultimately be able to go on.	Done during RPSTF process?			SSOC MACRO Sessions	In progress: tentatively put on agenda for April. Need to discuss with MACRO & CAB. Elliott agreed to attending these meetings during our conversation in the hallway on 2/20.
Conduct a daily or monthly review of calls for service and discuss why certain calls could have gone to MACRO or not, and figure out how to do more with MACRO resources going forward	Not happening yet.			Public CAB Meetings	At the Sept or October 2023 meeting OFD committed to having all CAB meetings public in 2024. Held last meeting in Hearing Room 1, but it was not open to the public. Was initially invited to 2/19 meeting then receiving a cancellation notice for. Told by CAB members it was still happening and was asked to attend so I did. While there was told it wasn't open to the public when I tried to speak. Didn't ask me to leave but didn't feel welcome. Was told that I couldn't make any comments unless there was time at the end. They've also changed their mind and now state that they'll only be doing 2 public meetings per year. When TBD. CAB meetings are dysfunctional in terms of what's expected of the members. They appear to starting from square 1 in terms of what their role should be. In addition, the Jan meeting was cancelled and rescheduled 3 times. I received invites to those meetings as well.
				Recommend to city council for MACRO to be governed by a city of Oakland Commission that's governed by the Brown Act for increased transparency and inclusiveness.	Recommendation in progress. Vote on recommendation now then present it to city council at the joint meeting? Recruit a Councilmember to create a resolution to initiate the development of a city of Oakland MACRO Commission that's governed by the Brown Act.
				Request MACRO be audited by the city auditor.	Discuss at April 2024 meeting.
				Create a public records request regarding MACRO inter-departmental communications	Discuss at April 2024 meeting.

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES FOR OVERSIGHT OF THE MOBILE ASSISTANCE COMMUNITY RESPONDERS OF OAKLAND (MACRO) IN ORDER TO IMPROVE PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY AND CREATE TRANSPARENT OPERATIONAL, BUSINESS, FINANCIAL, AND ADMINISTRATIVE MACRO PRACTICES

WHEREAS the city of Oakland has established public safety as one of its highest priorities and has determined that safety is essential for a thriving economy, healthy community, and quality of life for all Oakland residents; and

WHEREAS issues with police misconduct and ineffective deescalation tactics and training in response to members of the public who are in a mental health crises have at times resulted in excessive force and unnecessary loss of life at the hands of the police, as was the case during the Joshua Pawlik killing when the Oakland Police Department used their paramilitary BearCat armored vehicle as a shooting platform to apply deadly force; this incident was the impetus for adopting the Mobile Assistance Community Responders of Oakland (MACRO) program; and

WHEREAS investing in a coordinated system of non-sworn personnel intervention efforts before injury occurs will reduce economic and emotional costs and is a fiscally responsible use of taxpayer dollars when implemented efficiently and effectively; and

WHEREAS the current community input model for the Mobile Assistance Community Responders of Oakland is through the use of a Community Advisory Board (CAB) that is not operating as a City of Oakland Brown Act governed board or commission making it difficult to assess the efficacy of their operations; CAB meetings are not open to the public; recordings are not made, and minutes are not kept, making the functioning of the current CAB essentially confidential; and

WHEREAS members of the CAB have reported they have little to no direction on their duties. that meetings are not held on a consistent time or day, that there historically has been no set frequency, and that meetings are often canceled on short notice, making it difficult for them to plan their daily lives; CAB members have further stated that their input on the direction of the CAB and MACRO program is consistently disregarded or overlooked; and

WHEREAS the public perception is that the current percentage of 911 calls that MACRO handles in the place of the Oakland Police Department (OPD) is far less than the percentage forecasted by the study completed during the city of Oakland's Reimagining Public Safety Task Force process; and

WHEREAS the Oakland Police Department 911 Call Center has been out of California Office of Emergency Services (CAL OES) standards for call answering times for several years and is currently at risk of losing critical state funding or the ability to take 911 calls altogether if 911 call answering times are not improved; MACRO was designed to take a portion of 911 call center volume, resulting in a reduced overall call center volume and increased chances of meeting CAL OES standards; and

WHEREAS there is no evidence that MACRO has had an impact on improving 911 response , as anticipated; and

WHEREAS one of the duties of the Public Safety and Services Oversight Commission (SSOC) in the course of their oversight over Measure Z is to oversee and recommend strategies for improving 911 response times and is therefore recommending the implementation of this Resolution; and

BE IT RESOLVED the Oakland City Council establishes a City of Oakland Commission to oversee MACRO, with full Brown Act transparency requirements, and with the direction that this Commission meet no less than monthly; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that that the MACRO Commission shall: (1) receive reports on critical data including but not limited to: he number and percentage of 911 calls diverted from the Oakland Police Department and Oakland Fire Department call center to MACRO; the number of requests for service received through electronic mail (email); the number of requests for service received by their publicly shared phone numbers; (2) evaluate the total scope of calls for service MACRO will ultimately be able to respond to per day; (3) conduct a weekly or monthly review of calls for service and discuss why certain calls could have gone to MACRO or not, and figure out how to do more with MACRO resources thereafter; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the Oakland City Council instructs the Oakland Fire Department (OFD) and the Oakland Police Department to: (1) make public and implement clear and understandable policies regarding MACRO call for service capabilities and limitations; (2) make public any training and curriculum developed for 911 operators and MACRO responders, including training on the parameters of calls that can be diverted to MACRO; (3) review statistics from comparable agencies in an effort to conduct quantitative analysis on how they can become more functional, efficient and effective in responding to calls for service; (4) develop and implement a strategic plan that identifies an organizational structure and future plans to scale the program to their maximum capabilities; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that each fiscal year, before the City adopts its two year policy budget or its mid-cycle budget adjustments, the Oakland Fire Department shall submit to the City Council, and the City Council shall adopt, a MACRO personnel hiring plan demonstrating how the City will achieve and/or maintain a strength of force required by this Resolution for the MACRO program to operate to its highest capabilities; the hiring plan will make use of assumptions that department attrition rates, recruiting success, and other relevant factors affecting the growth or shrinkage of the program will be comparable to the past two to four years' experience; and

FINALLY, BE IT RESOLVED that the Oakland City Council finds and determines the forgoing recitals are true and correct and hereby adopts and incorporates them into this Resolution.

Measure Z and New Measure Feedback

These questions are designed to provide current SSOC commissioners with a summary of your feedback or lessons learned from your experiences as a commissioner. We would appreciate it if you could fill out this form by April 17 (Wed) at 5pm PST.

* Indicates required question

1. Name *

2. Email Address *

3. What was your biggest challenge as a member of the SSOC?

4. Is there anything you would have changed about Measure Z? If so, please elaborate.

5. Were there any additional support, resources, or authority you felt that the SSOC needed to be effective?

6. Have you reviewed the [new measure](#), entitled "The Oakland Community Violence and Emergency Response Act of 2024"? If so, do you support it? Why or why not? *

7. If we organized a get-together of former and current SSOC Commissioners, do you think you would attend? *

Mark only one oval.

- Yes, could be fun!
- No, I am done with all things SSOC!
- Maybe, invite me and I will see!

8. Is there anything else you'd like to add?

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Attachment for Agenda Item 8

Please see below proposed language for SSOC recommendation/endorsement of the Oakland Community Violence Reduction and Emergency Response Act. We will get a chance to discuss during our meeting.

Measure Z ends at the end of 2024. If we don't pass a new measure in November, we will lose over \$30 million in critical public safety funds at a time when many Oaklanders are asking for a greater investment in community safety. We, volunteer commissioners on the Oakland Safety Services Oversight Commission, urge you to sign the petition to get the Community Violence Reduction and Emergency Response Act on the ballot in November.

February 23, 2024

2024 FEB 23 PM 2:15
FILED
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
OAKLAND

VIA HAND-DELIVERY

Ms. Asha Reed
City Clerk, City of Oakland
1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza
First and Second Floors
Oakland, CA 94612

RE: Oakland Community Violence Reduction and Emergency
Response Act of 2024

Dear Ms. Reed:


Enclosed please find a "Notice of Intent to Circulate Petition," and the text for a proposed initiative ordinance in the City of Oakland, the "Oakland Community Violence Reduction and Emergency Response Act of 2024," along with the \$500 filing fee. I request that you immediately forward a copy of the proposed ordinance to the City Attorney for preparation of a Ballot Title and Summary. Also, enclosed please find the proponent's signed statement required by California Elections Code section 9608.

This letter authorizes my legal counsel Jim Sutton and Eli Love (copied here) to submit the initiative and accompanying documents to your office, and also authorizes you and other City officials to correspond with Mr. Sutton and Mr. Love for any and all matters related to this proposed initiative.

As soon as the Ballot Title and Summary are prepared, please e-mail it to Mr. Sutton and Mr. Love (jsutton@campaignlawyers.com, elove@campaignlawyers.com; 415/732-7700).

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please direct all correspondence and questions regarding this initiative ordinance to Mr. Sutton and Mr. Love.

Sincerely,


Zack Wasserman [Robert Zachary Wasserman]
3833 Lakeshore Ave.
Oakland, CA 94610

Attachments

cc: James R. Sutton, Esq.
Eli Love, Esq.

Proponent's Signed Statement Pursuant to Elections Code Section 9608

Pursuant to California Elections Code section 9608, I, as the proponent, hereby submit this signed statement with regard to the proposed initiative ordinance titled "Oakland Community Violence Reduction and Emergency Response Act of 2024:

I, Zack Wasserman, acknowledge that it is a misdemeanor under state law (Section 18650 of the Elections Code) to knowingly or willfully allow the signatures on an initiative petition to be used for any purpose other than qualification of the proposed measure for the ballot. I certify that I will not knowingly or willfully allow the signatures for this initiative to be used for any purpose other than qualification of the measure for the ballot.

Dated this 23rd day of February, 2024



Zack Wasserman
3833 Lakeshore Ave.
Oakland, CA 94610

[Repeat Zack Wasserman]

FILED
2024 FEB 23 PM 2:15
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
OAKLAND

2024 FEB 23 PM 2: 14

Notice of Intent to Circulate Petition

FILED
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
OAKLAND

Notice is hereby given by the person whose name appears hereon of her intention to circulate the petition within the City of Oakland for the purpose of raising revenue solely to pay for the development, implementation and evaluation of a holistic, results-driven approach to the prevention and reduction of violent crime in Oakland; balancing investments in community violence prevention, police and fire services; creating a Citywide Community Violence Reduction Plan designed to achieve specific violence reduction targets; empowering a citizens' planning and oversight commission and an independent budget auditor to monitor and account for the proper and effective use of revenue raised from this measure; and continuing and increasing the parcel tax and parking tax imposed by the 2014 Oakland Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act (Measure Z). The proposed initiative ordinance is titled the "Oakland Community Violence Reduction and Emergency Response Act of 2024."

A statement of the reasons of the proposed action as contemplated in the petition is as follows:

Violent crime is a very serious issue in our City, with most Oaklanders feeling less safe today than a year or two ago. Today Oakland is facing an unprecedented wave of robberies, burglaries and car jackings and break-ins. Oaklanders want city government to implement a results-driven approach to public safety that balances investments in community violence prevention and law enforcement strategies, and is publicly accountable for achieving meaningful reductions in violent crime.

Oaklanders want city government to prioritize the use of local tax dollars to reduce gun violence, improve response times to 911 emergency calls for service, and reduce human trafficking, including the sexual exploitation of minors. Oaklanders expect city government to be transparent and accountable to the general public for its strategic use of local tax dollars in achieving improvements in public safety.

The 2014 Oakland Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act and the parcel tax it authorized will expire at the end of 2024 and the continuation of the services provided by that act and the revenues it generates to support those services are critical to maintaining public safety in Oakland. If that Act is not renewed by the voters, the City will lose over \$30 million dollars that support public safety and that provides for critical violence prevention services and 58 sworn police officers.

The revenues received from the Act will be expended exclusively for the benefit of the purposes and goals stated in this Measure.

Please sign this petition so our Oakland voters can continue to provide funds to support critical violence prevention and public safety measures to protect our City.



Zack Wasserman
3833 Lakeshore Ave.
Oakland, CA 94610

[Robert Zachary Wasserman]

2/29/2024
Date

OAKLAND COMMUNITY VIOLENCE AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE ACT OF 2024

The People of the City of Oakland do ordain as follows:

PART 1. General Provisions

SECTION 1. Title.

This Ordinance may be cited as the “Oakland Community Violence Reduction and Emergency Response Act of 2024” and may be referred to herein as “the Act”, “this Ordinance” or “Measure”.

SECTION 2. Findings.

Violent crime is a very serious issue in our City. Most Oaklanders feel less safe today than a year or two ago with Oakland is facing an unprecedented wave of robberies, burglaries and break-ins. Oaklanders want City government to implement a results-driven approach to public safety which balances investments in community violence prevention and law enforcement strategies, and which is publicly accountable for achieving meaningful reductions in violent crime.

Oaklanders want City government to prioritize the use of local tax dollars to reduce gun violence and property crimes which threaten people’s safety, improve response times to 911 emergency calls for service, and reduce human trafficking, including the sexual exploitation of minors. Oaklanders expect City government to be transparent and accountable to the general public for its strategic use of local tax dollars in achieving improvements in public safety.

The 2014 Oakland Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act and the parcel tax it authorized which provided over \$30 million each year for these purposes will expire at the end of 2024. The continuation of the services provided by that Act and the revenues it generates to support those services are critical to maintaining public safety in Oakland.

The chief purpose and intent of this measure is to raise revenue solely to pay for the development, implementation, and evaluation of a holistic, results-driven approach to the prevention and reduction of violent crime in Oakland. This approach balances investments in community violence prevention, police, and fire services; creates a citywide Community Violence Reduction Plan designed to achieve specific violence reduction targets; and empowers a citizens’ planning and oversight commission and an independent budget auditor to monitor and account for the proper and effective use of revenue raised from this measure. The taxes imposed under this Ordinance are solely for these purposes and to pay for certain administrative expenses related to the funded programs.

FILED
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
OAKLAND
2024 FEB 23 PM 2:16

SECTION 3. Objectives.

The tax proceeds raised by the special taxes created by this Ordinance may be used only to pay for costs or expenses relating to or arising from efforts to achieve the following desired goals: (1) reduce homicides, robberies, car jackings and break-ins, domestic violence, and other gun-related violence; (2) reduce response time for 911 emergency calls for service, and improve the quality of response; and (3) reduce the incidence of human trafficking, including the sexual exploitation of minors.

SECTION 4. Planning, Oversight, and Accountability.

A. Commission: Adoption of this Ordinance shall establish the Oakland Public Safety Planning and Oversight Commission ("Commission") which shall replace the existing Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Oversight and Accountability Commission.

1. Composition: The Commission shall be composed of five (5) members who shall be appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Council pursuant to Section 601 of the Charter. The composition of the Commission should be reflective of the diversity of Oakland and shall include members who have expertise in criminal justice, public safety, public health, social services, emergency services, and community violence intervention and prevention programs and/or research, finance and evaluations in those areas. At least one member shall have lived experience with service-eligible populations, and one member shall have professional law enforcement experience, preferably at a command officer level, and/or academic expertise in law enforcement.
2. Conflicts of Interest: Each Commission member shall certify that the member and the member's immediate family members, business associates and employers have no financial interest in any program, project, organization, agency or other entity that is seeking or will seek funding approval under this Ordinance. Financial interest includes, without limitation, salaries, consultant fees, program fees, commissions, gifts, gratuities, favors, sales income, rental payments, investment income or other business income. A Commission member shall immediately notify the City Administrator and the Chair of the Commission of any real or possible conflict of interest between membership on the Commission and work or other involvement with entities funded by the taxes provided for in this Ordinance. Any dispute about whether a conflict of interest exists shall be resolved by the Public Ethics Commission.
3. Duties of the Commission: The Commission shall perform the following duties:
 - a. Develop and approve a Four Year Community Violence Reduction Plan.

- b. Recommend to the City Council the adoption of the Four Year Community Reduction Plan which the Council may approve or reject but not modify; if the Council rejects the Plan, it will return it to the Commission with recommended changes and the Commission will submit a new Plan to the Council which the Council may accept or reject but not modify.
 - c. Evaluate the implementation and impact of the Community Violence Reduction Plan, and, at the Commission's discretion, retain an independent consultant to assist such evaluation.
 - d. Review the seven hundred (700) floor number for sworn police officers, the eight hundred (800) number governing layoffs for police, and the four hundred eighty (480) number governing layoffs for firefighters set in Sections 5(A) and (B) below in 2029 for the City 2030 budget. Upon such review based upon the Four Year Community Reduction Plan, any analysis of the performance of the actions authorized by the Act and other crime factors and statistics, the Commission may recommend a different number for each category to the City Council and the Council may approve or reject the new number; if the Council rejects the recommendation, the number shall remain unchanged.
 - e. Monitor the allocation and use of all revenues generated by this Act;
 - f. Submit any policy recommendations to the Mayor and City Council to ensure the City of Oakland's compliance with the purpose and intent of this Act, including recommendations for corrective actions, if any.
 - g. Review and provide comments on all non-confidential reports and recommendations concerning potential suspension and/or reduction of the number of law enforcement personnel and suspension of the tax.
 - h. At least every three (3) years, the department head or his/her designee of each City department receiving and/or disbursing funds generated by this Act shall present to the Commission a priority spending plan for funds received from this Act. The priority spending plan shall include proposed expenditures, strategic rationales for those expenditures and intended measurable outcomes and metrics expected from those expenditures, all of which shall be incorporated into the Four Year Community Violence Reduction Plan. The first presentation shall occur within 120 days of the effective date of this Act. Twice each year, the Commission shall receive a report from a representative of each City department receiving funds from this Act on the status of the priority spending plans and the demonstrated progress towards the desired outcomes.
 - i. Submit reports to the public that the Commission determines are appropriate to serve its purposes.
4. Community Violence Reduction Planning: All revenue raised from this Act, after payment of the administrative fees described herein, shall be spent on direct services, programs, and strategies designed to achieve the violence reduction and public safety goals and metrics established in the Four-Year Community

Violence Reduction Plans developed by the Commission. The first Four-Year Plan will be effective July 1, 2026 and the second Four-Year Plan will be effective July 1, 2030. Each Four-Year Community Violence Reduction Plan shall describe:

- a. problems/needs to be addressed in this Act's three goal areas as stated herein, using multiple data sources;
- b. specific four-year impact goals and outcome metrics for each goal area;
- c. theory-of-change or strategy, informed by data and evidence-based practices, designed to achieve the specific four-year impact goals and outcome metrics;
- d. formal resource leveraging of and programmatic coordination with other city, county, school district, state, federal, and philanthropic resources to maximize the Four-Year Community Violence Reduction Plan's capacity to achieve four-year impact goals and outcome metrics;
- e. four-year budget and spending plan for the Community Violence Reduction Plan; and
- f. specific roles and relationships of the City's Violence Prevention Department, Police Department, Fire Department, and other City departments in the development and implementation of each Four-Year Community Violence Reduction Plan.

B. The Oakland Community Violence Reduction and Emergency Response Budget Auditor ("Budget Auditor") is hereby established in the Office of the City Auditor. The Budget Auditor shall perform an audit not less than every other year to ensure accountability and proper disbursement of all revenue collected by the City from the special tax imposed by this Ordinance, in accordance with the objectives stated herein and in compliance with provisions of State law. The Budget Auditor will also provide analysis to the Commission of current, past and potential expenditures by the departments funded by this Act, including use of overtime.

C. Annual Financial Report. The City's Finance Director or, at that Director's direction, the Budget Auditor, will make an annual report to the City Council and the Commission containing information about the amount of funds collected and expended pursuant to this Act, and the status of any project required or authorized to be funded pursuant to this Ordinance. At the discretion of the Commission, an independent audit may be performed annually to ensure accountability and proper disbursement of the proceeds of this tax in accordance with the objectives stated herein as provided by Government Code sections 50075.1 and 50075.3.

D. Joint Meetings of Relevant Commissions and City Council: The City Council, the Commission and other public safety-related boards and commissions shall conduct an annual joint special public informational meeting devoted to the subject of public

safety. At each the meeting, the public, the Commission, boards, other commissions and City Council will hear reports from representatives of relevant departments, including the Chief of Police, concerning the progress of all of the City's efforts to reduce violent crime.

SECTION 5. Use of Proceeds for Community Violence Reduction Outcomes.

- A. Uses. Through Fiscal Year 2025-2026, all annual revenue from this Act shall be allocated in a manner that continues and extends the 2014 Oakland Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act funding allocations. In Fiscal Years 2026-2027 through 2033-2034, all annual revenue from this Act shall be allocated as follows:

Taxes collected pursuant to the special taxes imposed by this Ordinance shall be used only in connection with programs and services which further the objectives set forth in Part 1, Section 3, such as but not limited to the following:

1. Direct Services, Programs, and Strategies designed to achieve violent crime and emergency response reduction goals and metrics. Pursuant to each Four-Year Community Violence Reduction Plan, once passed, revenue raised from this Act may be used to pay for direct services, programs, and strategies such as, but not limited to:
 - a. 911 dispatch and emergency responders
 - b. community ambassadors
 - c. community policing
 - d. community reentry services
 - e. crime lab operations
 - f. crime reduction teams
 - g. domestic violence intervention and response
 - h. education, training and employment services
 - i. group violence intervention
 - j. hospital-based violence intervention
 - k. intensive case management
 - l. intelligence-based policing
 - m. mental health services
 - n. mentoring for vulnerable and justice-involved youth
 - o. non-sworn mobile crisis responders
 - p. police recruitment, retention, and training
 - q. public safety technology enhancements
 - r. victim services
 - s. violence interruption
 - t. violent crime and human-trafficking investigations

2. Administrative Expenses. Includes direct and indirect costs associated with these special taxes and the provision of the aforementioned services, such as but not limited to:

- a. Paying any ancillary costs charged by County of Alameda to collect and remit these special taxes and other costs necessary to levy the special tax; and
- b. Paying any costs related to supporting the Commission, the Budget Auditor, costs to implement a performance tracking system, or to conduct an evaluation of the effectiveness of services or programs that are funded by the special taxes; and
- c. Paying administrative costs required to implement these services and programs.

B. Allocation. The proceeds of the special taxes shall be appropriated in the budget process or by resolution of the City Council. In the first fiscal year that funds from the Act are appropriated during the annual budget process:

1. Three percent (3%) of the total funds appropriated from these special taxes, net of any, audit, financial monitoring, collection and tax levy costs and fees, shall be appropriated for Administrative Expenses.
2. \$3 million of the total funds appropriated from these special taxes, net of any audit, financial monitoring collection and tax levy costs and fees, shall be appropriated for the Oakland Fire Department and associated administrative expenses. Starting in Fiscal Year 2025-26, this amount will increase annually by the same percentage established in Part 2, Section 4 below.
3. Of the amount remaining after the above allocations, net of any, audit, financial monitoring, collection and tax levy costs and fees, sixty percent (60%) shall be appropriated for police services as follows: Ten percent (10%) of the remaining amount shall be specifically allocated to costs associated with operations and functions by non-sworn personnel such as 911 dispatch, maintenance and investments in technology, and operations and functions of the crime lab and associated administrative expenses; and fifty percent (50%) of the remaining amount shall be allocated to costs associated with sworn police officers.
4. Of the amount remaining after the above allocations, net of any, audit, financial monitoring, collection and tax levy costs and fees, forty percent (40%) shall be appropriated for Violence Prevention Services and associated administrative expenses. At least seventy five percent (75%) of the total amount allocated herein for violence prevention services shall be spent on grants to and contracts with community-based service providers.
5. Future year appropriations of the Act's funds, net of any, audit, financial monitoring, collection and tax levy costs and fees, shall be in the same

proportion as those funds appropriated in the first year, rounded to the nearest tenth of a percentage.

- C. Authorized Uses of Tax Revenues. Except as otherwise expressly authorized by this Ordinance, the special taxes authorized and collected pursuant to this Ordinance shall be used only for the purposes set forth herein.

SECTION 6. Use of Proceeds for Maintenance of Sworn Police and Fire Personnel.

- A. Maintenance of Sworn Police Personnel: One intent of the augmented funding provided by this Act is to maintain sufficient resources to allow for the implementation of comprehensive policing within the City's limited resources and to begin the process of restoring the staffing of the Police Department's sworn police personnel to appropriate levels to meet the Police Department's stated mission of providing the people of Oakland with an environment where they can live, work, play and thrive free from crime and from the fear of crime. To ensure the Department's progress toward this mission, the following shall apply:
 - 1. Upon passage of this Ordinance, the City shall maintain a budgeted level of no fewer than seven hundred (700) sworn police personnel (including those sworn police personnel funded by this Ordinance) over the course of each fiscal year, subject to this number being modified as provided herein.
 - 2. The City shall hire and maintain no fewer than seven hundred (700) sworn police personnel as early as practicable after the passage of this Ordinance and at all times after July 1, 2026.
 - 3. The City is prohibited from laying off any police officers if such layoffs will result in a reduction of sworn police personnel to a level of less than eight hundred (800), subject to the review by the Commission as provided herein. Furthermore, the City is prohibited from laying off any police officers unless the City Council adopts a resolution containing factual findings that such layoffs are necessary.
- B. The City is prohibited from laying off any sworn firefighters if such layoffs will result in a reduction of sworn firefighters to a level of less than four hundred and eighty (480), subject to the review by the Commission as provided herein. Furthermore, the City is prohibited from laying off any firefighters unless the City Council adopts a resolution containing factual findings that such layoffs are necessary.
- C. If at any time the City fails to budget for the sworn police personnel staffing levels required by this Act for a fiscal year, the City shall suspend the levy and collection of the parcel tax provided for herein for any fiscal year during which it has failed to

budget for a minimum of seven hundred (700) sworn police personnel, unless either of the following is true:

1. If special revenue, grant, or other dedicated restricted funding used to support sworn police personnel in FY 2023-24 outside of the General Purpose Fund declines or becomes unavailable after that fiscal year, the numeric requirements for budgeting and maintaining sworn police personnel shall be reduced by the number of sworn police personnel previously funded by such lost revenue source. Such a circumstance shall be clearly described in the Adopted Budget for each year in which it is applied. Such a description shall include the steps that were taken by the City to try to replace such funding and possible steps the City will take in the future to replace such funding.
 2. If a severe and unanticipated financial or other event occurs which so adversely impacts the General Purpose Fund as to prevent the City from budgeting for the minimum number of sworn police personnel required by this Ordinance, the numeric requirements for budgeting and maintaining sworn police personnel shall be reduced by the numbers the City is unable to fund as a result of such event. The existence of a severe and unanticipated financial or other event must be established by the declaration of a state of extreme fiscal necessity via City Council Resolution for that annual or biennial cycle. Such a resolution shall also note the steps that were taken by the City to avoid the need to reduce the number of sworn police personnel and the steps that will be taken by the City in the future to restore sworn police personnel.
- D. If at any time the City fails to budget for the sworn police personnel staffing levels required by this Act for a fiscal year and there has been no Council action establishing an exception as provided above, the City shall provide appropriate notice to all parking lot operators that collection of the parking tax surcharge provided for in this Ordinance shall be suspended for a period of twelve (12) months.
- E. Minimum Officer Staffing: Upon passage of this Ordinance, the City shall hire and maintain no fewer than an annual average of seven hundred (700) sworn police personnel (including those sworn police personnel funded by this Ordinance) over the course of each fiscal year. The annual average shall be established by a reasonable method, such as the average number of filled sworn positions at the end of each calendar month, or similar methodology as determined by the City Administrator. To effectuate this requirement, in each fiscal year, as a component of its two-year policy budget or its mid-cycle budget adjustments, the City shall adopt a sworn police personnel staffing plan which indicates the estimated starting and ending number of sworn police personnel by month. The staffing plan will make use of assumptions that department attrition rates, recruiting success, academy yield and other relevant factors affecting the growth or shrinkage of the department's

number of sworn personnel. The required annual average of hired and maintained of sworn personnel shall be reduced to the number of budgeted officers if a valid exception has been established per the previous Section for that fiscal year. 700 sworn police personnel or the lower number provided for above shall constitute the Minimum Average Staffing Number for that fiscal year.

- F. If the annual average of sworn police personnel required by this Ordinance is projected to fall below the Minimum Average Staffing Number, the City Administrator shall report to the City Council concerning the reasons for the shortfall, the steps that should be taken to restore the sworn police personnel level, and the time frame for doing so. If appropriate, the City Council shall adopt a resolution modifying the staffing plan to provide for additional steps to be taken to restore the sworn police personnel level. The staffing plan in the subsequent budget following any such report by the City Administrator shall explicitly describe any changes to assumptions or policy taken to ensure a similar shortfall does not reoccur. Reports on the actual and projected sworn staffing shall be provided by informational memorandum no less than 31 days following the end of the City's Fiscal quarters; however, the City Administrator may establish an alternate reporting timeline that is more frequent.
- G. If there has not been a relevant report by the City Administrator or Council action authorizing steps taken to restore the sworn police personnel within one hundred and twenty (120) days of the publication of a report showing the City is projected to fall below the Minimum Average Staffing Number, the City shall provide appropriate notice to all parking lot operators that collection of the parking tax surcharge provided for in this Ordinance shall be suspended for a period of twelve (12) months, and the City shall suspend the levy and collection of the Parcel tax provided for in this Ordinance for the subsequent fiscal year.
- H. The City Administrator may determine, in his or her reasonable discretion, any minimum amounts required to be appropriated for particular uses pursuant to this Section.
- I. The City Council may temporarily suspend the provisions of this Section by resolution to meet urgent and changing needs in the event of extreme fiscal necessity.

SECTION 7. Special Fund.

All funds collected by the City from the special tax imposed by this Ordinance shall be deposited into one or more special funds in the City treasury and appropriated and expended only for the purposes and uses authorized by this Ordinance.

SECTION 8. Effective Date.

The taxes imposed by this Act shall become effective upon passage.

SECTION 9. Term of Tax Imposition.

The taxes enacted by this Act shall be imposed and levied for a period of Nine (9) years. The City shall place delinquencies on subsequent tax bills.

SECTION 10. Savings Clause.

If any provision, sentence, clause, section or part of this Act is found to be unconstitutional, illegal or invalid, including but not limited to the ability of the City Council to increase, suspend, reduce or eliminate this special tax, such unconstitutionality, illegality, or invalidity shall affect only such provision, sentence, clause, section or part of this Act and shall not affect any of the remaining provisions, sentences, clauses, sections or parts of this Ordinance. It is hereby declared to be the intention of the City, that the City would have adopted this Act had such unconstitutional, illegal or invalid provision, sentence, clause section or part thereof not been included herein.

If any tax or surcharge imposed by this Act, or any increase, suspension, reduction or elimination of such a tax, is found to be unconstitutional, illegal or invalid, the amounts, services, programs and personnel required to be funded from such taxes and surcharges shall be reduced proportionately by any revenues lost due to such unconstitutionality, illegality or invalidity.

SECTION 11. Amendment.

Except as otherwise expressly provided herein, the tax rates set forth herein may not be increased by action of the City Council without the applicable voter approval – but the City Council may make any other changes to this Ordinance as are consistent with its purpose, except that the City Council may only change the allocations defined in Part 1, Section 4 B as provided in that Section.

SECTION 12. Regulations.

The City Administrator may promulgate appropriate regulations to implement the provisions of this Act.

SECTION 13. Reimbursement.

At the discretion of the City Council, special tax revenues collected by the City pursuant to this Ordinance may be used to reimburse the City for costs incurred in connection with the election seeking voter approval of this Ordinance.

SECTION 14. Challenge to Tax.

Any action to challenge the taxes imposed by this ordinance shall be brought pursuant to Government Code section 50077.5 and Code of Civil Procedure section 860 et seq.

SECTION 15. Liberal Construction.

This Act shall be liberally construed to effectuate its purposes.

PART 2. Parcel Tax

SECTION 1. Definitions.

For purposes of this Part 2 only, the following terms shall be defined as set forth below:

- A. "Building" shall mean any structure having a roof supported by columns or by walls and designed for the shelter or housing of any person, chattel or property of any kind. The word "Building" includes the word "structure."
- B. "City" shall mean the City of Oakland, California.
- C. "Family" shall mean one (1) or more persons related by blood, marriage, domestic partnership, or adoption, legal guardianship, who are living together in a single residential unit and maintaining a common household. Family shall also mean all unrelated persons who live together in a single Residential Unit and maintain a common household.
- D. "Hotel" shall be as defined by Oakland Municipal Code Section 4.24.020.
- E. "Multiple Residential Unit Parcel" shall mean a parcel zoned for a Building, or those portions thereof, that accommodates or is intended to contain two (2) or more residential units, whether or not developed.
- F. "Non-Residential" shall mean all parcels that are not classified by this Act as Single Family Residential or Multiple Residential Unit Parcels, and shall include, but not be limited to, parcels for industrial, commercial and institutional improvements, whether or not developed.
- G. "Occupancy" shall be as defined by Oakland Municipal Code Section 4.24.020.
- H. "Operator" shall be as defined by Oakland Municipal Code Section 4.24.020.
- I. "Owner" shall mean the Person having title to real estate as shown on the most current official assessment role of the Alameda County Assessor.
- J. "Parcel" shall mean a unit of real estate in the City of Oakland as shown on the most current official assessment role of the Alameda County Assessor.
- K. "Person" shall mean an individual, firm, partnership, joint venture, association, social club, fraternal organization, joint stock company, corporation, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, trustee, syndicate, or any other group or combination acting as a unit.
- L. "Possessory Interest" as it applies to property owned by any agency of the government of the United States, the State of California, or any political subdivision thereof, shall mean possession of, claim to, or right to the possession of, land or Improvements and shall include any exclusive right to the use of such land or Improvements.

- M. "Residential Unit" shall mean a Building or portion of a Building designed for or occupied exclusively by one Family.
- N. "Single Family Residential Parcel" shall mean a parcel zoned for single-family residences, whether or not developed.
- O. "Tax" shall mean the parcel tax created by this Act and further described in Part 2, Section 2 below.
- P. "Transient" shall mean any individual who exercises Occupancy of a Hotel or is entitled to Occupancy by reason of concession, permit, right of access, license or other agreement for a period of thirty (30) consecutive calendar days or less, counting portions of calendar days as full days. Any individual so occupying space in a Hotel shall be deemed to be a Transient until the period of thirty (30) consecutive days has elapsed.

SECTION 2. Imposition of Parcel Tax.

There is hereby imposed a special tax on all Owners of parcels in the City of Oakland for the privilege of using municipal services and the availability of such services. The special tax imposed by this Section shall be assessed on the Owner unless the Owner is by law exempt from taxation, in which case, the tax imposed shall be assessed to the holder of any Possessory Interest in such parcel, unless such holder is also by law exempt from taxation. The tax is imposed as of July 1 of each year on the person who owned the parcel on that date. The tax shall be collected at the same time, by the same officials, and pursuant to the same procedures as the one percent imposed pursuant to Article XIII A of the California Constitution. The Parcel Tax shall be imposed for a period of Nine (9) years.

The tax hereby imposed shall be set as follows subject to adjustment as provided herein:

- A. For owners of all Single-Family Residential Parcels, the tax shall be at the annual rate of \$198.00 per Parcel.
- B. For owners of all Multiple Residential Unit Parcels, the tax shall be at the annual rate of \$132.00 per Residential Unit.
- C. The tax for Non-Residential Parcels is calculated using both frontage and square footage measurements to determine total single-family residential unit equivalents (SFE). A frontage of eighty (80) feet for a commercial institutional parcel, for example, is equal to one (1) single family residential unit equivalent. (See matrix.) An area of six thousand four hundred (6,400) square feet for the commercial institutional parcel is equal to one (1) single family residential unit equivalent. For tall buildings (more than five (5) stories), the single-family residential unit equivalent computation also includes one (1) single family residential unit equivalent for every five thousand (5,000) square feet of net rentable area. The tax is the annual rate \$198.00 multiplied by the total number of single-family residential unit equivalents (determined by the frontage and square footage).

LAND USE CATEGORY	FRONTAGE	AREA (SF)	BUILDING AREA (SF)
Commercial/Institutional	80	6,400	N/A
Industrial	100	10,000	N/A
Public Utility	1,000	100,000	N/A
Golf Course	500	100,000	N/A
Quarry	1,000	250,000	N/A
Tall Buildings > 5 stories	80	6,400	5,000

Example: assessment calculation for a Commercial Institutional Parcel with a Frontage of 160 feet and an Area of 12,800 square feet:

Frontage 160 feet ÷ 80 = 2 SFE

Area 12,800 square ÷ feet 6,400 = 2 SFE

2 SFE + 2 SFE = 4 SFE

4 SFE x \$198.00 = \$792 tax

- A. The tax imposed by this Act shall be imposed on each Hotel within the City as follows:
1. Residential Hotels. Rooms in a Hotel occupied by individuals who were not Transients for eighty percent (80%) or more of the previous fiscal year shall be deemed Residential Units and the parcel on which they are located shall be subject to the Parcel tax imposed on Multiple Residential Unit Parcels. The remainder of the Building shall be subject to the applicable tax computed in accordance with the single-family residential unit equivalent formula set forth in Part 2, Section 2(c) of this Act.
 2. Transient Hotels. Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of this subdivision, if eighty percent (80%) or more of the Operator's gross receipts for the previous Fiscal Year were reported as rent received from Transients on a return filed by the Operator in compliance with Section 4.24.010 of the Oakland Municipal Code (commonly known as the Uniform Transient Occupancy Tax of the City of Oakland), such Hotel shall be deemed a Transient Hotel. The entire Building shall be deemed a Non-Residential Parcel, categorized as commercial/institutional, and shall be subject to the applicable tax computed in accordance with the single-family residential unit equivalent formula set forth in Part 2 Section 2(c) of this Act, and the parcel tax imposed on Multiple Residential Units shall not apply.

SECTION 3. Exemptions.

- A. Very-Low income household exemption. The following is exempt from this tax: an Owner of a Single-Family Residential Unit (1) who resides in such unit and (2) whose combined family income, from all sources for the previous year, is at or below the income level qualifying as sixty percent (60%) of area median income for a Family of such size under Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C.A. sections 1437 et. seq.), or successor legislation, for such year. The Director of Finance shall set forth procedures for annual applications from Owners for the exemption, which may require information such as federal income tax returns and W-2 forms of owner occupants eligible for the exemption, or procedures for an alternative process.
- B. Senior household exemption. The following is exempt from this tax: an Owner of a single family residential unit (1) who resides in such unit, (2) who is sixty-five (65) years of age or older and (3) whose combined family income, from all sources for the previous year, is at or below the income level qualifying as eighty percent (80%) of area median income for a Family of such size under Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C.A. Sections 1437 et. seq.), or successor legislation, for such year. The Director of Finance shall set forth procedures for annual applications from Owners for the exemption, which may require information such as federal income tax returns and W-2 forms of owner occupants eligible for the exemption, or procedures for an alternative process.
- C. Fifty percent reduction for affordable housing projects. Rental housing owned by nonprofit corporations and nonprofit-controlled partnerships for senior, disabled and low-income households that are exempt from ad valorem property tax pursuant to California Revenue and Taxation Code 214(f), (g) and (h) shall be liable for only fifty percent (50%) of the parcel tax. The exemption shall apply in the same proportion that is exempted from ad valorem property tax.
- D. Rebate to tenants in foreclosed single-family homes. The City will provide a rebate of one-half (1/2) of the tax and subsequent increases thereto to tenants in single family homes that have been foreclosed upon who have paid a passed through Parcel Tax. To qualify for this rebate, a tenant must: (1) have lived in the unit before foreclosure proceedings commenced; and (2) be at or below the income level qualifying as sixty percent (60%) of area median income for a Family of such size under Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C.A. Sections 1437 et. seq.), or successor legislation, for such year. The City will provide this rebate for every month that the tax was applied and the tenant occupied the unit. The City will provide this rebate at the end of each year, or when the tenant vacates the unit, whichever is earlier. The City Administrator will promulgate regulations to effectuate this subdivision.

- E. Real property owned by a religious organization or school that is exempt from property taxes under California law is exempt from this tax. To qualify for this exemption, each religious organization or school seeking such exemption shall submit such information required to determine eligibility for such exemption.

SECTION 4. Adjustment of Tax Rate.

- A. Subject to paragraph (B) of this section, the tax rates imposed by this Ordinance are maximum rates and may not be increased by the City Council above such maximum rates. The tax imposed by the Ordinance may be suspended, reduced or eliminated by the City Council to the full extent allowed by the California Constitution.
- B. Beginning for the Fiscal Year 2025-2026, and each year thereafter, the City Council may increase the tax imposed herein up to the percentage change in the cost of living in the immediate San Francisco Bay Area, as determined by the twelve-month (12) Annual Percentage Change in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all items in the San Francisco Bay Area as published by the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics.

SECTION 5. Duties of the Director of Finance; Notice of Decisions.

It shall be the duty of the Director of Finance to collect and receive all taxes imposed by this Act. The Director of Finance is charged with the enforcement of this Act and may adopt rules and regulations relating to such enforcement.

SECTION 6. Examination of Books, Records, Witnesses; Penalties.

The Director of Finance or the Director of Finance's designee is hereby authorized to examine assessment rolls, property tax records, records of the Alameda County Recorder and any other records of the County of Alameda deemed necessary in order to determine ownership of Parcels and computation of the tax imposed by this Act.

The Director of Finance or the Director of Finance's designee is hereby authorized to examine the books, papers and records of any person subject to the tax imposed by this Act, including any person who claims an exemption, for the purpose of verifying the accuracy of any petition, claim or return filed and to ascertain the tax due. The Director of Finance, or the Director of Finance's designee is hereby authorized to examine any person, under oath, for the purpose of verifying the accuracy of any petition, claim or return filed or to ascertain the tax due under this Act and for this purpose may compel the production of books, papers and records, whether as parties or witnesses, whenever the Director of Finance believes such persons have knowledge of such matters. The refusal of such examination by any person subject to the tax shall be deemed a violation of this Act and of the Oakland Municipal Code and subject to any and all remedies specified therein.

SECTION 7. Collection of Tax; Interest and Penalties.

The tax shall be delinquent if the City does not receive it on or before the delinquency date set forth in the notice mailed to the Owner's address as shown on the most current assessment roll of the Alameda County Tax Collector; and the tax shall be collected in such a manner as the City Council may decide. The City may place delinquencies on a subsequent tax bill.

A one-time penalty at a rate set by the City Council, which in no event shall exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the tax due per fiscal year, is hereby imposed by this Act on all taxpayers who fail to timely pay the tax provided by this Act. In addition, the City Council may assess interest at the rate of one percent (1%) per month on the unpaid tax and the penalty thereon.

Every penalty imposed and such interest as accrues under the provisions of this Act shall become a part of the tax herein required to be paid.

The City may authorize the County of Alameda to collect the taxes imposed by this Act in conjunction with and at the same time and in the same manner as the County collects property taxes for the City. If the City elects to authorize the County of Alameda to collect the tax, penalties and interest shall be those applicable to the nonpayment of property taxes.

Nothing in this Ordinance is intended to preclude owners from recovering the tax from the occupant. Whether the occupant is charged depends on the occupancy agreement and the requirements of the Residential Rent Adjustment Program. Moreover, non-payment will not be a lien on the property but a personal obligation of the occupant or owner.

SECTION 8. Collection of Unpaid Taxes.

The amount of any tax, penalty, and interest imposed under the provisions of this Act shall be deemed a debt to the City. Any person owing money under the provisions of this Act shall be liable to an action brought in the name of the City for the recovery for such amount.

SECTION 9. Refund of Tax, Penalty, or Interest Paid More than Once, or Erroneously or Illegally Collected.

Whenever the amount of any tax, penalty, or interest imposed by this Act has been paid more than once, or has been erroneously or illegally collected or received by the City, it may be refunded provided a verified written claim for refund, stating the specific ground upon which such claim is founded, is received by the Director of Finance within one (1) year of the date of payment. The claim shall be filed by the person who paid the tax or such person's guardian, conservator, or the executor of her or his estate. No

representative claim may be filed on behalf of a taxpayer or a class of taxpayers. The claim shall be reviewed by the Director of Finance and shall be made on forms provided by the Director of Finance. If the claim is approved by the Director of Finance, the excess amount collected or paid may be refunded or may be credited against any amounts then due and payable from the person from whom it was collected or by whom paid, and the balance may be refunded to such person, or such person's administrators or executors. Filing a claim shall be a condition precedent to legal action against the City for a refund of the tax.

PART 3. Parking Tax

SECTION 1. Extension of Parking Tax Surcharge.

Section 4.16.031 of the Municipal Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Imposition of Surcharge. Subject to the provisions for the collection of taxes and definitions in this chapter, there shall be an additional tax of ten percent (10%) imposed on the rental of every parking space in a parking station in the City for nine (9) years starting on January 1, 2025.

Part 4. Miscellaneous Provisions

SECTION 1. Conflicting Measures.

- A. This measure is intended to be comprehensive. It is the intent of the people of Oakland that in the event this measure and one or more measures relating to funding for police and fire services or violence prevention and intervention strategies appear on the same ballot, whether placed on the ballot through a citizens initiative or by the City Council, the provisions of the other measure or measures shall be deemed to be in conflict with this measure.
- B. In the event that this measure receives a greater number of affirmative votes, the provisions of this measure shall prevail in their entirety, and all provisions of the other measure or measures shall be null and void.
- C. If this measure is approved by a majority of the voters but does not receive a greater number of affirmative votes than any other measure appearing on the same ballot regarding business taxes, provisions of this measure shall take effect to the extent that they are not in conflict with other said measure or measures.
- D. If this measure is approved by the voters but superseded by law by any other conflicting measure approved by voters at the same election, and the conflicting ballot measure is later held invalid, this measure shall be self-executing and given full force and effect.

SECTION 2. Construction.

This measure shall be liberally construed to effectuate its purposes.

SECTION 3. Municipal Affairs.

The People of Oakland hereby declare that providing funding for police and fire services and violence prevention and intervention through a parcel tax and parking tax constitutes a municipal affair. The People hereby further declare their desire for this measure to coexist with any similar tax measures adopted at the City, county or state levels.

SECTION 4. Severability and Savings Clause.

- A. If any provision, sentence, word, clause, section, or part of this measure is found to be unconstitutional, illegal, or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, including but not limited to the ability of the City Council to increase, suspend, reduce or eliminate the tax, such unconstitutionality, illegality, or invalidity shall affect only such provision, sentence, word, clause, section, or part of this measure and shall not affect or impair any of the remaining provisions, sentences, words, clauses, sections, or parts. It is hereby declared that it is the intent of the voters and the City that this measure would have been adopted had such unconstitutional, illegal, or invalid provision, sentence, word, clause, section, or part not been included.
- B. If any tax imposed by this measure, or any increase, suspension, reduction or elimination of such tax, is found to be unconstitutional, illegal or invalid, the amounts, services, programs and personnel required to be funded from such taxes and surcharges or such increases shall be reduced proportionately by any revenues lost due to such unconstitutionality, illegality or invalidity.
- C. No provision, sentence, word, clause, section, or part of this measure shall be construed as requiring the payment of any tax which would be in violation of City, state or federal law.

SECTION 5. Statement of Facts.

This true and impartial Statement of Facts explicitly and affirmatively identifies each tax in this measure and the specific limitation on how the revenue therefrom can be spent. This measure establishes a parcel tax and a parking tax for police and fire services and violence protection and intervention strategies at the rates outlined herein. The funds derived from the taxes imposed by this measure shall be used only for the purposes set forth in Part 1, Sections 3, 5, and 6.

SECTION 6. Legal Defense.

The People of Oakland desire that this measure, if approved by the voters and thereafter challenged in court, be defended by the City. The People, by approving this measure, hereby declare that the proponent(s) of this measure have a direct and personal stake in defending this measure from constitutional or statutory challenges to the measure's validity or implementation. In the event the City fails to defend this measure, or the City fails to appeal an adverse judgment against the constitutionality, statutory permissibility or implementation of this measure, in whole or in part, in any court of law, the measure's proponents shall be entitled to assert their direct personal stake by defending the measure's validity and implementation in any court of law and shall be empowered by the People through this measure to act as agents of the People. The City shall indemnify the proponents for reasonable expenses and any losses incurred by the proponents, as agents, in defending the validity and/or implementation of the challenged measure. The rate of indemnification shall be no more than the amount it would cost the City to perform the defense itself.

SECTION 7. Home Rule.

The authority to pass this measure is derived from Oakland's home rule powers outlined in the City Charter and Article XI, section 5 of the California Constitution. The People of Oakland declare their intent that this citizen initiative be enacted, and the business tax be collected, if this measure is approved by a simple majority of the voters pursuant to California Cannabis Coalition v. City of Upland (2017) 3 Cal.5th 924 and subsequent court cases affirming its holding. To the extent that the California Constitution or state law is amended on or after the date that this measure is passed by the voters to change or create additional voting requirements in order to implement or to continue to implement this measure, the People of Oakland declare their intent that such amendments should be applied prospectively only and not apply to, or in any way affect, this tax or this measure.

SECTION 8. Findings.

This measure is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq. ("CEQA"), since in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15061, subdivision (b)(3), it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity authorized herein may have significant effect on the environment.

SECTION 9. Appropriations Limit.

To the extent that the revenue from the tax is in excess of the spending limit for the City, as provided for in applicable provisions of the California Constitution and state law, the approval of this measure by the voters shall constitute approval to increase the City's spending limit in an amount equal to the revenue derived from the tax for the maximum period of time as allowed by law.



Executive Summary:

Oakland Ceasefire Audit Report & Findings

December 2023

Prepared for Oakland Mayor Sheng Thao



Executive Summary

Audit Findings: The City of Oakland gradually walked away from the Ceasefire strategy, notably in 2020. In 2020 there was a clear shift away from ensuring that the components of the Ceasefire strategy were focused on groups and individuals at the highest risk of gun violence; and that the strategy was implemented with sufficient quality to impact citywide violence. As supported by agency staff and managers, this shift away from high-risk people to places were diametrically opposed to the focus that Ceasefire requires and directly contributed to the strategy becoming ineffective. During the audit process, we found that beginning in 2016-2017 and accelerating in 2019 and 2020, each essential element of the strategy was significantly watered down, resources stripped away, or refocused. As a result, the Ceasefire strategy no longer impacted citywide levels of violence in Oakland and as such the City of Oakland has not been effectively implementing the Ceasefire strategy since 2020.

CPSC came to this conclusion during the audit process through observations, and a review of quantitative and qualitative data that included interviews with key stakeholders currently doing this work in Oakland. Specifically, this audit included collecting a) quantitative crime and key performance data from 2021, 2022, and 2023, b) qualitative interviews with key stakeholders from OPD and DVP, c) document review, meeting observations, and d) debriefing with stakeholders after the sessions to gather additional information.

The analysis was conducted by examining each component of the Ceasefire strategy including: 1) Gun problem analysis; 2) Shooting review; 3) Coordination meeting; 4) Direct communication; 5) Life coaching and services and supports; 6) Focused supervision and enforcement. In these components the analysis sought to understand the conditions of management and governance and elaborate proposals to improve it (see figure 3 below).

Figure 3: Ceasefire Oakland Strategy



Source: NICJR

A brief description of the Oakland Ceasefire Strategy components, the diagnostic and recommendations are summarized below.

1. Gun Problem Analysis: Identifies what is driving gun violence in Oakland and who is at the highest risk of being a victim or perpetrator of gun violence. This is a foundational document specific to Oakland that informs *who* and *what* intervention and enforcement partners should focus on.

a. Diagnostic: Oakland's violence problem remains largely consistent with prior analysis in 2011-2012; 2016-2017 and 2020-2021, which found a hyper concentration of risk among justice involved, black and Latino adult men, with social connections to identifiable street groups and gangs in Oakland. The increase in violence in Oakland cannot be explained by some dramatic shift in the nature of the problem.

b. Recommendations:

- i. Increase Subject Matter Experts (SME) on Latino Gangs/groups to include newly immigrated groups (Guatemalan, Salvadorian, and Honduran) in both the DVP and the OPD. In OPD these SME should be a new unit within Ceasefire.
- ii. Reconfigure the risk assessments for DVP gun violence prevention/intervention to align with the Problem Analysis. The Problem Analysis should set the risk assessments for clients in Life Coaching and those receiving services and support under the gun violence prevention/intervention framework.

2. Shooting Review: The Shooting Review is a weekly OPD and law enforcement meeting examining every shooting that took place in the last seven days to help determine 1) which incidents will result in retaliation, 2) what is driving violence that week, 3) identify gun violence trends and violence dynamics, 4) identify which incidents, based upon evidence, individuals will be arrested for engagement in violence, 5) manages and focuses enforcement plans, and 6) identifies who will be intervened with using direct communication.

a. Diagnostic:

- i. The effectiveness and significance of the Shooting Review meeting, crucial to the success of this strategy, have significantly diminished because this meeting is no longer used to manage and direct gun violence reduction efforts.

b. Recommendations:

- i. To Make the Shooting Review functional, the OPD executive team should make this meeting and this strategy ***a priority*** for the Department again. Specifically, the executive team of the OPD needs to attend and participate in every meeting.

- ii. The shooting review should remain the Department's primary meeting to analyze and address gun violence in Oakland; should link analysis; investigations and enforcement; direct communication; and should guide the Department's work with partners including justice system agencies and community intervention organizations.
- iii. The National Integrated Ballistics Information Network (NIBIN) meeting should continue and be prioritized. Although this meeting is new, it has tremendous promise and should be fostered and cultivated to continue to inform the Shooting Review.

3. Coordination Meeting: The purpose of the Coordination Meeting is for 1) information to be shared with DVP and service providers on shooting incidents from the previous week, 2) to share what is believed to be driving gun violence dynamics, 3) to share who will be intervened with and why, and 4) to develop a proactive plan to address retaliatory shootings

a. Diagnostic:

- i. Coordination meetings are divided into two sessions. The first meeting involves key stakeholders and lacks documentation, while the second meeting, though structured, faces challenges in planning for retaliation.

b. Recommendations:

- i. Consolidate the coordination meetings into a singular session. Two coordination meetings are inefficient and consumes unnecessary staff and CBO resources. Streamlining this process into a single meeting would optimize time and resources.
- ii. The meetings should be led and overseen by the Mayor's Office or a designated senior public safety representative from the City Administration. These facilitators must take responsibility for guiding staff in formulating plans and subsequently hold them accountable for outcomes,
- iii. The meeting needs to examine incidents comprehensively, emphasizing not only their literal review but also a critical discussion on *how* the team plans to utilize the array of city and city-funded resources to proactively prevent retaliation. This robust discussion should inform near term violence reduction plans aimed at reducing retaliation and addressing violence drivers.

4. Direct Communication: Direct Communications include call-ins and custom notifications. Call-ins are larger group meetings with individuals at the highest risk of gun violence, law enforcement, service providers, and survivors of gun violence. Custom notifications are smaller meetings with a community member, a law enforcement official, a service provider, and individuals at the very highest risk of gun violence. The message

communicated to participants in these meetings is that we care about you, want to help you, and have tailored services to assist you, and gun violence must stop.

a. Diagnostic:

- i. Quantity: The audit reveals challenges in tracking direct communications data from 2020-2023, hindering analysis. The average number of individuals directly communicated with has decreased compared to pre-pandemic years, raising concerns about the effectiveness of the current approach in reaching those at the highest risk of gun violence.
- ii. Quality: The messaging in both call-ins and custom notifications appears to be effective. However, we recommend that speakers in attendance at the meeting be reflective of the entire partnership to include the District Attorney's Office and trauma surgeons/social workers to be in alignment with best practices.
- iii. Finally, the quality of call-in messaging from OPD would benefit from the use of the PowerPoint that had historically been used to ensure more succinct messaging.
- iv. Lastly, the audit observed challenges in consistently tracking the promptness of custom notification referrals from the OPD Shooting Review to actual message delivery.

Recommendations:

- v. We recommend increasing custom notifications with highest risk people that are directly impacted by gun violence. This strategy works best when communications are done with *impacted* individuals who are out of custody. Direct communications should be similar to pre-pandemic levels at approximately 300-350.
- vi. During the audit process, data availability and discrepancies coming from OPD to DVP were a common theme. Data should be provided to DVP Life Coaches from OPD consistently regarding individuals communicated with including *why* they were communicated with and contact information.

5. Life Coaching & Services and Support are offered to individuals in call-ins and custom notifications. Participation in Life Coaching and services and support is not required. However, if people are interested in life coaching, then the goal of the engagement is to reduce an individual's *risk* of becoming a victim or perpetrator of gun violence.

a. Diagnostic: DVP is poorly structured to address the service and support needs of high-risk individuals that express interest in services. Organizationally, key staff that would be responsible for locating these individuals and providing services to them are under different chains of command and do not formally communicate.

- i. Information provided by the DVP regarding percentage on retention during the observation period was unclear leading to inconsistencies between data and percentages
- ii. Even though the vast majority of direct communication recipients indicate interest in receiving help and support (84%); very few (only 25%) end up on a caseload after being referred to Life Coaching.
- iii. Out of the 25% of clients integrated into the caseload, a significant portion of Ceasefire clients do not remain on the caseload for an extended duration. Analysis of the data from the reporting period reveals a rapid decline, with Ceasefire clients often disengaging from the caseload within a span of 2-3 months.

b. Recommendations:

- i. Re-organize the DVP Gun Violence work under one management structure. The DVP lacks strategic focus and intentionality and needs to be reorganized with an understanding of the difference between prevention and intervention as it relates to gun violence.
- ii. The DVP needs a clear theory of change around gun violence. Currently, there are bits and pieces of elements of different strategies. The theory of change needs to be developed and designed based on the data and who is at the very highest risk of gun violence.
- iii. To increase the percentage of clients who come onto life coaching case load, we recommend combining the Outreach Worker and Violence Interrupter positions so that they can engage in relentless outreach. Relentless outreach is a function that the city currently does not fund and is needed to locate and engage Ceasefire clients and other individuals at elevated risk levels that are often difficult to consistently locate.
- iv. We recommend that 70% of DVP Life Coaches' caseloads be made up of Ceasefire referrals that originate from the Shooting Review, Custom Notifications, Call-Ins, and Coordination Meetings. The other 30% must meet at least four of the five following criteria to ensure they are the very highest risk population as per multiple problem analysis findings:
 - 1. Aged 18-35 Black or Latino male
 - 2. Significant Criminal Justice history
 - 3. Connected to a crew/group/gang
 - 4. Prior shooting victim
 - 5. Connected to a recent shooting (in the past six months, a friend, a family member, or a fellow group member was either shot or arrested for a shooting)

6. Focused Supervision & Enforcement for individuals who continue to engage in gun violence. Enforcement should be specific to the small number of individuals who continue to engage in gun violence.

a. Diagnostic:

- i. While the goal of the Ceasefire strategy is to minimize the use of law enforcement sanctions and maximize the use of community intervention; holding violent perpetrators accountable is necessary both to provide justice to victims and families but also to be able to stem ongoing cycles of retaliation.
- ii. The Ceasefire unit's focused enforcement on violence drivers is impeded by staffing shortages and by being diverted to address other crimes. Current staffing levels don't allow the Ceasefire section to fulfill its focused enforcement responsibilities, given the violence in Oakland and the number of ongoing conflicts.¹
- iii. This issue is attributed to broader structural and leadership challenges within the Department. The OPD's organizational shift, particularly with the creation of the Violent Crime Operations Center (VCOC) in 2021, by the former Chief of Police, prioritized solving past crimes to boost clearance rates. However, this strategy fails to yield sustainable crime reductions, as evidenced by a declining homicide clearance rate from 50% in 2020 to 35% in 2022. The focus on solving past crimes appears to contribute to the creation of new crimes, ultimately straining the OPD's resources and exacerbating the challenge of solving crimes effectively.

b. Recommendations:

- i. Disband the VCOC due to the lack of focus on preventing violence and addressing current violence trends at the area level
- ii. Fully staff the Ceasefire Unit to allow them to focus on multiple active conflicts simultaneously
- iii. Combine the Ceasefire Unit, and the Crime Gun Intelligence Center (CGIC), under one chain of command
- iv. Put the Crime Reduction Teams (CRTs) back into the geographic areas
 1. Fully staff the area-based CRTs with a prioritization for areas most impacted by gun violence
- v. The Assistant Chief of Police should manage the Ceasefire Unit with a focus on reducing gun violence.
- vi. Area based CRTs impacted by gun violence should have person specific plans that complement the Ceasefire units plans to reduce gun violence.

¹ The diminished staffing (16-20 in 2023, compared to a peak of 32-40) restricts their ability to address these conflicts effectively.

- vii. Ceasefire and CRT gun violence plans should be managed by the Assistant Chief of Police

Management and Governance

As supported by agency staff interviewed, the Ceasefire strategy lacks effective management and a clear chain of supervision at various levels within both the DVP and the OPD. There are individuals who do aspects of the work, but no one with the authority to manage *all* of it with clarity on the performance indicators. This is a departure from the prior strategy implementation from 2011-2018.

Beginning with the **Ceasefire Director position**, it is crucial that this position aligns to the original design of the role which had significantly more authority and access to the mayor and executive leadership in both the OPD and DVP. Because of the breadth of the position, focus on strong project management skills are necessary and we recommend that the director position have the direct reporting relationship to the Chief of Police and to the Mayor per the Executive Directive issued in 2015.²

Additionally, given the amount of work that the director is responsible for, the management of the strategy should be expanded to include a **data position** that works with the director to ensure that data is analyzed and shared with DVP consistently and that grants are applied for and effectively managed. Finally, a **community engagement specialist position** is needed to grow community partnerships.

For the strategy to be successful, we recommend that the mayor, upon assessing the findings of this audit, restart the **Ceasefire performance review meetings** in February 2024 and continue them quarterly throughout the year. We also recommend that the new DVP chief have regular meetings with the Mayor and City Administrator where she and her team are held accountable for outcomes related to Ceasefire clients.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the mayor and her staff will need to make clear who is responsible for gun violence reduction. To do this, she will need to build a **cohesive management team focused on gun violence reduction** with clear performance indicators for this strategy to begin yielding results. This team needs to include the DVP Chief, and her lead staff focused on gun violence reduction. Under the current organization this would need to include individuals responsible for Life Coaching and Violence Interruption and from OPD this should include the Chief of Police, Assistant Chief of Police, Ceasefire Captain, and Ceasefire Director. This team will need support and regular engagement with the Mayor's Senior Public Safety staff and the City Administrator's office. The team will also need to be managed rigorously and regularly to ensure they are resourced, focused on the right people, and applying the appropriate interventions to reduce gun violence in the near term.

² Ceasefire Executive Directive, October 14, 2015, Mayor Libby Schaaf

Ceasefire Re-implementation	Date: 4/17/24										
Progress Report Request											
Ongoing Analysis	Areas for	Status	Direct Communication	Areas for	Status	Services & Support	Areas for	Status	Law Enforcement	Areas for	Status
	Improvement			Improvement			Improvement			Improvement	
Data & Intel Sharing			Call-ins	Covid-prevented call ins		Interested Direct Communication Participants			First and Worst Offender Follow Through		
Shooting Reviews			Interventions			DVP Service Providers			OPD Ceasefire Unit		
Crime Analysis			Custom Notifications			Life Coaches			Other Units or Agencies		
Law Enforcement Partner Analysis			Community Partners								
			Faith Leaders								
			US Attorney's Office								
			DA's Office								
			Service Providers								
			Victims of Violence								

ARTICLE VI: Meetings

1) Quorum

Ordinance 13303 C.M.S. created a quorum for the SSOC as five (5) members. A quorum shall be called for prior to any official business being conducted at the meeting. If there is no quorum at that time, no official action may be taken at that meeting. In the event that a quorum is not established within thirty (30) minutes of the noticed start time of the meeting, the Chairperson, in her or his discretion, may cancel the meeting or may allow the meeting to make place without any official action being taken at the meeting without a quorum.

2) Voting

Each member of the Commission shall have one vote. Consistent with Article II, Section 5, a motion shall be passed or defeated by a simple majority of those members present and voting at a meeting where a quorum has been established.

3) Public Input

(a) Public Input on Items Officially Noticed for the Agenda

At every regular meeting, members of the public shall have an opportunity to address the SSOC on matters within the SEC's subject matter jurisdiction. Public input and comment on matters on the agenda, as well as public input and comment on matters not otherwise on the agenda, shall be made during the time set aside for public comment. Members of the public wishing to speak and who have filled out a speaker's card, shall have two (2) minutes to speak unless the chairperson otherwise limits the total amount of time allocated for public discussion on particular issues and/or the time allocated for each individual speaker.

(b) Public Input on Items Not Officially Noticed for the Agenda (Open Forum)

Matters brought before the Commission at a regular meeting which were not placed on the agenda of the meeting shall not be acted upon or discussed by the SSOC at that meeting unless action or discussion on such matters is permissible pursuant to the Brown Act and the Sunshine Ordinance. Those non-agenda items brought before the SSOC which the SSOC determines will require consideration and action and where action at that meeting is not so authorized shall be placed on the agenda for the next regular meeting.

(c) Identification of Speaker

Persons addressing the SSOC shall be asked to state their names and the organization they represent, if any. They shall be asked to confine their remarks to the subject under discussion, unless they speak during the Open Forum portion of the agenda.

4) Regular Meetings

The Commission shall meet regularly on the fourth Monday of each month, at the hour of 6:30 pm, in Oakland, California. In the event that the regular meeting date shall be a legal holiday, then any such regular meeting shall be rescheduled at least two meetings prior to the meeting for a business day thereafter is not a legal holiday. A notice, agenda, and other necessary documents shall be delivered to the members, personally or by mail, at least seventy-two hours prior to the meeting.

5) Remote Participation Via Teleconference

Commissioners may participate remotely in meetings of the SSOC under the circumstances authorized by: (1) the traditional teleconference rules of the Brown Act (California Government Code section 54953(b)(3)), as interpreted prior to March 4, 2020; and (2) the new teleconference rules put into effect by Assembly Bill (“AB”) 2449.

This provision of the SSOC Bylaws summarizes guidance provided to all City of Oakland legislative bodies by the City Attorney’s Office on March 30, 2023.

(a) Under the traditional Brown Act rules, Commissioners may participate via teleconference if:

- (i) Notices and agendas are posted for each teleconference location from which Commissioners intend to participate;
- (ii) Each teleconference location is identified in the notice and agenda of the meeting;
- (iii) Each teleconference location is accessible to the public, including persons with disabilities;
- (iv) The public could participate in the meeting from each teleconference location;
- (v) A quorum of the Commission participates from locations in Oakland.

Commissioners who wish to use the traditional rules for remote participation need to coordinate with the SSOC staff liaison to ensure that all Brown Act requirements are met. No limit exists on the number of times a Commissioner may participate via teleconference using the traditional Brown Act teleconference rules. All votes during the meeting must be by roll call.

(b) Under the provisions of AB 2449, Commissioners may participate via teleconference for “just cause” and “emergency circumstances” regardless of whether a state of emergency exists and without providing notice of or public access to the teleconference location.

If Commissioners invoke the “Just Cause” basis for remote participation, they have to comply with the following requirements:

- (i) “Just cause” remote participation is allowed for any of the following:
 - (A) A childcare or caregiving need of a child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, spouse, or domestic partner that requires them to participate remotely;
 - (B) A contagious illness that prevents a Commissioner from attending in person.

(C) A need related to a physical or mental disability not otherwise accommodated.

(D) Travel while on official business of the Commission or another state or local agency.

(ii) Timing of Notice: The Commissioner must notify the SSOC of their need to participate remotely at the earliest opportunity possible, up to the commencement of the meeting.

(iii) What to include in the Notice: The notice must provide a general description of the circumstances relating to their need to appear remotely at the given meeting.

(iv) No action by Commission required: Invoking the just cause exception is self-executing and no further action by the body is required.

(v) Per-meeting notice is not required: Unlike the emergency circumstances exception, it does not appear that separate notices are required for participating remotely under the just cause exception. Thus, a member could provide notice of remote participation for just cause for up to two meetings—the maximum number of times just cause can be used—if the member is aware of the need in advance, such as for childcare or official travel.

If Commissioners invoke the “Emergency Circumstances” basis for remote participation, they have to comply with the following:

(i) “Emergency circumstance” entails a physical or family medical emergency that prevents a Commissioner from attending in person.

(ii) Timing of Request: The Commissioner must request that the SSOC allow them to participate in the meeting remotely due to emergency circumstances as soon as possible, preferably with enough time to place the proposed action on the posted agenda for the meeting for which the request was made. However, if the timing of the request does not allow sufficient time to post the matter on the agenda, the Commission may take action at the beginning of the meeting.

(iii) What to include in the Request: The Commissioner need not provide any additional information at the time of the request, but they do need to provide a general description at the time of the meeting of the circumstances relating to their need to appear remotely. The general description need not exceed 20 words and shall not require the member to disclose any medical diagnosis or disability, or any personal medical information that is already exempt under existing law.

(iv) Action by legislative body is required: the Commission may approve a member’s request by a majority vote.

(v) Per meeting request is required: A member must make a separate request for each meeting in which they seek to participate remotely.

In addition to these requirements, AB 2449 imposes strict limits on the use of its provisions:

(i) Each Commissioner can request to use AB 2449 up to two times per calendar year, regardless of the basis for remote participation (just cause or emergency circumstances).

- (ii) AB 2449 can be used only when members of the public are also allowed to participate remotely (i.e. to listen/observe and provide comment). AB 2449 does not apply and cannot be used for meetings that are only offered in-person or that are in-person with teleconference options set to “observation only” such that the public cannot provide comment via teleconference.
- (iii) AB 2449 can be used only if a quorum of Commissioners participate in person from the same location within the City, and location must be clearly identified on the agenda and open to the public.
- (iv) Commissioners participating remotely under AB 2449 must participate both on camera and via audio.
- (v) Additionally, before any action is taken, Commissioners participating remotely must disclose if anyone 18 or older is in the room at the remote location with them, and the general nature of the relationship with the person or persons.
- (vi) The agenda must identify the call-in option, internet-based service option and the in-person location of the meeting.
- (vii) All votes must be by roll call.
- (viii) In the event of a disruption that prevents the Commission from broadcasting the meeting to members of the public, or in the event of disruption within the agency’s control that prevents members of the public from offering public comment, the Commission must not take further action on items appearing on the meeting agenda until public access to the meeting is restored. In-person public comment and discussion by the Commission may continue, and the Commission may pause the meeting while technical difficulties are resolved.

6) Notice and Conduct of Regular Meetings

Notices and agendas of all regular SSOC meetings requiring notice shall be posted in the City Clerk's Office and on an exterior bulletin board accessible twenty-four hours a day. Notice of regular meetings shall be posted at least seventy-two hours before the meeting. Action may only be taken on items for which notice was provided in compliance with the Sunshine Ordinance and the Brown Act.

7) Minutes

Minutes shall be taken at every SSOC meeting. Minutes shall be prepared in writing by the Custodian of Records. Copies of the minutes of each SSOC meeting shall be made available to each member of the SSOC and the City. Approved minutes shall be filed in the official SSOC file.

Measure Z (MZ) Objectives:	I. Improve 911 Response Times and Other Services	Strategic Plan Goals:	I. Financial Accountability & Transparency						
	II. Reduce robberies, homicides, burglaries, & gun violence		II. Evaluation of Violence Reduction Measures						
	III. Invest in violence prevention & intervention strategies		III. Outreach & Engagement						
			IV. Policies & Practices to Improve MZ Outcomes						
SSOC Initiatives 2024									
Item	Point of Contact	History	Status	MZ Alignment	Strategic Plan Alignment	Strategic Plan - Core Value Alignment	Oversight Duty	Equity Score	
							"Evaluate, Inquire, Review, Report, Recommend"		
Future of MZ	Paula, Yoana, Omar, Sonya	Last met in Nov 2023 w/ Mayor's reps. Met with MZ advocates in October 2023.	Staff is reaching out to Brooklyn & Zach. Oaklanders Together will be presenting in March. Included in survey to previous commissioners. Will vote on whether the SSOC will adopt it as a commission recommendation on 4/22.	MZ Section 4A6F	Part III	Impact Oriented, Evidence Based rec's	"Evaluate, Report, Recommend"	5 (6,9,10-12)	
RPSTF-SSOC Alignment (sheet 4)	Yoana, Omar	Omar & Yoana met with CM's Bas, Kaplan, and Fife on 1/29/24 via Zoom.	Met w/ CMs. Developed action items. Create a phase II presentation.	Objectives I, II, III	Part II	Impact Oriented, Evidence Based rec's	"Evaluate & Recommend"		
CARE Plan	Yoana, Omar, Gloria, Wallace?	In 2023 presented to: Grand Lake NC, 22x, Mt. Zion Missionary Baptist Church, LWVO, VPC	Offsite mtg? Presentations 2/21 (33x 34x Zoom), 3/27 35y, 4/3 (35x Zoom). Work w/ Wallace	MZ Section 1 4A5 & 4A6F. Recommended for new MZ.	Part III	Evidence Based - Qualitative data, Respect & Courtesy, Teamwork	"Inquire & Report"		
Verified Response	Omar	Passed Rules Committee on 2/8. RPSTF Rec #53.	COMPLETE: Passed Public Safety on 2/27. Passed full city council on 3/5 and 3/19.	Objective I	Part II	Evidence Based - Quantitative Data	"Evaluate & Recommend"	5 (2,6,7,9,10)	
ASAP to PSAP	Omar	Needs to be scheduled for the Rules Committee.	Will know more before the end of March. Need to reconvene discussions with CM Kaplans office or another CM.	Objective I	Part II	Evidence Based - Quantitative Data	"Evaluate & Recommend"	4 (2,6,9,10)	
Nightscope Technology	Omar	Use of autonomous robot tech to decrease calls for service and to deter auto burglaries and robberies.	Scheduled to present to the SSOC on Feb 26th. Have to reschedule D7 3/20 mtg w/ business leaders. Discussed with Faith in Action East Bay on 4/12.	Objective I, II	Part II	Evidence Based - Quantitative Data	"Evaluate & Recommend"		
Zoom Meeting Access	Paula, Yoana	Residents listening online are unable to make public comments.	Waiting to hear back from CAO? Paula reached out to all commissioners via email for input. Yoana has drafted language we'll vote on it in on 3/25/24. Yoana to discuss on 4/22.	Transparency	N/A	Respect & Courtesy	"Recommend"		
Violence Prevention Dashboard	Yoana, Omar	Promote a holistic approach to public safety by sharing violence prevention and intervention results at DVP.	Meeting with DVP, & D7 on March 27th. Yoana to update the commission on 4/22.	Objective III	Part II	Evidence Based - Quantitative and Qualitative Data, Teamwork	"Inquire & Report"		
Evaluation Summary	Omar & Kelly? and/or Sonya?, Gloria?	Summarize all recommendations made through evaluations and summarize their status for the public	In progress. Currently working on OPD's evaluation from 2017 on sheet 5. Kelly has made significant progress. We will discuss on 4/22.	MZ Section 4A6F	Part I, II, III	Evidence Based - Quantitative Data	"Evaluate & Report"		
Strategic Plan Summary	Yoana, Omar	Summarize in 1-2 slides the impact of the Strategic Plan and any lessons learned.	Due by Oct meeting 2024.	MZ Section 4A6F	Part III	Evidence Based - Quantitative and Qualitative Data	"Report & Recommend"		
MZ Lessons Learned	Omar; but all current and previous commissioners are involved	Staff reach out to previous commissioners for input. Create a survey for them.	Waiting to hear back from staff on contact info for previous commissioners. Omar emailed 9 former commissioners. Need staff to contact the rest. 1 former Chairperson will join us on 4/22. 2 others have replied and are considering providing input. At least 1 of those 2 will.	MZ Section 4A6F	Part II, III, IV	Evidence Based - Qualitative data	"Evaluate, Inquire, Review, Report, Recommend"		
Community Education Campaign	Omar & Yoana, Sonya? Kelly?	Historically the general public has not been aware of the SSOC. Educate them on its results over the last 10 years + about the new MZ.	Educate the public about the SSOC by using flyers for meetings and social media posts. Include a quick reference guide with our objectives, recommendations, and hyperlinks to info. Educate folks on the history of MZ. Or write joint article instead. Have an offsite meeting?	MZ Section 1 4A5 & 4A6F. Recommended for new MZ.	Part III	Respect & Courtesy, Teamwork	"Report"		
MACRO Development	Paula, Yoana, Omar	Improves 911 response times by having calls diverted from 911 to MACRO.	See sheet 3 for details. Need to coordinate scheduling MACRO to come to SSOC meetings. Get an update on the # and if mtg's are public now. Part IV, I, III. Vote on 4/22 whether to recommend creating a Brown Act governed city commission to oversee MACRO. MACRO ad hoc has a plan to reach out to 3 CMs to sponsor if approved.	Objective I, III	Part II	Evidence Based - Quantitative Data	"Evaluate, Inquire, Review, Report, Recommend"		
Strategic Plan Objectives for 2024	Omar, Yoana	Summarize which objectives we'd like to have presentations for in 2024.	1.1 Annual fiscal and performance audits. 1.3 Review OPD Hiring Plan. 1.4 Annual Report of SVS. 2.1 Annual Ceasefire Report. 2.2-2.3 Annual CRO & CRT Reports. 2.5 Annual Update Diversity of MZ Positions. 2.6 OFD Annual Report on Call Center. 2.4 Tracking Recommendations from Evaluations	Objectives I, II, III, IV	Objectives I, II, III, IV	Evidence Based - Quantitative and Qualitative Data	"Evaluate & Review"		
Public Safety Officer position	Omar	Slow 911 response times. Have applicants attend both fire and police academies to create a new role.	Increases the number of folks who can respond to both medical/fire + law enforcement issues by increasing officer capabilities. Helps shift from a warrior to a guardian mindset.	Objective I	Part II				
Cross Training OFD call center w/ 911 call center	Omar	911 call center is out of CAL OES standards for call answering times.	Research cross training OFD center folks to augment 911 center staff.	Objective I	Part II				
Self-triage 911	Omar	A way of reducing 911 hold times. Mentioned at joint mtg.	Gathering info and intend to circle back to this rec ASAP. The idea is to be able to press 1 for OPD, 2 for OFD, 3 for MACRO.	Objective II					

CARE: Community Activation, Research, & Elevation		Members: Omar, Yoana, Gloria	Presentation: https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1bfhnnCl4jkMqGIAaVShvJd-TMHGwqdX/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=114868257533086066029&rtopof=true&sd=true						
2023-2024 Presentations	Date	Location	Feedback	2024 Presentations	Date	Loation	Potential Presentations	Location	Status
NCPC 22x	Feb 28th 2023	D4	None to note.	NCPC 35y	Mar 27th 2024 (in-person)	D7	Associated Residents of Sequoyah Highlands	D7	TBD
League of Women Voters	May 9th 2023	City-wide	Upgraded us to a high functioning board. Willing to assist with vacancy advocacy.	NCPC 35x	Apr 3rd 2024 (zoom). Postponed to June 5th	D7	Sobrante Park Resident Action Council	D7	TBD
Violence Prevention Coalition	July 17th 2023	City-wide	Interested in MACRO development and transparency				40x40 PAC group	D7	TBD
NCPC 14y & 16x	Aug 16th 2023	D1 & D2	Recruited Commissioner Cure. Residents need to see DVP success stories. CM Kalb shared the OFD call center # and said to use if you can't get through to 911.				NCPC 32Y	D7	Emailed Feb 1st, No Reply
Mt. Zion Missionary Baptist Church	Sept 30th 2023	D3	None to note.				NCPC 31Y & 31Z	D7	Emailed Feb 1st, No Reply
Delta Town Hall @ City of Refuge	Dec 9th 2023	D7	Interested in RPSTF rec's.						
NCPC 32x	Feb 15th 2024	D7	Interested in being able to get through to 911 and 311 faster.						
NCPC 33x & 34x	Feb 21st 2024	D7	Collaboration with other boards? Invited to Mar 20th business leader meeting to discuss Knightscope technology						