



**Community Policing Advisory Board**  
**Meeting Agenda**  
**November 4, 2015**  
**1 Frank Ogawa Plaza, Oakland City Hall**  
**City Council Chambers, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor Oakland City Hall**

---

**Committee Membership:** Chairperson Jay Ashford (M), Cathy Leonard (Dist. 1) John Garvey (Dist. 2), Ravinder Singh (Dist. 4), Sal Gomez (District 5), Colleen Brown (Dist. 6), Angela Haller (NW), Don Link (M), Sheryl Walton (M), and Renia Webb (OHA), Nancy Sidebothem (NW pending).

**Vacancies:** District 3, District 7, At-Large, and OUSD.

**Staff:** Joe DeVries

**Appointee Notes:** Dist. = District; M = Mayoral; NW = Neighborhood Watch; OHA = Oakland Housing Authority; OUSD = Oakland Unified School District

New: Website: <http://oaklandcommunitypolicing.org>

Twitter Handle: @oaklandcpab

---

*Each person wishing to speak on items must fill out a speaker's card. Persons addressing the Community Policing Advisory Board shall state their names and the organization they are representing, if any.*

1. **Open Forum:** (6:10 – 6:20)
2. **Minutes:** Approval of October 2015 minutes (Joe, Board) – (6:20 – 6:25)
3. **Presentation by Coalition for Police Accountability** (Rashidah G.) – (6:25 – 7:05)
  - a. **Outcome:** receive informational presentation by C.P.A and have time for Q/A
4. **Preparation for a January 2016 Report by CPAB to Public Safety Committee** (Jay, Joe) – (7:05 – 7:30)
  - a. **Outcome:** CPAB approval of a proposed annual report and presentation of “Definition of Community Policing...” to PSC in January 2016 (exact date TBD). Begin discussion of what should be included in the report.
5. **NCPC Funds Process:** Updates from staff on status of Funds Disbursement Process (Joe D.) - (7:30 – 7:45)
  - a. **Outcome:** hear an update (if applicable) to finalization of funds disbursement process, and identification of next steps.
6. **Staff Report:** (Joe) – (7:40 – 7:55)

# Community Policing Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

October 7, 2015

1 Frank Ogawa Plaza, Oakland City Hall  
City Council Chambers, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor Oakland City Hall

---

**Committee Membership:** Chairperson Jay Ashford (M), Cathy Leonard (Dist. 1) John Garvey (Dist. 2), Ravinder Singh (Dist. 4), Sal Gomez (District 5), Colleen Brown (Dist. 6), Angela Haller (NW), Don Link (M), Sheryl Walton (M), and Renia Webb (OHA).

**Vacancies:** District 3, District 7, At-Large, Neighborhood Watch (2<sup>nd</sup> appt.), and OUSD

**Staff:** Joe DeVries

**Appointee Notes:** Dist. = District; M = Mayoral; NW = Neighborhood Watch; OHA = Oakland Housing Authority; OUSD = Oakland Unified School District

---

*Each person wishing to speak on items must fill out a speaker's card. Persons addressing the Community Policing Advisory Board shall state their names and the organization they are representing, if any.*

Members present: Ashford, Garvey, Singh, Brown, Link, Leonard, Haller, Webb, and Walton

Members absent: Gomez

## 1. Open Forum:

*There were no Open Forum Speakers.*

## 2. Minutes: Approval of Sept. 2015 minutes

*The September Meeting Minutes were approved unanimously.*

## 3. NCPC Funds Process: Review process for NCPC funds disbursement, tracking/audit of funds

*Chairperson Ashford framed the discussion about NCPC funding and its history and asked that Joe DeVries provide an overview of internal discussions. Joe DeVries explained that the City was attempting to find a way to provide the funding up front to NCPCs that submit an appropriate spending plan to avoid NCPC members having to spend the money first and then get reimbursed. He outlined some of the complexities created by tax law reporting requirements and the City's internal controls. One obstacle is that the City would have to report any payment to individuals as taxable income. One way for the City to avoid the reporting requirement would be to give the funding to a non-profit acting as a fiscal sponsor. However, that non-profit would still need to report payments to individuals as taxable income and also would likely need to charge a fee for the service as the processing of payments and receipts among 40 different NCPCs would require considerable staff time. Another option is for the City to create a Purchase Order with a few select vendors (such as FedEx Kinko's or Smart-n-Final) and allow NCPCs to simply purchase directly from those vendors.*

Member Haller noted from past experience that it would be vital to determine who “holds” the money and how we hold people accountable. Member Garvey asked what policy would be adopted regarding NCPCs who don’t use their funding. For example, would it be available to other NCPCs and would there be a cap to avoid one NCPC from spending disproportionately more than others.

Several Public Speakers participated in the conversation as noted below:

Billie Jean Carter (Beat 35x) emphasized the number of senior citizens in her area that do not have computers and complain about no flyers or mailings to receive word of the meetings. She stated this is the biggest complaint she hears from members.

Vivian Irving (Beat 30x) Agreed with this sentiment and advocated for funding for stamps, stationary, and for food expenditures for National Night Out.

Beverly Williams (Beat 33/34) suggested the NSCs should handle the funding and ensure at least two to three flyers per year to residents especially with all of the new renters in her area that have not been engaged yet. She also supported the idea of funding food for large public gatherings. She also asked if the money would roll-over if unspent and if a list of “don’ts” would be created by the CPAB or City for leaders to follow.

Cheryl Golden (Beat 24y) suggested NCPCs create a bank account the money could be deposited to and that there are banks that will offer a free account for a community group such as NCPCs. She was definitely opposed to a model where individuals would have to report the funding as income and receive a 1099. She noted that marketing for NCPCs can come in many forms including banners and that the NSCs should play a role in helping smaller NCPCs figure out what to do. She also liked the idea of using funds to buy tools and gloves for neighborhood clean-up and gardening projects. She emphasized the need to keep bureaucracy low so that people will take advantage of the funding.

Otha McCain (Beat 32x) stated the NSCs should just be responsible for the funding.

Carolyn Winters (Beat 13z) stated the funding was a good way to encourage NCPCs to get bank accounts and also believed the NSCs should help manage the funding and she supports the concept of the development of the spending plans beforehand. Also she would like help identifying all the Neighborhood Watch leaders in her beat to enlist their participation.

Mike (?) (Rockridge Beat 12y/13x) did not support any plan that required the City to issue a 1099 and suggested that the City may then require people to file taxes as a business or register as vendors/contractors creating a whole new set of reporting requirements. He supports on-line engagement but also feels NCPCs having a presence at street fairs and other public gatherings is also a worthy expenditure. He also noted that a non-profit may have the same reporting requirements as the City in regard to 1099s\*

\*Staff researched this further and determined he is correct; the reporting requirement does not disappear by distributing the money through a non-profit.

Rick Belew from Open Oakland spoke about a crime reporting database he is developing that would provide greater access to neighborhood level crime issue for NCPCs and indicated that OPD and the community could communicate better through a well-developed website/online presence. He also advocated for funding to be spent helping NCPCs communicate across beats with each other helping to create a citywide network of NCPC

leaders communicating with each other. He also suggested the city could put a portion of the money onto an account with one print shop that many NCPCs could have access to.

He also asked if the rare occasion of an NCPC being de-certified would disqualify them from receiving funds.

David Flack (Beat 14y/16x) commented that NCPCs could get bank accounts but often the fees are prohibitive. He suggested the City could help establish 57 NCPC accounts using its banking relationships and that could help avoid the fees. He also pointed out that many years ago a list of all of the addresses in the city was purchased and split among beats so that beat wide MAILERS could be sent out. Acknowledging that the list is a bit old due to new development, it still has enough accuracy that it could be used to re-engage a lot of people.

Dave (?) (Beat 1x Jack London) noted his group is very new and they would love quarterly forums with other NCPCs to help support their learning and development.

Francesca Austin (Beat 15x) said their neighborhood has a Feet on the Street walking group that could use funds for supplies.

The Discussion returned back to the Board Members:

Member Leonard noted that the attendance in her NCPC (Beat 10x) dropped significantly when the mailings stopped years ago and believes that should be a high priority thing to restore. However, she also encouraged grant writing classes to help eliminate the disparity through grants.

Member Brown stated that every suggestion the Board heard tonight was a good one and has been done before; the biggest hurdle however, is the resolution requiring a flyer being sent to every home in the beat at least yearly. She also pointed out that other uses included paying for babysitting at meetings, youth stipends, and funding the annual summit. In the past the policy was a "use it or lose it" policy but there was a point that the CPAB set up a Purchase Order at a print shop and that was effective.

Member Webb suggested there should be more training for NCPCs and an effort to get more young people involved. In her area many youth think of the NCPC as just a place to "snitch" because they don't understand that the community cares about improvement, not just crime.

Member Singh said his goal was to avoid administrative burden and cost in administering the program while still maintaining accountability to see the funds are spent wisely. His NCPC (Beat 22x) used funds they had for banners and signs at Bus stops and they found these to be more effective than mailings.

The Board agreed to resume the conversation next month when staff would have a clearer picture as to the City's limitations on the disbursement of the funds based on the input received tonight.

#### 4. **CPAB Outreach:** Updates on using the CPAB Twitter Account

Member Garvey discussed the creation of the E-Newsletter and told people how to subscribe to it. He also noted that he created a twitter account for the CPAB that any member could post to and the info would upload

to the newsletter. The web address he created is: [oaklandcommunitypolicing.org](http://oaklandcommunitypolicing.org) and it was agreed to put the link to these on upcoming agenda/monthly notices so people can subscribe.

5. **Administrative:** Shift CPAB monthly locales?

*The Board discussed the idea of moving alternating meetings to the Eastmont Police Station to provide greater access to the East Oakland community. Several members supported the idea but there were concerns about transportation and access. OPD staff must be present for the group to meet at Eastmont for example since it is a secure facility and the front desk is not staffed after 4pm on weekdays. Also, other NCPCs use that space on some even numbered months so there would need to be coordination.*

*The Board voted to start conducting odd month meetings at Eastmont starting in 2016.*

6. **Staff Report:** *There was no further staff report.*

7. **CPAB Apparel:** Chairperson Ashford handed out CPAB T0shirts that he had made, with the new logo, to all members!

# Community Policing Advisory Board Annual Report 2011

Presented by the CPAB

The functions and duties of the Advisory Board are to oversee, monitor and report at least twice yearly on the implementation of Resolution No. 72727 C.M.S, and to provide recommendations to the Mayor, Council, City Manager and Chief of Police on further steps necessary to carry out the objectives of said Resolution.



## Community Policing Advisory Board Annual Report 2011

### Overview & Summary

The state of community policing in Oakland continues to present a major challenge for residents – many of whom are still largely unaware of the changes in the Oakland Police Department (OPD) and how those changes actively affect their neighborhood. With the passing of Measure BB in November 2010, the redeployment of the Problem Solving Officers (PSOs) in January 2011 was a big positive for the citizens of Oakland and gave back a critical part of the community policing equation. But the continued reshuffling of the department to meet strategic needs and the reduction in the resources that serve OPD as a result of the 2011-2012 fiscal year budgeting, negatively impacted the effectiveness of community policing.

Despite this challenge, it is apparent to the Community Policing Advisory Board (CPAB) through its interaction with the community that there are citizens of Oakland who continue to support the goals of community policing and seek to better understand the role it can play in their own neighborhood. Despite limitations, they try to embrace in both theory and practice the full intent of community policing. This continues to be evident by their presence and participation in Neighborhood Crime Prevention Councils (NCPC) and a strong show of support at City Council meetings to retain the necessary resources that support community policing.

The citizens continue to reach out for ways in which they can actively engage their PSO and Neighborhood Services Coordinator (NSC) to identify and address public safety priorities in their neighborhoods. They look for best practices and are willing to shift the standard models of neighborhood councils typically set forth by the city in order to fully support the community policing model. Although frustrated by the continued decline in city services and resources, they recognize

## Community Policing History in Oakland



In 1996, Resolution 72727 was established for the implementation of the City of Oakland's Community Policing Policy. In this Resolution it was declared, "Community policing is the public safety policy and philosophy of the City of Oakland." The Resolution sought to put in place the community policing policy and to provide a structured approach to community involvement.

The Resolution was further amended in late 1996, 1997 and lastly in 2005. The 2005 Resolution 79235 is the most recent amendment and stands as the City's current policy on community policing.

The Community Policing Advisory Board (CPAB) was finalized in its current structure in 2008 and serves as the advisory arm to the Mayor, City Council and Oakland Police Department on the implementation and management of community policing in Oakland.



the need to come together to implement working strategies to solve their neighborhood's most troubling problems.

At a strategic level, the CPAB continues to struggle with being recognized as the City's Advisory for community policing. There is concern by both members of the board and the community that are invested in the oversight of community policing, that the City does not properly engage the CPAB when decisions are being made or strategies are being considered for the implementation of community policing. Departments, city services and OPD continue to operate in a silo affect, not taking into account that preventing violence and ensuring public safety requires an integrated system – one that regularly seeks input from important facets of the system so as to produce the most effective outcome possible.

Community policing was established in Oakland because "...cities and police departments across the US have adopted strategies to reduce reliance on 911-reponse policing and instead utilize approaches known as 'Community Oriented Policing' or 'Problem Oriented Policing' or 'Community Policing.'" It was determined that "...the experience of police departments which have adopted community policing strategy demonstrates the effectiveness of this approach in both reducing crime levels and increasing public sense of safety..." With the current state of Oakland City from both a fiscal and human capital perspective, the City is having a difficult time adhering to the original Resolution. There were many things in 2011 that took attention away from the core parts of community policing, making it a challenge to see great progress in moving the practice of community policing forward.

Continuing to focus on the key objectives of community policing as outlined in the Resolution, in addition to finding the most effective ways possible to make it work is going to be Oakland's biggest and most important challenge moving forward. It is absolutely critical that the City start taking some of the recommendations set forth by the CPAB to further community policing and its ability to reduce crime and increase public safety. The City needs to focus on building long-term community policing strategies that could ultimately change the face of Oakland's public safety.

Although OPD has reaffirmed some of its commitment to community policing in 2011 with the redeployment and support of PSOs, there have been continual disruptions as OPD staff is shifted around to help stem the growing violence in Oakland. This takes away from some of the key directives set forth by the Resolution and ultimately hurts the citizens of Oakland at the very core level – their neighborhoods.

Despite these very serious challenges, the CPAB continues to reaffirm its commitment to community policing in Oakland through the establishment of a peer level partnership between community, the police department and other city agencies. We remain committed to serving both the city and its citizens.

## *Overall State of Community Policing in Oakland in 2011*

### *OPD & Community Policing*

It is apparent, from community feedback and the experiences of the board in their own communities that all citizens of Oakland continue to suffer tremendously due to under-staffing and under-funding





of OPD and its resources. This is the *largest single factor* affecting community policing in Oakland and has been reported on by the CPAB starting as far back as 2004. Both the PSOs and the community suffer greatly when the police force is reduced and resources are shifted away from problem-oriented policing. Without the consistent presence of a resource such as the PSO in any given Beat, the community lacks the ability to establish a long term relationship with OPD that will eventually lead to better and more effective community policing. In addition, the lack of resources produces two residual effects that can have a long term impact on the community:

1. It produces minimal success and examples of how community policing can work and its overall effectiveness in a community and;
2. It erodes the overall relationship between OPD and the community. Without strong examples of what a good working relationship can do for the community, the citizens lack a frame of reference that positively reinforces their participation in community policing.

Some hope was injected into community policing advocates in 2009 with the appointment of Chief Anthony Batts. It was thought that there would be a fundamental shift in the support and model of community policing in Oakland however, it wasn't long before it was revealed Former Chief Batts was considering leaving the department for a position in San Jose. Although there is no empirical evidence, it appears that this and his subsequent departure from OPD in October of 2011 only furthered the erosion of the relationship between OPD and the community.

In the midst of all the disruption and difficulties, the CPAB is witness to some very strong examples of effective community policing – one where the relationship between the PSO, the NSC and the community has effectively worked in coordination to reduce crime and prevent violence. They have attacked long-term, neighborhood-specific problems (such as homeless encampments or foreclosed homes) and nearly eradicated them. The continued problem is that Oakland does not have enough of these examples – ultimately at least a few in each Beat – to say that effective community policing in Oakland is happening. It will take a honed and very strategic approach in order to put into practice community policing that can be regularly and actively measured for its effectiveness.

Although OPD is not the only party responsible for making community policing work in the City of Oakland, the community needs guidance in both the theory and practice of community policing in order to be fully effective. This guidance is best led by OPD in coordination with other organizations like the CPAB.

### *Citizens & Community Policing*

Neighborhood Service Coordinators and Problem Solving Officers monitor robberies, burglaries, and narcotics activity. They take initiative to identify problems, develop solutions, and collaborate with Patrol and other units. They are the face of the Department in individual neighborhoods: their responsiveness and competence helps build trust within the community. PSOs and NSCs are the face of community policing and when their numbers and subsequent resources are reduced, so is the connection to the community. The CPAB serves to establish and maintain the relationship between the community and the police to further the benefits of community policing. At the Community Policing Workshop held at the Public Safety Summit in October 2011, it was noted that there are citizens and NCPC members that were still not aware of the redeployment of PSOs in January 2011. Additionally, they were unaware of the new shifted distribution of the PSOs in July 2011 where the number of PSOs



was dropped from 57 to 35 and PSOs were redistributed (some responsible for more than one Beat at one time).

Being short staffed makes it difficult for OPD to effectively communicate these changes and educate the community on how those changes impact them; however it's critical to make sure that this education is being put into action.

Additionally, it is still unclear from the CPAB's perspective (and from community members as well) as to how they can give feedback on the perceived effectiveness of their PSO and/or bring up any concerns about the PSO's reporting to the community.

### *City Resources & Community Policing*

The Resolution's directive clearly states that the Board's objective is to "provide recommendations to the Mayor, City Council, City Manager and Chief of Police on further steps necessary to carry out its objectives." In light of continued cuts in city services and staff, the CPAB continues to see a minimal presence by key players in community policing at the CPAB meetings including the Mayor's office, the Chief of Police (or equivalent heads), the City Manager and regular involvement by the Public Safety Committee. The most regular presence in 2011 was OPD staff such as Commanders and PSOs. Without regular interaction of these entities with the CPAB (even at the 30 day interval set by the meeting schedule) effective community policing will be hard to achieve. The CPAB can offer a road into the community, one that these city entities may otherwise not have regular access to. Additionally, the CPAB can offer assistance in gathering community input where necessary to help build effective community policing practices.

### *Police Beats & Police Staffing*

*"Police officers assigned to each community policing beat shall be known as Community Police Officers. Community Police Officers shall focus their efforts on problem solving and quality of life improvement on their community policing beat, and shall not be routinely reassigned to 911 patrol or other non-community policing duties."*

The beginning of 2011 started off on a positive note with the passing of Measure BB which allowed for the reintroduction and staffing of Problem Solving Officers in the City's beats by February 2011. The CPAB was introduced by OPD of a new and improved method of reporting on priorities identified by each NCPC along with the appointment of a new head (Lt. Blair Alexander) to oversee the PSO training, deployment and management. In 2009 the CPAB reported on the fact that PSOS were "assigned with little or no PSO-related training that supports the ability of PSOs to function well in their assigned role" so in 2011 when it was announced that additional resources and support were being put towards this training, it appeared that community policing in Oakland was getting the proper support it needed. PSOs now had a defined and consistent way in which they could report back to the community on the establishment, goals and progress of identified problems in their Beat. OPD opted to do this by equipping each PSO with PowerPoint training (the preferred product used to present progress to the community), a laptop and projector so that they were able to report to the community at each NCPC meeting they attended. Each PSO was to create goals for the priority in conjunction with their supervisor so that they could measure whether or not progress on improving the priority had occurred. In July 2011, it was noted that OPD had shifted resources yet again resulting in a



decrease in the total number of PSOs from 57 to 35. OPD stated that this was in coordination with the total number of actual police beats, however it drew concern from the CPAB when the Board noted that this resulted in fewer PSOs on the streets and even had some PSOs covering two beats instead of their usual one.

Reductions in the police force over the years due to budget cuts has continued to cripple the progress necessary for community policing. In a September 2010 report by then Chief Anthony Batts reporting on how OPD intended to adhere to the City's community policing policy despite the recent reduction in force, it was stated that, "Selected NCPC priorities will be addressed via the SARA process. The Area Commander will task these projects (to be tracked using existing Department software) to the appropriate personnel under their chain-of-command to oversee and manage. Project updates as well as outcomes will be communicated with the affected NCPC by their designated Beat officer." The CPAB has seen some adherence to this in the restructure and deployment of the PSOs which we believe has resulted in positive interaction with the community and an effective reduction in problems in some neighborhoods in Oakland. However, it is still unclear as to how and how often the PSOs are using the SARA process to see an identified community problem through from beginning to end. Other entities focused on community policing such as the Measure Oversight Committee have also pushed on the importance and use of the SARA process in the hopes that OPD would more clearly utilize this valuable tool.

In Resolution 79235 Section 5.7 it states that "...the Oakland Police Department will consult the Board [CPAB] before implementing policy, operational or organizational changes that will affect the functioning and operation of Community Policing as described in the provisions of Resolution 72727 C.M.S." The CPAB has found it challenging to get the proper notification and inclusion in this important review process. There have been many changes made by OPD in 2011 to refocus and make more effective OPD, and many of those changes directly affect the way in which community policing operates in the City. The issue between the CPAB and proper inclusion and notification by OPD stems as far back as 2007 when the 2006 Annual Report made the recommendation that "OPD should meet its obligation to discuss changes that will affect the function and operation of community policing with the CPAB before they are implemented as required by Resolution 79235." Until OPD sees the CPAB as a true advisory arm, one that has a direct line into many citizens in Oakland, not only will the directives of the Resolution continue to be unmet but

The Resolution notes that the primary responsibility of the City Manager in relation to community policing is to "establish inter-departmental coordinating committee to insure the prioritization community policing programs and activities by all relevant city departments and employees."

## Neighborhood Organization

*"Neighborhood Councils [also known as Neighborhood Crime Prevention Councils or NCPCs] are the neighborhood-level component of the City's Community Policing Program."*

Neighborhood Councils cooperate actively with police officers, public employees, interested individuals and organizations to improve the quality of life in their neighborhoods

NCPC's are established and maintained in each police beat. As of January 2011, there were 58 active NCPCs. The groups held a total of 432 community meetings in 2010 with approximate monthly



attendance at 1,300 residents. 31 NCPCs hold monthly meetings; 7 hold bi-monthly; and 7 hold quarterly meetings. In 2010, a number of NCPC Beats combined their meetings with other Beats. 23 Beats now hold joint meetings. This has resulted in increased attendance at some and shared projects.

Attendance at meetings has been consistent, and has been as high as 200 residents. The average attendance is about 30 residents per Beat. Most attendees are residents in the Beat. The elimination of funding has resulted in the elimination of flyers and postage for outreach mailings to encourage attendance at the NCPC meetings. The main notification of meetings is primarily through email and associated listservs.

Attendance spikes during times when crime activity is impacting the Beat. The fact that residents turn to the NCPC when crime hits close to home speaks to the association of the NCPC as a tool to report and learn what is going on in their neighborhood.

NCPCs are active and engaged. In addition to working with the Oakland Police Department and city departments to identify and address illegal and/or nuisances activity in their neighborhoods, they conduct on-going activities to build community such as block parties, workshops on safety, community clean ups, safety patrols, National Night Out Parties and other activities.

Overall, residents feel the Neighborhood Crime Prevention Council is an effective vehicle to address crime and quality of life issues at the neighborhood level. NCPC's are taking pro-active approach to addressing crime and quality of life issues in their communities. Residents have learned how to access services and get things done. NCPC members are independent, effective and take ownership for the quality of life in their neighborhoods.

The NCPCs need assistance in increasing representation as defined in the Resolution. Given the lack of resources provided by the City, especially in light of continuing budget and resource cuts, NCPCs still struggle to provide to the community their purpose as outlined in the Resolution.

## Citywide Organization

*"The Community Policing Advisory Board and the Home Alert Steering Committee [Neighborhood Watch Steering Committee] are citywide advocates for community policing, and help bring the block and neighborhood groups together as a citywide voice for community policing."*

## Block Level Organization

*"Home Alert [Neighborhood Watch] is the block-level component of the City's Community Policing Program."*

The Neighborhood Watch Steering Committee (formerly known as the Home Alert Steering Committee) continues to be the primary entity focused on guiding and shaping the Neighborhood Watch groups. Two members of the committee sit on the CPAB so that there is a direct connection between the work being done at the Neighborhood Watch level and the goals/objectives of community policing as guided by the CPAB. The Neighborhood Watch needs to be a focus of every NCPC.

Since July 2010 the Neighborhood Watch Steering Committee has made the following accomplishments:



1. Neighborhood Watch has grown to nearly 800 (by Jan 2012) organized groups in Oakland with nearly 100 new groups in the past two years.
2. Neighborhood Watch Steering Committee has sponsored eight "Neighborhood Watch Presents", informational meetings for Neighborhood Watch Block Captains covering a range of topics such as "Parole & Probation", "Crime Prevention Technologies", "Merchant Watch", and "Safe Pathways". Neighborhood Watch has also sponsored two "Networking Socials" and participated in the 2011 Public Safety Summit.
3. Worked with OUSD in working to implement "Safe Pathways" a program where interested neighbors around each school will serve to 'look out' to assure safe passage to and from school and to become more involved with the associated school PTA. The specifics of the program are still in discussion and not yet implemented though we do have several interested Block Captains interested in piloting this program.
4. Neighborhood Watch Steering Committee has rewritten its bylaws to align with the election terms of the CPAB. The NWSC additionally assured better geographic representation by creation of "Area Representatives" as well a "Merchant Watch" Representative. These bylaws were ratified at the January 25, 2012 meeting. Elections for the new board are scheduled for March 28, 2012. Structure of CPAB in 2011

The current makeup of the CPAB was constructed in 2008 with fifteen total possible members representing the Mayor's office, the districts of Oakland, the OUSD, the NWSC, and OHA. The board was served by Chair Olugbemiga Oluwole Sr. until March 2, 2011 at which time the current Chair, Krista Gulbransen. As of December 2011 the Board has filled 13 of its 15 member positions. Missing member representation includes OUSD and District 5 which Staff Member Claudia Albano continues to try and fill in coordination with the Chair.

### *CPAB's Goals & Objectives 2011*

At a Board Retreat in June 2011, the Board identified the following as the overarching goals of the CPAB:

- To guide and advocate for the community regarding Community Policing.
- To advise the City of Oakland on Community Policing.
- To report on the state of Community Policing in the city of Oakland.

The ways in which the CPAB achieves these goals are through:

- Relationship building
- Advocacy work
- Communication and outreach

The tasks associated with each of the above objectives are:

#### **#1 Relationship Building:**

1. Oversee the NCPC structure and its operational practices
2. Attend NCPCs every month (at least 12 per year)
3. Co-host educational meetings with the NWSC to communicate community policing





## **#2 Advocacy work**

1. Identify available resources and position resources for the most effective use
2. Advocate for more city resources to building Community Policing
3. Find funds for NCPCs

## **#3 Communications and Outreach**

1. Develop a Community Policing handbook that includes Neighborhood Watch, Merchant Watch and NCPCs
2. Provide a Community Policing Summit
3. Hold a Community Policing appreciation event

To support these objectives, the CPAB's two sub committees (as outlined in the Bylaws) have taken up the effort of focusing on the tactical work necessary to achieve these objectives. They are the Programs & Services Committee and the NCPC Resources Committee. By July of 2011, these committees were up and running with Chairs and members. They meet on a monthly basis. The Programs & Services Committee has focused on developing a Community Policing handbook by rewriting one written many years ago. The NCPC Resources Committee is focusing on the recertification of NCPCs which has been long overdue.

The Resolution states that "The CPAB, NWSC, Police Department and City Council will sponsor an annual citywide Community Policing Summit." It had been a number of years since a Community Policing Summit had commenced in Oakland when Mayor Jean Quan opted in mid-2011 to create a Public Safety Summit. The CPAB was disappointed to learn that the majority of the planning of the Summit occurred without its full consent or participation. The CPAB did manage to squeeze in a Community Policing Workshop within the Summit but subsequently expressed its disappointment in the process to the neighbor in a letter sent to her office in November 2011. When anything occurs in the City that allows for interaction with the community and focuses on public safety, the CPAB needs to be involved. It is our role and focus to help guide and inform the community about the theories and practices of community policing. There is no reason this education should be done in a vacuum by one entity and not another. In the future, we strongly recommend a joint Community Policing & Public Safety Summit be a joint effort of those tasked with furthering community policing in Oakland (see 2012 CPAB Recommendations at the end of this report).

## *Neighborhood Services Coordinator*

*"The City shall assign a Neighborhood Services Coordinator (NSC) to each community policing beat."*

The Neighborhood Services Department (NSD) has been witness to a decline in its NSCs due to budget cuts since 2008. In the 2011-2012 fiscal year budget planning, the core group of NSCs were ultimately retained but the NSD took a hit with the elimination of 3 positions. For the 9 NSCs that remained, the distribution of work to cover all Police Beats in the City of Oakland has been a continued strain. In an effort to spread an already thinned NSC staff that covered up to 8 beats per person, NSCs had to reduce their regular monthly attendance at some NCPC meetings. Since NSCs play a critical role in the practices associated with community policing, it has been a hit to the community to see a reduction in their presence and availability. Over the years as the PSO staff has waxed and waned due to cuts,



Oakland neighborhoods found that the NSC would step in and take on some of the duties normally assigned to a PSO. They are a key and critical conduit between the community and its PSO and Beat officers. Their continued decline and thinned out availability to the citizens of Oakland is an impediment to successful community policing. We know this to be true because when relationship between NSC, the community and the PSO is symbiotic, positive outcomes have occurred. Long-term solutions are put into place and key problems abated within the community.

## Implementation

*“The City Administrator or his/her designated agency head(s) shall be primarily responsible for the implementation of this program...and shall require the cooperation of all city departments.”*

The Resolution notes that the primary responsibility of the City Manager in relation to community policing is to “establish inter-departmental coordinating committee to insure the prioritization community policing programs and activities by all relevant city departments and employees.”

In 2011 there was a shift in Staff Member’s for the CPAB. When Staff Member Jeff Baker was let go from the City, NSD Supervisor Claudia Albano was assigned as the new Staff Member. As quickly as she got up to speed, this disruption in critical support for the CPAB was a challenge. Not all records were properly maintained by previous Staff Members and with a new Chair in place, it was at times challenging to find the documents necessary to keep the Board going.

With a new Mayor in 2011 also came a new administration, causing further disruption the support from the City Administrator’s office that the CPAB should have been receiving according to the Resolution. There was almost no communication by the City Administrator’s office in 2011 with the CPAB, save Staff Member Albano acting as a conduit when particular information was needed. This has furthered the CPAB’s feeling of working in a bit of a vacuum, one where not all information is being coordinated and communicated effectively.

We must ask ourselves whether this is humanly feasible in a time where the City has faced great deficit in both its finances and human capital. The Resolution clearly states what the role and responsibility is by the City Administrator’s office but can the city meet its obligation to provide that support as outlined in the Resolution? The CPAB has felt the effects of not having that support in place and does feel that it can negatively impact the effectiveness of community policing.

## Prior Year’s Recommendations & Current Status

Over the past four years, the CPAB has presented a number of significant recommendations to the City for the effective use of community policing to help reduce crime and violence. It is noted that out of the a large number of recommendations presented over that four year period, only a small handful have been put into place by those the recommendations were geared towards.

### **2011 Recommendations (Taken from 2009/2010 CPAB Annual Report)**

1. Establish a Mayoral Staff Public Safety Director to be a leader in the City of Oakland as the Mayor’s representative for all public safety efforts.
2. Fund a budget submitted by OPD for full support of the Neighborhood Services Division (NSD) including a full time manager, three NSC supervisors and a full complement of NSCs.



3. Fund 2 full OPD Academies in 2011.
4. The Mayor's office to communicate all community policing related activities and submit all community policing related measures and initiatives to the various City-established community policing boards, committees and councils for their review and comment prior to contemplation of action, ensuring adequate time for response.
5. OPD department wide recommendations included establishing area-wide quarterly training schedules for every Area officer on enhancing community policing; dedicating resources to establish data collection and data analysis of all OPD activities; and establish a public, city-wide website dealing with community policing.
6. OPD patrol and OPD Dispatch should be fully staffed
7. PSO recommendations included establishing a hiring and retention process for PSOs; creating performance-based evaluation for all officers; establish a protocol for tracking time and resources use in dispatching PSOs; development of protocols for PSO that includes walking and bicycling within their beats; and ensuring that PSOs remain in their Beat and not be moved.
8. Maintain full staffing of PSOs.

Of the eight overarching recommendations made by the CPAB, only the recommendations contained in #5 were addressed in 2011. Since the City agencies responsible for implementing the recommendations did not report back to CPAB on their progress, we can only assume that for whatever reason they chose to not implement the recommendations. This is damaging to both





## *Conclusion & 2012 CPAB Recommendations*

In the past, the CPAB has made more detailed recommendations, outlining key action items for each recommendation. Taking into consideration the serious nature of the current state of the City, the CPAB's recommendations for 2012 are focused on getting back to some of the basics necessary to further community policing in Oakland.

With the CPAB's continued commitment to effective and XX community policing in the City of Oakland, we strongly encourage the City to review our recommendations below and work with the CPAB for full implementation and action on these recommendations:

1. The CPAB to work with the NSD and other entities to provide resources and direction that can shape and guide the NCPCs in being the most effective possible.
2. The City, the Public Safety Committee and other resources to utilize the CPAB as the conduit of information to the NCPCs and other community members. The CPAB can be used as an implementation tool to help spread the word to the community about policies and strategies being put into place that affect public safety.
3. OPD and the City Administrator to inform and consult the board on all decisions and actions that may affect community policing.
4. The CPAB to establish an educational process for the full understanding of a PSO's responsibilities and purpose within each Beat, to be presented to the NCPCs, Neighborhood Watch leaders, Measure Y Oversight Committee and any other community policing related entities. A component of that education should include an overview of community policing theories and practices. This will be best delivered by the PSO (or other OPD staff in the Community Policing Department) and the CPAB.
5. OPD establish a formal process in which citizens can give feedback on the performance and effectiveness of their PSO.
6. OPD conduct its outreach to Oakland youth, particularly middle school students, to coincide with the 2012 Federal Grant the city was awarded. A stronger relationship with OUSD police is warranted given the high truancy rate in Oakland. Not only can this act as a preventive measure, it is critical to greatly improve the relationship between youth and the police. Additionally, Oakland needs to take a long range planning and holistic approach to recruiting. This could potentially include youth who have grown up in Oakland for future staffing opportunities.
7. OPD commit to the SARA process when identifying and processing a neighborhood priority. The use of this process should be made transparent to the community in is serving.
8. The CPAB co-host with the Mayor's office and other key City entities focused on community policing for a youth-focused Community Policing & Public Safety Summit.
9. City Council reinstate the NCPC funds in full, or at the least minimally, provide funds for an annual mailing to residents in the NCPC's beat.
10. The resolution be modified so that the timeframe for presentation of this CPAB Annual Report is once per year instead of twice per year.