

COMMUNITY POLICING ADVISORY BOARD
ACTION RECAP
SPECIAL MEETING
JULY 10, 2013

CONVENE / ROLL CALL:

Chairperson Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:09 p.m. Board members present were Frank Castro, John Garvey, Sal Gomez, Krista Gulbransen, Barbara Hunter, Chairperson Marcus Johnson, Vice Chair John Nichols, Renia Webb, Vertis Whitaker, and Chief James Williams.

Absent: Angela Haller

Vacancies: Three mayoral appointments, District 7

1. **PUBLIC COMMENT / OPEN FORUM:** None

2. **ACTION RECAP:**

2.1. Member's Ground Rules Discussion | Agreement

A motion to adopt the "Do Our Best" Ground Rules as the ground rules of the CPAB,

There was no public comment

Moved: Gulbransen

Seconded: Castro

Vote- Ayes (10): Brown, Castro, Garvey, Gomez, Gulbransen, Haller, Hunter, Chairperson Johnson, Vice Chair Nichols, Webb, Whitaker, and Chief Williams. Noes: none; Recused: none;

Motion passed

2.2. Member Duties and Responsibilities Discussion

No action

There was no public comment

2.3. OPD Discussion-Dashboard

No action

There was no public comment

2.4. Committee Discussion

Committees formed, members confirmed

A motion that the Board conduct a special meeting in August to set the priorities and the Chairs of the Committees with a accepted friendly amendment (Gomez) that the August meeting include just three items: Open Forum, Meeting with the Captains, and the priority setting for the committees.

There was no public comment

Moved: Gulbransen

Seconded: Hunter

Vote- Ayes (10): Brown, Castro, Garvey, Gomez, Gulbransen, Haller, Hunter, Chairperson Johnson, Vice Chair Nichols, Webb, Whitaker, and Chief Williams. Noes: none; Recused: none;

Motion passed

2.5. CPAB Sponsorship: Robbery | Burglary Town Hall

A motion to not sponsor Town Hall Workshops but have a spot on the agenda.

There was no public comment

Moved: Gulbransen

Seconded: Castro

Vote- Ayes (1): Castro, Noes: Brown, Garvey, Gomez, Gulbransen, Haller, Hunter, Chairperson Johnson, Vice Chair Nichols, Webb, Whitaker, and Chief Williams.; Recused: none;

Motion failed

A motion to sponsor Town Hall Workshops and seek 10 minutes on the agenda.

There was no public comment

Moved: Garvey

Seconded: Gulbransen

Vote- Ayes (9): Brown, Castro, Garvey, Gomez, Gulbransen, Haller, Hunter, Chairperson Johnson, Vice Chair Nichols, Webb, Whitaker, and Chief Williams. Noes: Castro; Recused: none;

Motion passed

2.6. Agenda Building

See above item (2.4)

NOTE: PAST MEETING MINUTES ATTACHED.

ADJOURNMENT-9:08 p.m.

COMMUNITY POLICING ADVISORY BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES
SPECIAL MEETING
July 10, 2013

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:09 and asked staff to conduct role call.

Members Present: Williams, Gomez, Castro, Johnson, Nichols, Gulbransen, Garvey, Hunter, Whitaker.

Members absent: Haller.

1. Open Forum: There were no public speakers.

2. 1. Member's Ground Rules Discussion-Agreement

Chairperson Johnson asked that the Board review the rules that were agreed upon at the retreat and determine if there are any additions or deletions. Member Castro asked for a modification to the rule about turning off all electronic devices because he uses his iPad to take notes. The Chair accepted this modification and Member Gulbransen made a motion that the group adopt the "Do Our Best" Ground Rules as the ground rules of the CPAB, the motion was seconded by Member Castro and was passed by consensus.

2.2 Member Duties and Responsibilities Discussion:

Chairperson Johnson noted that he asked members to bring their binders as a reference including information about the Brown Act, the Sunshine Ordinance and several other guiding documents. Also, staff brought a copy of the City's new Handbook for Boards and Commissions for the members to reference that has a lot of good information as well. The group reviewed the handbook.

Chairperson Johnson asked the group if there were any comments or questions and Member Castro noted that in regard to Robert's Rules of order, (Pg. 14, appendix A) when someone makes a motion and it is seconded, the Chair needs to make a statement, "Is there any discussion?" to clarify whether or not there is any discussion before the actual vote, especially as reflected in the minutes.

Chairperson Johnson agreed to see that he does make that distinction moving forward.

Member Garvey asked for clarification as to when to make a motion outside of the agenda. He cited the two minute limit on public speakers that he does not like because it goes against the by-laws. He doesn't know when it is appropriate to make a motion to change this since it isn't on the agenda. The Chairperson said he thought the bylaws did allow of that limit but to Member Garvey's point about the agenda he suggested this was a good example of what to ask the Public Ethics Director, Whitney Barazato, when she addresses the Board at a future meeting and that the Board can get an opinion from the City Attorney as well. Member Castro commented that his read is that this is not a CPAB issue but a Sunshine Ordinance issue; the board cannot take action on an item that is not duly noticed so that the public can be there to make comment on.

Member Nichols noted that members should be aware of Form 700 and the need to file that form upon appointment, annually, and within 30 days of leaving the board.

Joe DeVries added that the State is stepping up efforts to ensure people are filing those forms and in fact has required the City to fine people who do not file in a timely manner. Member Gomez asked what is considered a gift. Member Williams suggested he look online as there is a guidebook to follow that explains what needs to be reported.

Joe DeVries also pointed out that it is a requirement to report gifts, these gifts are not illegal, they just need to be reported.

Member Nichols encouraged people to fill out online as the City Clerk will then send an update each year via email.

Joe DeVries noted the City Clerk is the expert and can answer any questions on this.

Chairperson Johnson said that he has heard the expression, "the CPAB has been reconstituted" several times in the past year and now he feels the Board has a lot of good energy, and is ready to be a strong body.

There was no action on the item.

2.3. OPD Discussion-Dashboard:

Chairperson Johnson said that he and Member Castro has a conversation with Scott Hugo and Member Garvey met with him as well and asked for the two members to explain what this "Dashboard" was about.

Member Garvey explained that Scott Hugo was an intern from the Kennedy School at Harvard and was assigned to work with OPD around construction of a website that would be a more reasonable way for residents to get crime statistics as well as a way to learn about all the services the department provides.

Member Garvey noted that Scott Hugo is not a web designer; Crimestoppers already provides crime data for the City but Mr. Hugo's work will be embedded in that webpage.

Specifically Member Garvey spoke with Mr. Hugo about the challenges residents have who are pulling data together from multiple sources to present as part of their NCPC meetings on a monthly basis. He noted that NCPC Chairs, City Council Offices, Crime Analysts, and others spend a lot of time gathering crime data and he suggest to Mr. Hugo that he spend time automating that process and invited him to speak with the Board to hear what statistics people are interested in. There will be a three pronged website built out including an internal version for OPD, an external version on the website and a community version that the CPAB could advocate for.

Member Castro noted this item came up at the last CPAB Meeting during discussion with Assistant Chief Figueroa. As the Chair of the Rockridge NCPC he puts together a report for residents about what has been going on in the past thirty days. He receives monthly statistics from Marie Mason, a Crime Analyst at OPD but she references three other data sources where the public can go and none of these four sources correlate.

He wants to know why we cannot get one set of data that is accurate. The Company that the city is contracting with, Omega, will be creating a "Dashboard" database which will have different levels of access for different groups. OPD will have access to all the data including the details of each crime report to help in the investigation of crimes, the City Administrator and City Council would also have access to be able to do their job in developing public policy, the third level would be accessible to the community. He feels stingily that having this accurate information is crucial to community polling so neighbors who are involved will know anytime an incident takes place in their neighborhood that generates an incident report, the community will have accurate information about it. He cited a study he did of one week's worth of data from Crime Watch and the spread sheet that he received from Marie Mason and found five incidents on Crime Watch that were not inner spreadsheet. He noted that if you were to then add the discrepancies in the other two sources of data and multiplied over a whole year, there would be huge discrepancies. The effort is to make this a seamless, consistent system.

Chairperson Johnson said he was excited that there would be an effort to roll this out to the community and in fact Mr. Hugo was at an NCPC Meeting tonight discussing this issue. He also noted that Mr. Hugo had sent an example of what the webpage would look like and it included a variety of information beyond just crime such as the number of officers on duty, and the number of complaints filed.

Member Garvey pointed out that there would always be some discrepancies in the data because it comes from multiple sources but Omega will have exclusive contractual rights to all that data so hopefully they will be able to make it more accurate. He also noted that there is a Google system called Answers. Oaklandnet.com which is put together by IT and Code for America which has a lot of other data where people can even submit questions of there own like when and where their NCPC meets.

Chairperson wanted to have this discussion without OPD here so that the Board can invite OPD back to tell them what he Board is interested in having in the database as opposed to OPD telling them what they have to offer. He feels the Board should have this discussion and set the parameters of what people want to have OPD provide on a consistent and regular

basis. He wants to avoid having different Commanders come before the Board giving presentations that vary widely and can be hard to follow. He wants to see the Board able to discuss the issues they want to discuss regardless of which Commander is appearing before the Board.

Member Castro noted that this really gets to the heart of why the CPAB exists. At his first CPAB meeting they had a discussion about what they wanted from OPD. At that time they asked about the strategic plan that Chief Batts developed. He was referencing a working draft that was presented in 2010 as an example he cited Strategic objective 4.1 which was: to effectively implement Community Policing in Oakland as currently defined by current policy and requirements. It had nine specifically defined priority actions regarding implementation. In this plan it talks about the areas of responsibility as under the Bureau of Field Operations. Every item references the CPAB as responsible for implementation. He asked if this plan was still alive and something OPD is looking to regarding community policing, and if not why not? If it is, why has no one from OPD come to the Board to discuss this document? For example item 4.1.1 states: Clarify the understanding of the objectives strategies and desired outcomes of the community policing approach. he is not aware of any discussion of this or eight other specific items in the strategic plan. He would like OPD to come speak on each of these objectives to the Board to see that we effectively implement community policing in Oakland.

Chairperson Johnson stated that he believes there was conversation about these topics at a Subcommittee level last year but he agreed that the conversation was never finished and the Board does need to bring these items back especially with the change in leadership at OPD.

Joe DeVries asked if Member Castro could read the document for the benefit of the board and also noted that with the leadership changes in OPD and the consulting team restructuring the department, it would be important to clarify which of the previously listed items are still relevant.

Member Castro summarized the main objectives:

1. Clarify the understanding of the objectives strategies and desired outcomes of the community policing approach.
2. Develop and implement Community Policing training for all OPD personnel and offer it on a frequent and consistent basis.
3. Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the Neighborhood Services Coordinators, the NCPCs, Neighborhood Watch, and others involved in Community Policing.
4. Develop and implement a Community Policing activity tracking system to provide information on problems identified, activities conducted, and outcomes achieved.
5. Develop an Annual Community Policing Report highlighting the accomplishments of the community and the OPD Community Policing in addressing community concerns.
6. Collect information and conduct research on best practices on community policing and potential models to be implemented in Oakland.
7. Develop a draft model for Community Policing in Oakland based on best practices researched and Oakland's strong Community Policing History.
8. Obtain feedback and input from members of the community on the draft model for Community Policing in Oakland and revise as needed. Identify changes required in ordinance or voter initiatives to implement the revised model of Community Policing in Oakland and pursue needed changes.

Member Castro noted that all of the above goes to the heart of what the CPAB does. these objectives stand alone on the website but also are contained in a report about the 100 block plan.

Member Hunter agreed that this is exactly what the CPAB should be advising OPD on as opposed to OPD coming and advising the Board on what they are doing.

Member Gulbransen suggested that the Board review this document at the next meeting and determine which parts of it are relevant. Member Castro modified that to propose that the Board invite OPD to the next meeting and specifically address what the current philosophy of OPD on Community Policing and what they see the CPABs role in developing that policy.

Member Gulbransen noted that this Board has been trying to do that for a long time. Instead she suggested a more specific plan would be to review the training plan that OPD is using currently with officers so that the Board could review and comment on it.

Chairperson Johnson shared some frustration about asking OPD to report back since there has been so much transition in the department.

Joe DeVries noted that with the Wasserman report being drafted, there is yet another "re-boot" of the department and he can cite several examples of commitments made by OPD that he is not sure are being implemented such as involving community members in training new officers. He noted that CPAB members, especially those who have chaired NCPCs should be given the opportunity to conduct those trainings.

Member Gomez asked when those commitments were made and who should be held accountable for them.

Member Williams noted that although Assistant Chief Toribio made some commitments, he is no longer the Assistant Chief. He suggested the current Assistant Chief (Figueroa) would be able to do respond to these questions. Chairperson Johnson noted that the smaller advisory group that Chief Jordan had assembled has not met in two months.

Member Castro said he thinks its premature to ask the department to review the above objectives especially since another report is about to be finished. He wants to review how the Board can be more effective in advising OPD while we wait for the new consultant's recommendations are made.

Member Garvey agreed that waiting on OPD to define Community Policing is not the most effective approach. Instead of asking OPD how they perceive Community Policing or how they train cadets for example, the Board should generate what the model should be.

Member Hunter added that she feels the Board needs to steer away from philosophical questions and ask more specific questions on something the Board has already requested or on a commitment OPD already has made. For example, since they committed to providing the training documents about Community policing that the Board should ensure they follow-up on that specific commitment.

Member Gomez commented that as a new member he is hearing a lot of frustration and feels this frustration has been building for years.

Member Nichols said that Member Gomez hit the nail on the head. As chair of his own NCPC he has seen too many commanders and Captains not really understand Community Policing and not appearing to be committed. He cited an example of an Area Commander not showing up to a meeting where he was on the agenda and later found out they were at the shooting range.

Member Gomez asked what the Board should do to hold the department accountable. Member Nichols responded that he spoke with his Council Member and she was willing to pursue this problem but with the constant changing of leadership, pursuing this may not matter.

Member Castro noted that his new Area Commander is now providing his daily logs to the NCPC Leaders in his area and they are extremely happy with that level of information.

Chairperson Johnson asked how the department could provide that sort of service consistently across the Board.

Joe DeVries suggested three options that the Board could pursue: invite all five commanders to the next meeting to have a conversation, write a letter to the City Administrator regarding the desire for consistency, or go before the Public Safety Committee.

Chairperson Johnson supported the first of these ideas, seeing it as an opportunity to get a level of consistency across the City.

Member Gulbransen asked if they would be presenting to the Board or would the Board be presenting to them.

Member Castro framed the meeting conceptually: all five Captains come to the Board, and each Board member can ask their most poignant , carefully crafted questions of the Captains, hear their responses, and provide them consistent feedback of what the Board's expectations are.

Member Webb asked what the next step is if the Captains are not willing to adhere to what the Board expects.

Member Gomez responded that the Board should not just have the Captains appear once, but instead, bring them back to report back on what they have done after a few months.

Member Gulbransen went further suggesting after hearing their responses, the Board could develop a report and then take that report out to the community, to the Public Safety Meeting, and to the City Council to get on the public record what the Board is hearing and how the department is responding.

Joe DeVries asked if the members of the Board had been contacted by their Captains to be a member of their new Area Advisory Boards. Many Board members indicated they had not been contacted. He went on to note that he could go back through the past minutes and determine what commitments were made that need to be reviewed. Chairperson Johnson said that he would perform that function to develop his questions for them.

There was discussion about whether that meeting would be in August and the Board decided to have a Special Meeting in August which falls the day after National Night Out which would likely mean there would be many captains still in town.

There was a brief discussion about how many meetings a member can miss before being removed from the Board. It was clarified that there is official language in the by-laws but a more informal check-in with members is a better route to take to see if they need support or if they want to continue on the Board.

Member Gulbransen noted that the new Boards and Commissions Handbook has clear language in it about the importance of attendance at meetings.

2.4 Committee Discussion:

Chairperson Johnson referenced the snapshot document in the agenda packet from the retreat which listed out the committees discussed and compared them to the committees listed in the by-laws. He went on to state that he thought it was important to have a discussion about what the Board wants to work on in the committees. He emphasized the importance of the committee work and the serious commitment of whomever chairs each committee.

Joe DeVries commented that his job is to provide as much support as possible including providing access to appropriate meeting space, posting agendas, providing support materials, and attending when necessary.

Chairperson Johnson listed the standing committees in the by-laws: Executive Committee; Fund Development Committee, Program and Service Committee, and the NCPC Resource Committee. Regarding the Fund Development Committee he noted that even though the NCPC funding was taken away, there still is a role for such a committee.

Member Gulbransen noted that in the past there had been some confusion about the role of each committee. She cited the Programs and Services Committee's role was to raise the profile of the CPAB including such things as brochures, a newsletter to NCPCs, and communications in general. Whereas the NCPC Resource Committee provides support for NCPCs such as certification, by-law development, and the other nuts and bolts of what an NCPC needs to do to be successful operationally.

Member Castro agreed that further defining the nature and scope of the committees may require a by-law change to alleviate confusion and give everyone an idea of exactly what the committees should be involved in. She also wanted to be sure that there was agreement about the fact that the committees do the work of the Board during the 29 days out of the month the the Board is not meeting. The committees report back their work to the full Board each month.

Chairperson Johnson restated the responsibility of the committee and especially the chair is to: generate an agenda, work with staff to get a location, pursue items that are then reported to the full Board, and seek approval of the Board as to the committee's direction. He further suggested that the Board agree to the scope of the work and then revisit the scope in a year or as necessary to evaluate the work. He also noted the ability to create ad hoc committees for items that come up and need to be addressed that don't necessarily fall under the jurisdiction of a standing committee.

Member Nichols commented that when Mayor Quan was first elected and he attended some town hall meetings, there was a lot of talk about the CPRB but no mention of the CPAB.

Member Gulbransen asked staff if the CPAB could become a 501C3 non-profit and it was clarified that the City can serve as a fiscal agent for the Board if there was funding sought.

The group decided to determine who was interested in serving on each committee and wait to make assignments of chairpersons for each committee from among the people who are interested in each committee. The group self selected to be on each committee:

Executive Committee:
Member Williams
Member Castro
Member Gulbransen

Fund Development Committee:
Member Gomez
Member Webb
Member Whitaker

Program and Services Committee:
Member Gulbransen
Member Garvey
Member Castro

NCPC Resource Committee:
Member Williams
Member Nichols
Member Hunter
Member Whitaker

Chairperson Johnson noted that as Chair he serves as an ex-officio member of all the committees. Also, he wants to see the members of each committee develop their top priorities for the next meetings.

Member Gulbransen raised a concern that without a Chair, who will schedule and plan the agenda for the first meetings of the committees. Joe DeVries suggested that all the committees could meet in succession at the next meeting (each for a thirty to forty minute span) with a simple agenda of setting their priorities and selecting a chair. That avoids needing a Chair and agenda setting and ensures the meetings are publicly noticed.

Member Castro likes this idea but has concern that action items at the meeting would need to be noticed ahead of time. Member Hunter noted that she will be out of town for much of August. Member Williams also noted that he is tied up the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month due to School Board Meetings.

Member Gulbransen suggested that at an August Meeting the entire Board come together and set the priorities and/or tonight the Board could select an interim Chair. She does feel public noticing the meeting is important to allow for the public to give input.

Member Gulbransen made a motion that the Board conduct a special meeting in August to set the priorities and the Chairs of the Committees. Member Hunter seconded the motion.

Member Castro raised the prior decision of the Board to invite the OPD Captains at the next meeting of the Board. Member Webb suggested that the Board ask the Captains to be at a special meeting in September. Member Castro asked for clarification from staff.

Joe DeVries noted that it is likely that the Captains will be in town on the first Wednesday of August since its one day after National Night Out. Based on that,

Member Gomez made a friendly amendment that the August meeting include just three items: Open Forum, Meeting with the Captains, and the priority setting for the committees. The friendly amendment was accepted and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson Johnson asked for a motion to extend the meeting to allow staff to make a presentation about the Robbery/Burglary Workshops. The motion was made and passed.

Joe DeVries explained his proposal (included in packet) and asked for the Board's support. He noted that these workshops have been conducted by the Neighborhood Services Division and Neighborhood Watch Steering Committee, and that Member Haller has been instrumental in creating the format of these workshops. He also went on to note that because there was a push to get the first of these scheduled, the first one is scheduled for July 20th in Area 3 which is his fault for getting out ahead on the planning of this first workshop without first approaching the Board.

Chairperson Johnson noted that while he likes the idea of supporting the workshops, he does not think they should replace the summit. Instead he feels the Board should conduct a summit, even if it takes on a different format which is less robust AND support the workshops. Joe DeVries noted that this could work, there just aren't the resources to fund a robust all day summit and the workshops.

Member Gulbransen shared the Chair's concerns about the summit but also did not see anything on the draft materials about the CPAB.

Member Castro agreed with Member Gulbransen and had three points: This should not replace the summit as the purpose of the workshops is to prevent robberies and burglaries, whereas the summit is about community policing, second he feels the timing is off in that the workshops are already being scheduled, the first on July 20th. He wants to see time carved out during these workshops for the CPAB to serve their role as liaisons to the community. Last, July 23rd is the last meeting of the Public Safety Committee and he would want to attend to talk about why the CPAB supports something like this.

Joe DeVries responded to the scheduling question that his Division Chair asked the four captains about what dates in September and October would work so the workshops could be locked in on the calendar.

Member Castro also made the point that the Neighborhood Watch Steering Committee meets on July 31st and he will discuss it with them and can report back to the Board on their sponsorship.

Member Gulbransen stated she was confused that the first workshop is taking place before the Board or Neighborhood Watch Steering Committee have voted on sponsoring the workshops so the process doesn't make sense. Chairperson Johnson also shares her concern and suggested maybe the Board should pass on sponsorship. Member Castro did not want to miss the opportunity to represent the CPAB at the workshops.

Member Gulbransen made a motion that the Board not sponsor the workshops but ask to have a spot on the agenda.

Member Castro seconded her motion.

Member Webb asked for clarification as to what sponsorship means.

Joe DeVries explained that sponsorship means helping with outreach, manning a table at the workshops, and speaking on the agenda. He again apologized that the first meeting was scheduled before the CPAB could discuss the issue. He further clarified that he added the Neighborhood Watch Steering Committee after Chairperson Johnson pointed out that resolution 79235 states the Neighborhood Watch Steering Committee is supposed to be involved in the Summit.

Member Williams stated he was a little upset that the City got out ahead of the Board, but sees the opportunity as one that should not be passed up.

Member Gulbransen amended her motion to actually sponsor the workshops and ask for time on the agenda.

Member Castro did not support this amendment. He suggested the Board place the item on the August meeting agenda for a brief discussion.

Member Gulbransen struck her friendly amendment noting that there needs to be a vote on her original amendment.

The amendment failed with Members Webb, Gomez, Williams, Johnson, Nichols, Gulbransen, Garvey, Hunter, and Whitaker voting No. Member Castro voted yes.

Member Garvey made a motion that the Board sponsor the events and seek ten minutes on the agenda.

Chairperson Johnson noted that he supports the workshops but feels that there should have been more time to discuss the item. He also noted that the staff concern about the budget was not created by the CPAB and is really a separate issue.

Member Castro stated he would support the motion but would also like a strongly worded letter to the City Administrator (and possibly the public Safety Committee) that if they want a strong community policing model with community input, that this type of situation cannot continue to happen in the future. The CPAB, as the conductor, needs to be in the driver's seat before the train leaves the station. Run things by the CPAB before decisions are made.

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:08pm.