



The Oakland Observer [@Oak_Observer](#)

Jun 03 · [53 tweets](#)

They are starting the second meeting. It's the Geologic Hazard Abatement District meeting. It's usually perfunctory, but usually not this perfunctory. No discussion...

FISCAL IMPACT:

The GHAD is funded 100% through assessments levied on properties within the GHAD, and is a separate legal entity from the City of Oakland, therefore the GHAD's operations have no fiscal impact on the City of Oakland General Fund. For Fiscal Year (FY) 2025/26, the GHAD anticipates \$0 in assessment revenue and \$150,000 in investment revenue. Expenses for FY 2025/26 are estimated at \$357,700. The current budget projects that, at the beginning of the FY 2025/26 (July 1, 2025), the cumulative reserve will be about \$4,887,240 and approximately \$4,679,540 at the end of the FY 2025/26 (June 30, 2026).

A Reserve Fund Study for the Leona Quarry GHAD was completed in May 2024. As part of annual budget preparation, an analysis of the reserve fund was performed and it has been determined that an adequate target reserve has been maintained. Therefore, the GHAD Manager recommends suspension of the assessment levy for FY 2025/26.

Clearly Jenkins' goal as Council President is to expedite meetings...in more well attended meetings, this may run into resistance.

Back to council meeting, that was the quickest GHAD I've ever seen, it was under 8 minutes.

No one pulled any items to non-consent. I thought someone might pull MACRO to non-consent both because of level of community interest & fact Chair of Public Safety Committee Wang originally scheduled it to non-consent. Jenkins reversed that at Rules, putting it on consent

Jenkins also reduced each public comment to one minute, he said "due to abundance of speakers". The clerk read in 13 speakers, not an unusually high number.

Jaseon Outlaw, former chair of ALCO Mental Health Board; he's suggesting that OPD put out the counseling contract going to Palmertree to bid, who's held the role for 20 years. Outlaw's org has 13 psychologists, compared to Palmertree's sole practice. There was no

bid.

Agency and the City Council

On Consent

S5.19 Subject: Michael Palmertree Professional Services Contract
From: Oakland Police Department
Recommendation: Adopt A Resolution (1) Authorizing The City Administrator To Enter Into A Professional Services Agreement With Michael Palmertree, Marriage Family Therapist, To Provide Behavioral Science Consultation And Training Services To The Oakland Police Department From July 1, 2025, To June 30, 2030, In An Amount Not To Exceed Six Hundred Eighty-Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$687,500); And (2) Waiving The Competitive Request For Proposal/Qualifications (RFP/Q) , And The Local/Small Local Business Enterprise Program Requirements
[25-0669](#)

Sponsors: Oakland Police Department

Attachments: [View Report](#)

[View Legislation](#)

[View Supplemental Document Presentation 5/23/2025](#)

Millie Cleveland objecting to MACRO report being shifted from non consent to consent. Cleveland complains about the scope of work of MACRO being changed from focus on East Oakland on view, to city wide--now most interactions happening downtown.

Cleveland also notes that MACRO has no money in budget for grant, and that Director Jones told PSC that they have to raise private money for third party evaluation.

Anne Jenks also complaining about MACRO's shift to consent: she says that consent calendar is only for non controversial items, items with "high level of public interest and controversy" should be on non consent

Another speaker expressing the same complaint on shift to consent. OO reported Jenkins' unusual move at the time. There does appear to have been some minor organizing on MACRO with assumption it would be on non consent x.com/Oak_Observer/s...



Another supporter of the view that MACRO should have been moved to non-consent to answer questions about evaluation, shift of scope, and budget.

Another mental health worker also asked about the Palmertree contract, a member of several Black mental clinician orgs. This is the first time there's been pushback, but it makes a lot of sense as the contract enters its second decade and Palmertree nears retirement.

Correction earlier, because Jenkins' comments were so vague. He now says he was reiterating rules of procedure, which is 1 min per Consent item. But he specified he was limiting speaking, not reiterating rules. Sounded as if he limited multi-item comments too,

but it wasn't case

Jenkins said that PSC chair could re-agendize the MACRO report. They are now discussing amending Palmertree contract from 5 year contract to 1 year, to allow to put the contract out to bid and onboard new provider if one is found

Unger says he wants to ensure that OPD and OPOA are comfortable with the contract limit, none are here: "I'm uncomfortable making changes to this life-saving contract...I would like to hear from OPD about how they feel about this..."

In committee, the main argument for keeping Palmertree was that after years of providing services, officers have level of comfort with Palmertree. Devries also says that OPD also put out the contract three times with no bidders...but the last time was many years ago

Ramachandran asked if the item could instead come back to council. Jenkins suggested removing the motion and continuing the item. Wang said that she has been told Palmertree is retiring soon, and it would behoove to have contracting process

Gallo confused about the item. The OPD mental health contract was not put out to bid, it is currently being done by the current bidder. Gallo's now insisting that the item was put out to bid, and the contractors "had their chance". He's completely mistaken.

Devries now clarifying the last RFP was in 2020. The previous RFP before that was over a decade before that, however.

Fife got in touch with Deputy Chief Ausmus, who is speaking on the item. She says that he's a first responder expert. She supports keeping Palmertree, and notes a psychologist would likely be triple the cost.

Ausmus also noted that Palmertree is likely to retire at some point within the contract lifeline, and that OPD is developing a "succession plan". Fife suggests that the Council keep track of that instead of putting out new RFP

Ausmus also doesn't support seeking a new provider now, due to relationship between Palmertree and OPD

Jenkins suggested 18 months instead. But she also doesn't support a "succession plan to

literally hand off a contract to another is unethical and inequitable"...she says there should be a robust RFP instead...

*Fife

To clarify Jenkins has made a motion to have an 18 month contract, that would go out to bid before the end of the contract. That appears to have satisfied everyone, with Fife's concerns.

Now there's back and forth about the MACRO item, Wang asked if she could move it to consent, but OCA noted that the time to change calendar passed without necessary motion to move to non consent. Others also said that comments had already been given, adding not much utility

The OCA also noted, interestingly, that consent also can have robust discussion of CMs.

The Palmertree amendment to 18 month contract was taken separately; Unger voted no, all the rest voted yes. The consent item was then approved unanimously. The public hearings on the agenda can't be heard until 5pm, so there's a recess until then.

Back from recess. There are two items with statutory public hearing requirements. Someone should look into the LLAD some day, but it likely won't be OO. I do wonder if newcomer CMs will have questions. My brief reporting from newsletter this week.

6.1 Subject: FY 2025-26 Landscaping And Lighting Assessment District (LLAD) - Confirmation
 From: Finance Department
 Recommendation: Conduct A Public Hearing And Upon Conclusion Adopt A Resolution Confirming The City Of Oakland Landscaping And Lighting Assessment District (LLAD) Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-26 Engineer's Report And The Levying Of Assessments [25-0731](#)

Sponsors: Finance Department

Attachments: [View Report](#)
 [View Appendix A](#)
 [View Legislation](#)
 [View Exhibit A](#)

Legislative History

FY2 25-26 Landscaping & Lighting Assessment District hearing and the new Master Fee Schedule which will adjust costs and fees to the public.

The LLAD established in 1989 by California law, will generate a projected total of about \$19 MM in assessed property taxes—but the report notes that statutorily, the LLAD assessments have not increased since 1993 and can no longer support the same level of expenditures in the various parks and lighting areas that it has in the past. Over the years, the LLAD has not been able to continue the level of service initially established without running a deficit.

The LLAD is an example of an assessment driven project that doesn't have a COLA escalator. It becomes a quagmire, because it needs a voter measure to be repealed and soon can't handle the expenses in its project scope---like the LLAD

That was extremely quick. Fife noted it "things like the LLAD become routine...unless there's something outstanding, it's pretty perfunctory"

Next public hearing on Master Fee schedule. This is the yearly list of public facing fees increases in every dept of city. There's no large increase in this, probably biggest thing is 300 approx dollar fee for late events applications.

6.2 Subject: Amending The FY 2024-25 Master Fee Schedule (MFS)
 From: Finance Department
 Recommendation: Conduct A Public Hearing And Upon Conclusion Adopt An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 13799 C.M.S. (Which Adopted The Fiscal Year 2024-25 Master Fee Schedule), As Amended, To Establish, Modify And Delete Fees And Penalties Assessed By The City Of Oakland For Fiscal Year 2025-26
[25-0708](#)

Sponsors: Finance Department

Attachments: [View Report](#)
[View Attachment A1 - A 11](#)
[View Legislation And Exhibits A1 - A12](#)
[View Supplemental Attachment A1 - A 11 - 5/22/2025](#)
[View Supplemental Report - 5/30/2025](#)
[View Supplemental Attachment A: A-1 - 5/30/2025](#)

ACTION ON THIS ITEM WILL RESULT IN INTRODUCTION (First Reading) OF THIS ORDINANCE.

*and decreases of fees, of course.

The bulk of fees based revenue

Service Charges Revenue

Fund - Department	FY25-26 Proposed Budget - Service Charges
3100 - Sewer Service Fund	76,636,102
DP300 - Oakland Public Works Department	76,634,911
DP350 - Department of Transportation	1,191
2415 - Development Service Fund	44,987,695
DP200 - Fire Department	6,609,357
DP300 - Oakland Public Works Department	2,009,355
DP350 - Department of Transportation	6,943,449
DP840 - Planning and Building Department	29,425,534
1010 - General Fund: General Purpose	38,798,173
DP1000 - Police Department	6,915,889
DP200 - Fire Department	11,503,583
DP350 - Department of Transportation	17,051,888
DP670 - Workplace and Employment Standards	1,694,000
DP750 - Human Services Department	219,680
DP850 - Economic and Workforce Development Department	1,413,133
1720 - Comprehensive Clean-up	24,088,132
DP300 - Oakland Public Works Department	23,988,132
DP350 - Department of Transportation	100,000
2413 - Rent Adjustment Program Fund	9,392,299
DP890 - Housing and Community Development Department	9,392,299
1750 - Multipurpose Reserve	7,003,288
DP350 - Department of Transportation	7,003,288
1820 - OPRCA Self Sustaining Revolving Fund	6,051,426
DP5000 - Oakland Parks and Recreation Department	6,051,426
1710 - Recycling Program	5,837,126
DP300 - Oakland Public Works Department	5,837,126



CITY OF
OAKLAND

I did go over all this from the committee in live reporting. Will note any new issues, or novel

information.

Departments With Changes

Animal Services
Police Department
Fire Department
Parks and Recreation and Youth Development
Human Services
Public Works
Economic Workforce Development
Housing and Community Development
Planning and Building
Transportation
Special Events
Workplace Employment Standards



I think Jenkins will have to find a sweet spot in his goal of speeding up the council meetings. This level feels abrupt, untransparent and rushed and applying a one size fits all approach to all items.

Speaker is praising the rent adjustment program.

The RAP fee would increase by about 36 dollars per year, from 101 to 137 tenants pay 50% of that.

speaker says that the RAP program helps landlords too, important because he has heard at these meetings that landlord are "so impoverished by having to provide housing that they can't afford to feed their families"

Wang's questions are a bit hard to follow because she's new to this process.

Wang had asked about event permits in Lake, but those are less permits, than rentals. Devries said that parks/rec no longer rents out certain areas because they are impossible to keep closed

Wang is asking about "high cost of permits for events at Lake". To be honest, this sounds like people trying to shut the park down again.

The whole convo about graffiti ended up being about the cost that would be applied to tagger if caught. So, it was wrong focus, but also illuminatingly naive.

Jenkins could definitely snip time off pontification, many hours to save there, unfortunately

PBD answers with the obvious question to the constant unserious comments made by those claiming no one works at City. Obviously, public facing employees work at site.

Editorializing here; this discourse is not intended to achieve results, its to pull the window of discussion to useless focus that generates popular anger because the public does not know whether its true or not.

Brown asking about an increase in PBD fees that's bringing in an additional 9 MM this year; wondering if its budgeted. It is. But PBD fees must go back into PBD related costs, and can't be put into GPF

FINDINGS

Reduced Dog license fees for a spayed or neutered dog: from \$17.03 to \$20.00 for a one-year license, \$31.80 to \$35.00 for a two-year license, and \$45.42 to \$50.00 for a three-year license.

Reduced Dog license for spayed or neutered dog belonging to senior citizen: from \$12.78 to \$15.00 for one year license, \$23.85 to \$28.00 for a two-year license and \$34.07 to \$40.00 for a three-year license.

Duplicate metal tags will now be free due to the vendor offering those for free annually.

Penalty for failure to renew dog license within 30 days of expired license: from \$15.75 to \$20.00

Potentially dangerous dog permit: from \$135.19 to \$177.00 due to the amount of time an ACO must spend on these cases.

To: Jestin D. Johnson, CAO
Subject: OAS 2025-2026 Master Fee Schedule
Date: April 17, 2025

Page 2

Vicious dog permit: from \$216.30 to \$284.00 due to the amount of time an ACO must spend on these cases.

Impound fees: from \$53.53 to \$58.00 per animal for the first impound/redemption. The penalty for second impound (within 12 Rolling Months) is \$100 raising the total redemption cost to \$158.00 for the second impound within 12 months, and \$200 for the third impoundment (within 12 Rolling Months) raising the total cost to redeem to \$258.00.

Inspections: Penalty for 2nd Inspection for PDD/VD Dog Permit: from \$66.15 to \$71.00 and At-Large Dog Inspections from \$68.13 to \$71.00.

Labor fees for an Animal Control Officer: from \$64.05 to \$71.00.

Here's the reporting from the committee presentation oakland-observer.ghost.io/content/file/...

Very little engagement there.

A big downside of strategy they are following now: muted discussion of items w/argument

they were discussed in committee; but majority of committees are held during day when public can't attend. Then when they can, there's no discussion with excuse, they've already been discussed

But its worse if they are going to also rush through things that haven't actually been heard at committee.

That's it for my reporting tonight.

Source: https://x.com/Oak_Observer/status/1930067933172248802

Thread: <https://twitter-thread.com/t/1930067933172248802>