



The Oakland Observer [@Oak_Observer](#)

Jun 03 · [60 tweets](#)

Starting this Special City Council meeting. There's two meetings today, first has the non consent items, the second starting at 3:30pm, has consent, and two public hearings [the city wide staffing report is on the 3:30 pm meeting as a public hearing, but it isn't]

Jenkins lately is keeping strict timing, also says "expectation is also that CMs have read the agenda packets [uh oh, Gallo]

We're on to the OPD staffing prospectus, which got a lot of media when it was leaked. Not sure public in general realized it was agendized today, nor at 12 pm like this.

Intro comments, PFM is giving the report: study based on "observed conditions at the time, 2022 for calls for service, policing; 2023 for investigations"

OPD investigators recorded time on tasks for distinct areas of work...not all areas were completed, this hampered analysis, which necessitated PFM to make assumptions.

Based on the analysis "199 additional sworn officers would be necessary to meet that workload from two years ago...crucial to point out that this includes necessary increases in supervision" for best oversight

"this serves as a jumping off point, next logical steps for Oakland...is to assess what comes next for OPD" report is very insistent that the analysis should exist to inform how to staff OPD, and presumably, what to civilianize or relieve OPD of

The report reveals in one sense, that OPD has poor time use recordation, especially for investigations. PFM had to use assumptions.

A speaker notes the question of recruiting is not one of how many OPD should have, but how many it can have with decreasing recruitment "every year there's a contest about who can schedule the most academies, to get elected"

Full disclosure, the speaker quoted Oakland Observer's reporting on historic academy production oakland-observer.ghost.io/10-years-of-op...

Gallo went through a lot of usetobees

Gallo's comments end with no observations on the report, no insights into current public safety staffing, and no policy recommendations

Unger: what can you tell us about the number of officers on street, vs doing admin tasks...do we have a relatively large number on desks vs streets, compared to other cities.

PFM: Comparison to other jurisdiction can be tricky...different jurisdictions have different priorities, use officers in different ways...we can compare function, but not number...

PFM: Did see impact on sgt staffing level, given requirements with NSA, use of force reporting, competing with time on streets supervisory

Wang: "were there specific units where there was a lack of staffing..."

PFM: "we are only learning recently what investigators are really doing on task...based on what we do know, they're short"

PFM: "our assessment is based on what they told us, based on a tool that we gave them to record...because they didn't have that"

Several mentions of the fact that the OPD does not evaluate its own time usage and efficiency. Surprised this isn't a bigger focus right now.

PFM on issue of efficiency/alts: moving to private vendors for traffic ax without injuries...false alarm reduction fee is not being enforced...co-responder model for mental health needs...all these would have 84 officers move part of their day moved with alternative responses

Brown asked about MACRO's ability to reduce police time needs. PFM: "I don't think I've seen a perfect model anywhere...opportunity to improve...in study, it was generally working, and something that could be alternative...another tool in the tool kit"

Brown asks about supervisors...

PFM: "no matter what the community, active, effective and close supervision of detectives improves clearance rates"

It's interesting how much attention was paid to the idea of necessary number of officers, but much of the report is about how OPD structures its work, bottlenecks, alternatives

Fife asked if there's an expansion of report necessary, given the focus. "I'm not sure how well people understand that people are not going into this type of service...not military service, civil service, police depts, across the board"

Fife: "If we don't have people going into academies, is there any observations about how to do public safety"

PFM: police think tanks say we're seeing that the important part is retention, not just recruiting...seeing some movement towards being able to hire more people...recruiting gets better when there is a lot of retention, word of mouth.

Fife asked if there was anything in financial incentives [like APD], PFM says that's incentivizer but once you get them, are you keeping them...big cities lose officers to surrounding cities anyway...[interesting insight into an idea that keeps coming up in Oakland]

PFM noted that in addition to staffing levels, one of the issues driving high overtime is not enough supervisory control over approving OT [especially relevant comment given shift extension questions]

Fife: "I'm advocating for civilianization...move civilians to do more IT work, or some of the admin work, so we don't have to worry about paying for another academy, we take officers that we have...we've been informed that there's as many as 38, that could move to patrol"

PFM: civilian staff tends to be removed quicker during budget crisis, then OPD are doing their jobs [interesting vicious cycle, you definitely see it in Oakland]

A civilian OPD worker told this publication that one element driving that dynamic is that OPD can't be laid off. You lay off the civilian workers to save the money there, because there will always be OPD to do the work, their staff can't be reduced, the differences not visible

Houston is asking several questions that are answered in the report if we're being honest about costs and scope of work. Unfortunate claims about the OIG's ability to do the work

that aren't valid.

With report received, on to Measure A sales tax legislation. It basically is paper work, authorizing agreement w/California Dept of Tax and Fee Admin that handles tax collection; ongoing fees of 1.16 cents per \$, one time cost of \$175K

On Non Consent (12:00 P.M.)

Council

- 6** **Subject:** Resolution To Execute Agreements For Implementation Of Measure A Transaction And Use Tax
 From: Finance Department
 Recommendation: Adopt A Resolution Authorizing The City Administrator To Execute Agreements With The California Department Of Tax And Fee Administration For Implementation Of The Local City Of Oakland Transactions And Use Tax
 [25-0744](#)

 Sponsors: Finance Department
 Attachments: [View Report](#)
 [View Legislation And Exhibits A And B](#)

The Measure A collection paperwork passed unanimously

On to the COLA increase for parcel tax based levies, it's periodic to keep up with inflation and was written into the ballot measures

On to the 5 year forecast, Bradley Johnson: "the forecast shows an ongoing and growing deficit...all revenues will grow, but not equal to expenditures, calpers premiums...over the course of 5 years..."

Long term fiscal road map approach, the 5 yr forecast doesn't include all issues, deferred maintenance, federal govt risks, vehicle replacement, new MOUs

The headline, basically Finance says its cut the deficit projected at the beginning of the FY by half, to about 57MM. With further balancing for the rest of the year, Roseman predicting the final deficit will be around 300K. [we'll see]

Roseman notes that the volume of sales generating RETT has increased, but not the amount, because the growth is in residential sales, but not larger commercial sales.

Most departments are under their budget...but it's cancelled out and then some by OPD

and OFD.

Fife thanks Mitchell for being able to bring down overtime costs, but she says there's still no plan to do that on a regular basis

With those reports out of the way, the real main event today is going to be the Campaign Reform Act: increases to campaign funding and limited public financing will likely be uncontroversial, but details on how to handle Democracy Dollars funding, office holder acct increase not

On Non Consent (12:00 P.M.)

- 10** **Subject:** Campaign Reform Act: Temporary Increase In Contribution Limits
 From: Council President Jenkins And Councilmembers Ramachandran And Houston
 Recommendation: Adopt An Ordinance Amending The Oakland Campaign Reform Act (Oakland Municipal Code Title 3, Municipal Elections, Article III, Chapter 3.12), To Add Section 3.12.045 To Temporarily Increase Contribution Limits For Candidates And To Amend Section 3.12.150 To Increase Officeholder Fund Limits And Amending The Limited Public Financing Act Of 2024 (Oakland Municipal Code Title 3, Municipal Elections, Article III, Chapter 3.13), To Amend Sections 3.13.060 And 3.13.265 To Extend The Limited Public Financing Act To Apply To 2026 And 2028 General Elections
 [25-0579](#)

Sponsors: Ramachandran, Houston and Jenkins

Attachments: [View Memo](#)

[View Legislation](#)

[View Supplemental Memo - 5/15/2025](#)

[View Supplemental Legislation - 5/15/2025](#)

[View Supplemental Report - PEC Charter 603\(h\) Comment to Council - 5/29/20](#)

[View Supplemental Legislation - 5/29/2025](#)

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

Francis Upton of the PEC is giving their recs, they have a statutory requirement to review and recommend.



PEC has a rec letter in the package. oakland.legistar.com/gateway.aspx?m...

Neutral on the campaign contribution limits increase, prefer July rather than immediate actual; revisit in 2026; no on officeholder, due to perceptions of corruption, behested payments can do the work

1. **Campaign contribution limits increase – *Neutral*.** Should the council advance this proposal, the Commission strongly recommends: a) that implementation begin on July 1, 2025 and b) that the increased limits sunset on December 31, 2026.
2. **Officeholder account contribution limit increase – *Oppose*.** The PEC requests additional data and safeguards before reconsidering.
3. **LPF reauthorization – *Support reauthorization but with a different duration*.** The PEC supports reauthorizing the LPF until Democracy Dollars is funded and able to be implemented.

Supports Limited Public Financing, if its linked to Democracy Dollars. The legislation has an end date, and it could end before DD is put into place.

Houston is advocating for the office holder account increase, he's been advocating for this even before the legislation was introduced this time around.

Fife says some legislation makes sense, and it maybe should be separated. Fife says she probably spent 20k out of pocket over last few years...Fife says she's not very supportive of either increase. Fife says it would benefit candidates now, but not others [her for example]

Fife also says that wealthy financiers have told her that they plan to buy Oakland through IEs in "perpetuity", so she isn't convinced that the increased office holder campaign limit actually helps much

Jenkins is moving pretty fast "coming back and doing clean up language after this" to prevent Wang's idea of preventing office holder accounts from being used for mailers to be done on the floor. He's basically promising to bring a new item with changes. odd.

Without allowing amendments on the floor, Jenkins is forcing the hands of those that don't feel comfortable with all of it, making it more likely to fail.

Brown says she agrees with Fife's concern about the time limit on campaign finance limit...some back and forth about why it's being done, concerns from PEC about it lasting too long. JR saying that hopefully by sunset, DD will be operative

Brown asking if the office holder account can be transferred into a campaign committee...PEC director says that it's a one way move from campaign account to office holder account, which most candidates do once elected. They don't go back

Questions interrupted Jenkins race to get the vote going. Fife: "I want us to be honest about DD, it's very expensive..." she says its not going to happen in budget climate, we won't have the money, not even on a limited basis...won't have equity reach.

Fife: "I'm not comfortable moving it forward with amendments that come after legislation passed..."

Fife says she would want the sunset date to be removed by amendment; Fife said she supports Wang's amendment that would ban office holder accounts from being spent on mailers three months before an election.

OCA says Wang's restrictions would be okay as amendment on the floor, but amendment to remove sunset date would expand the legislation, that would re-trigger the PEC's requirement to review and recommend.

JR says that she wouldn't support the removal of sunset date, because DD isn't rescinded and it would give the impression it will never happen. She also says that it can be extended again before sunset by new council vote

Fife trying to understand what Jenkins is suggesting. Apparently Jenkins is saying he will re-introduce the legislation [that can be done before the second reading, which would make it the first reading again] Gallo voted no, 7 ayes passed. It feels a bit odd, and not typical

Any item that requires two readings can be pulled again to alter it, then it goes back for a first reading again. usually it's not planned to happen that way tho. A first reading is treated as the one shot to pass legislation usually.

That's it for this meeting. There's another at 3:30pm as noted. There will be a new thread for that

Source: https://x.com/Oak_Observer/status/1930007692317470904

Thread: <https://twitter-thread.com/t/1930007692317470904>