

# CITY OF OAKLAND

## BUDGET ADVISORY COMMISSION

Notice is hereby given that a special meeting of the City of Oakland Budget Advisory Commission (BAC) is scheduled for **Wednesday, August 13, 2025, at 6:00 PM.**

The Budget Advisory Commission will be held in The Meeting Room at the 81<sup>st</sup> Avenue Branch Library, located at 1021 81st Ave, Oakland, CA 94621.

Members of the Public have the following options to observe the meeting:

1. Watch the meeting on KTOP using Granicus.
2. Use the Zoom link attached to this agenda to remotely observe the meeting.

### **Commission Members:**

Mandela Bliss, Larisa Casillas, Mike Forbes, Ben Gould, Margaret Grimsley, Mike Petouhoff, Jane Yang, Stephisha Ycoy-Walton

### **City's Representative(s):**

Nathan Bassett & Walter Silva – *Finance Department*

### **Meeting Agenda:**

1. Administrative Matters [5 minutes]
  - Welcome and attendance rollcall
2. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes [5 minutes]
  - Approval of Meeting Minutes for the April 9, 2025; May 14, 2025; June 11, 2025; and July 9, 2025 meetings
3. Commissioner's Protocol [5 minutes]
  - Review of appointments, applications and inquiries for the Budget Advisory Commission
4. Finance Department Updates [5 minutes]
5. Community Engagement Ad Hoc: Community Input on the Budget Process [60 minutes]
6. Open Forum [10 minutes]
7. Adjournment

**CITY OF OAKLAND  
BUDGET ADVISORY COMMISSION**

Attachments: BAC 2025-04-09 Minutes; BAC 2025-05-14 Minutes; BAC 2025-06-11 Minutes;  
BAC 2025-07-09 Minutes; 25-27 Budget Process Recommendations; 25-27 Budget Process  
Recommendations - Spanish

You are invited to a Zoom webinar!  
When: Aug 13, 2025 06:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)  
Every month on the Second Wed,  
Topic: Meeting of the City of Oakland Budget Advisory Commission (BAC)

Join from PC, Mac, iPad, or Android:  
<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/82745108829>

Phone one-tap:  
+16699006833,,82745108829# US (San Jose)  
+16694449171,,82745108829# US

Join via audio:  
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)  
+1 669 444 9171 US  
+1 719 359 4580 US  
+1 253 205 0468 US  
+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)  
+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)  
+1 309 205 3325 US  
+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)  
+1 360 209 5623 US  
+1 386 347 5053 US  
+1 507 473 4847 US  
+1 564 217 2000 US  
+1 646 931 3860 US  
+1 689 278 1000 US  
+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)  
+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)  
+1 305 224 1968 US  
Webinar ID: 827 4510 8829  
International numbers available: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/82745108829>

# CITY OF OAKLAND

## BUDGET ADVISORY COMMISSION

Meeting of the City of Oakland Budget Advisory Commission (BAC) held  
Wednesday, April 9, 2025, at 6:00 PM.

The Budget Advisory Commission meeting was held in Hearing Room 2 in City Hall.

### Commission Members:

Mandela Bliss, Larisa Casillas, Mike Forbes, Ben Gould, Margaret Grimsley, Mike Petouhoff,  
Jane Yang, Stephisha Ycoy-Walton

### City's Representative(s):

Nathan Bassett – Finance Department  
Walter Silva – Finance Department

---

## Meeting Minutes:

### 1. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- **Present:** Commissioners Bliss, Casillas, Gould, Grimsley, Petouhoff, Ycoy-Walton and City of Oakland staff member Bassett
- **Absent:** Commissioners Forbes, Yang
- Roll call was conducted with six out of eight current commissioners present, establishing a quorum
- Meeting called to order by Acting Chair Casillas at approximately 6:03 PM

### 2. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

Meeting minutes for March 12, 2025 were reviewed. Commissioner Petouhoff requested several amendments to ensure complete and accurate recording of recommendations.

Commissioner Gould made a motion to accept the minutes with the changes proposed by Commissioner Petouhoff. Commissioner Ycoy-Walton seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

### 3. COMMISSIONERS' PROTOCOL

Staff reported that the member of the Mayor's Office responsible for appointments was released as of Monday. No new appointments are expected until after the mayoral election is resolved.

### 4. AD HOC COMMITTEE UPDATES / PRESENTATIONS

#### Public Safety & Economic Development (30 minutes)

Commissioner Petouhoff presented updates on:

**Revenue Enhancement Meeting:** City Council will hold a dedicated meeting on April 14th focused on revenue enhancement.

**Illegal Dumping and Blight:** Only 11% of dumping citations are collected, and over 50% of appeals are granted. Recommended enhanced enforcement as both revenue enhancement and crime prevention.

**Trench Repair Standards:** Recommended city adopt standards similar to Fremont and other cities requiring financial deposits for public right-of-way work.

**Pension Obligations:** Potential refinancing opportunities identified, though credit rating concerns noted. Possible \$20-40 million in savings conceivable if feasible.

**Measure W Homelessness Funding:** Recommended allocation by homeless population rather than general population to secure Oakland's fair share of over \$500 million available.

**Return on Investment Calculations:** Presented ROI analysis for various homeless intervention programs:

- Family reunion programs: Over 1,000% ROI
- Guaranteed minimum income: 178% ROI
- Tiny home villages: 116% ROI

**MACRO Program Funding:** Suggested potential county funding through Measure W given MACRO's role in assisting unhoused populations.

#### Safety Ambassadors Presentation

Daniel Swafford, Executive Director of three Oakland Business Improvement Districts (Laurel, Montclair, Temescal), presented on Public Safety Ambassador programs:

**Program Results:** Six-week pilot program showed 40% reduction in all incidents across the board compared to prior six weeks, post-program period, and neighboring commercial district.

**Cost Structure:**

- Comprehensive coverage (18-20 hours daily): \$25,000/month
- Current scaled program (12 hours daily, 5 days/week): \$15,000/month

**Services Provided:** Overnight vehicle patrol, daytime walking patrol, merchant engagement, 24/7 response service with 15-minute response time.

**Coordination:** Established relationships with OPD captains and community resource officers, with clear escalation protocols.

### **Community Engagement (10 minutes)**

Commissioner Grimsley reported the ad hoc will meet with Andrew from Tribe regarding the 12th Street homelessness encampment proposal. Full presentation planned for the next meeting.

### **Ad Hocs to Stand Up (5 minutes)**

**Budget Ad Hoc Committee:** Commissioners Petouhoff, Forbes, Gould, and Bliss volunteered for the Mayor's Proposed Budget response committee.

**Budget Process Report Ad Hoc:** Commissioner Casillas lead, with commissioners assigned to attend district town halls for process evaluation.

**Community Meeting Location:** Acting Chair Casillas proposed moving one commission meeting to 81st Avenue Library community room to increase community engagement.

## **5. FINANCE DEPARTMENT UPDATES (30 minutes)**

Nathan Bassett presented the FY 2024-25 Q2 Revenue & Expenses Report:

**General Purpose Fund Status:** Estimated available fund balance at year-end projected at negative \$89.17 million, improved from negative \$120.71 million in Q1 through various balancing actions.

### **Revenue Performance:**

- Real estate transfer tax: Still underperforming despite some improvement in high-value transactions
- Transient occupancy tax: Down almost 20% due to hotel industry distress
- Sales tax: Down 6% average, with autos/transportation down 14% and fuel/service stations down 16%
- Business license tax: 3.2% of businesses that filed in 2024 have closed, including impact from Kaiser Permanente headquarters relocation

**Expenditure Challenges:** Multiple departments showing over-budget projections, including Fire Department at \$197.2 million against \$166 million adjusted budget, and Police Department projected 12% over budget primarily due to overtime.

### **Balancing Actions Taken:**

- Position elimination reduced from 91.96 to 42 FTEs
- Equipment Services Fund balance transfer of \$8.3 million
- Various restricted fund transfers totaling approximately \$35 million in deficit reduction

## **6. CITY COUNCIL UPDATES (10 minutes)**

**Commissioner Meetings:** Commissioner Ycoy-Walton reported outreach to District 7 with meeting scheduled for following week. Commissioner Petouhoff noted discussions with Council Member Ramachandran (Finance Committee Chair) on pension liability review and potential citywide safety ambassador program.

**Budget Survey Results:** Distributed to all council members as follow-up to commission's community engagement work.

**Business Survey Proposal:** Discussion of potential business district survey to inform April 14th economic development council meeting.

## **7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

- Business survey development and implementation
- Sales tax measure spending oversight (pending election results)
- Joint meeting with Parks Recreation Advisory Commission on parks maintenance budget recommendations
- Community meeting at 81st Avenue Library (June meeting proposed)

## **8. OPEN FORUM**

Survey materials from unhoused residents provided by Commissioner Ycoy-Walton.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:02 PM.

---

*These minutes were drafted using a large language model based on a transcript of the meeting recording. They were reviewed and edited by a human for accuracy.*

# CITY OF OAKLAND

## BUDGET ADVISORY COMMISSION

Meeting of the City of Oakland Budget Advisory Commission (BAC) held  
Wednesday, May 14, 2025, at 6:00 PM.

The Budget Advisory Commission meeting was held in Hearing Room 2 in City Hall.

### **Commission Members:**

Mandela Bliss, Larisa Casillas, Mike Forbes, Ben Gould, Margaret Grimsley, Mike Petouhoff, Jane Yang, Stephisha Ycoy-Walton

### **City's Representative(s):**

Nathan Bassett – Finance Department  
Walter Silva - Finance Department

### **Meeting Minutes:**

#### **1. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

- Present: Commissioners Bliss, Forbes, Gould, Petouhoff, Yang, Ycoy-Walton
- Absent: Commissioner Grimsley
- Arrived late: Commissioner Casillas
- Roll call was conducted with six out of eight current commissioners present, establishing a quorum.
- Meeting called to order by Chair Yang at approximately 6:00 PM
- Introduction of incoming Budget Advisory Commissioner Karen Roy from District 4, who will officially following council confirmation. Ms. Roy brings experience as Director of Child Support for San Francisco and background in budget analysis and auditing.

#### **2. CITY OF OAKLAND 2025-2028 STRATEGIC PLAN OVERVIEW**

Staff member Bassett provided an overview of the City's new strategic plan led by Deputy City Administrator Monica Davis and passed by City Council on April 14th. The plan focuses on fiscal recovery while ensuring core services meet community needs. Key findings from internal engagement included:

- Need for standardization in policies and citywide operations
- Importance of strategic cross-departmental collaboration
- Communication gaps between City Council and directors
- Staffing challenges including understaffing and inefficiencies
- Need for budget alignment between department priorities and citywide goals

The plan establishes five three-year strategic priorities: streamline operations, foster cross-department collaboration, enhance communication and coordination, optimize workforce management, and align budget with citywide priorities. Implementation teams have been formed with six-month progress reports to Council planned.

Commissioner Forbes inquired about performance management framework metrics, learning they will be included in the adopted budget but not the proposed budget, meaning Council won't see metrics until after budget adoption.

### **3. MAYOR'S COMMISSION ON AGING PRESENTATION**

Commissioner Lenore Gunst from the Mayor's Commission on Aging presented on senior services priorities. Oakland serves over 5,000 seniors through three city-run senior centers, providing congregate meals, home-delivered groceries, and homebound meal services. Key challenges include late or missed payments to nonprofit partners and the need for permanent funding sources.

By 2040, 20% of California's population will be over 65. Oakland's senior services include meals, case management, transportation assistance, and housing referrals. The Commission is conducting a strategic planning process with 17 listening sessions across all districts.

Priority requests include preserving senior center operations (currently four days per week, 9 AM to 1 PM), protecting contracted services for AAPI and Hispanic communities, maintaining food and nutrition programs, and unfreezing the Human Services director position.

Commissioner Forbes requested to speak with nonprofits to understand payment delay issues. Commissioner Ycoy-Walton suggested partnerships with community organizations and exploring student translators for language access.

### **4. BAC RESTRICTED FUNDS ANALYSIS**

Vice Chair Forbes presented an analysis of the City's restricted funds, which comprise about 60% of total city spending across at least 129 funds. Key findings showed declining fund balances across 93 of 129 funds, with measures declining by approximately \$200 million this year.

Major concerns include:

- Revenue shortfalls in several measure funds (HH, BB, F, Parks)
- Use of measure funds for expenses not originally intended by voters
- Depletion of quasi-reserve funds like self-insurance liability fund
- Shifting of General Purpose Fund expenses to restricted funds

Forbes noted that as GPF reserves declined from \$120 million in 2022 to under \$20 million, the city increasingly relied on restricted fund balances. This creates a secondary layer of budget issues beyond the GPF deficit that will need addressing.



Staff clarified that some fund declines represent normal project spending of carry-forward balances, while others reflect genuine revenue/expense imbalances.

## **5. BAC RESPONSE TO MAYOR'S PROPOSED FY 2025-27 BUDGET**

The Ad Hoc Committee (Commissioners Petouhoff, Forbes, and Gould) presented their draft recommendations report prepared in just 72 hours after budget release. Key findings included:

### **Positive observations:**

- Balanced budget minimizing layoffs and preserving core services
- Generally follows Consolidated Fiscal Policy
- Provides funding for 738 sworn officers (though staff noted an errata was issued correcting this to 678)

### **Areas of concern:**

- Budget assumes \$40 million annual parcel tax approval by voters
- \$20 million increase in property tax revenue appears optimistic
- Non-compliance with several voter-approved measures (Library measures C&D, City Auditor staffing, Democracy Dollars)
- \$60 million in contracts with no descriptions, primarily in human services
- All 12 mayor's staff positions elevated to Special Assistant III level (\$150K-\$250K range)

### **Recommendations included:**

- Budget cautiously with contingency plans for revenue shortfalls
- Comply with voter-approved measures by reallocating funding sources
- Require descriptions for all proposed contracts before approval
- Review staffing classifications and levels across departments
- Develop five-year forecast and strategic plan
- Address police overtime audit recommendations
- Explore pension cost reduction strategies
- Coordinate better with county services

Commissioner Bliss questioned the selection of specific measures for compliance focus. Commissioner Casillas raised concerns about comparing Oakland to other cities without considering unique circumstances. Commissioner Ycoy-Walton concurred with the need for a contingency plan in case the \$40 million parcel tax is not passed. Commissioner Yang recommended citing alignment with the strategic plan and better framing trade-offs in funding source shifts.

**Motion:** Chair Yang made a motion for the Budget Advisory Commission to grant the ad hoc committee authority to finalize the report, incorporating commissioner feedback, and submit it to

City Council by the June 1 deadline, including conversion to slide format. Commissioner Ycoy-Walton seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Motion passed with seven commissioners voting in favor and one absent (Commissioner Grimsley).

## **6. OPEN FORUM**

Karen Roy commented on the potential for reviewing departmental encumbrances to release unneeded funds back to the general fund, and suggested considering civilianization of certain sworn officer duties for cost effectiveness.

Staff noted that the Finance Director has submitted resignation effective June 15th.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:10 PM.

*These minutes were drafted using a large language model using a transcript of the meeting recording. They were reviewed and edited by a human for accuracy.*

# CITY OF OAKLAND

## BUDGET ADVISORY COMMISSION

**Meeting of the City of Oakland Budget Advisory Commission (BAC) held  
Wednesday, June 11, 2025, at 6:00 PM.**

The Budget Advisory Commission meeting was held in Hearing Room 2 in City Hall.

### **Commission Members:**

Mandela Bliss, Larisa Casillas, Mike Forbes, Ben Gould, Margaret Grimsley, Mike Petouhoff, Jane Yang, Stephisha Ycoy-Walton

### **City's Representative(s):**

Nathan Bassett – Finance Department  
Walter Silva – Finance Department

---

## **Meeting Minutes:**

### **1. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

- Present: Commissioners Bliss, Forbes, Gould, Grimsley, Petouhoff, Yang, Ycoy-Walton
- Absent: Commissioner Casillas
- Late Arrival: Commissioner Petouhoff arrived late due to Sacramento travel
- Roll call was conducted with six out of eight current commissioners present, establishing a quorum
- Meeting called to order by Chair Yang at approximately 6:02 PM

### **2. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES**

Meeting minutes for April 9, 2025 and May 14, 2025 meetings were deferred to the July 9, 2025 meeting.

### **3. COMMISSIONERS' PROTOCOL**

Staff reported three applications currently with the mayor's office for appointment:

- Two related to the Finance and Management Committee

- One from District Two for Commissioner Grimsley's seat (currently serving on holdover status)
- Five vacant seats total: District 3, District 6, District 7, and two mayoral seats
- Mayor's office has indicated they will prioritize appointments to this commission

#### **4. FY25-27 BUDGET RECOMMENDATION AD HOC DEBRIEF**

Commissioner Petouhoff provided a comprehensive debrief on the Budget Advisory Commission's presentation to City Council:

- Praised the mayor's cover letter for its forthright articulation of budget challenges, including discussion of deficit sources, one-time funds, Coliseum sale, and COVID spending increases
- All council members provided feedback during Q&A session
- Council members described BAC recommendations as "insightful and helpful"
- Several BAC recommendations were incorporated into council amendments
- City staff extended invitation for BAC to participate in the roadmap to fiscal health initiative
- Commissioner Forbes noted the need to verify if voter-approved measures were fully funded
- Commissioner Gould emphasized the significant improvement in budget process compared to previous years

#### **5. BUDGET PROCESS RECOMMENDATIONS AD HOC**

Chair Yang announced formation of new ad hoc to provide mandated report to City Council on budget development process:

- **Members:** Commissioners Ycoy-Walton, Petouhoff, Gould, and Casillas
- **Deadline:** September 30th
- Ad hoc authorized to self-organize and request agenda time as needed

#### **6. HOUSING & HOMELESSNESS AD HOC DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Grimsley presented a draft proposal for transitional, co-governed unhoused community:

- Partnership with Wood Street Commons and Homeless Advocacy Working Group
- Proposal for self-governed community on publicly owned land funded by Measure W
- Would include tent platforms, RV parking, shared facilities, and supportive services
- Cost-effective alternative to encampment sweeps and traditional shelters

**Public Comments:**

- Armando (Wood Street Commons): Supported redirecting sweep funding toward proposed solution
- Monique French (formerly unhoused, Wood Street Commons member): Emphasized lived experience perspective and scalability potential

#### **Commissioner responses:**

- Commissioner Bliss expressed interest in joining the ad hoc to focus on cost-benefit analysis
- Commissioner Forbes noted preference for this type of transitional housing and flagged potential startup cost considerations
- Chair Yang emphasized need for clear articulation of why this proposal is in scope for the BAC and coordination with existing Housing Commission on Homelessness
- Commissioner Gould noted existence of Commission on Homelessness and importance of coordination
- Commissioner Ycoy-Walton confirmed commitment to continue the work with additional ad hoc support

## **7. BUDGET ADVISORY COMMISSION 2025 STRATEGY MID-YEAR CHECK-IN**

Chair Yang led reflection on commission's 2025 strategy progress:

#### **Areas of Success:**

- Becoming trusted, respected voice
- Building strong team relationships and filling vacancies
- Enhanced working relationships with city council and staff
- Providing concrete, evidence-based recommendations

#### **Areas for Growth:**

- Commissioner Petouhoff suggested pension liability and non-city contracts as potential ad hoc topics
- Commissioner Forbes emphasized learning from other cities' practices
- Commissioner Bliss highlighted continued need for diverse perspectives
- Commissioner Grimsley expressed regret about limited progress on police spending accountability

**Pulse Check:** Commissioners rated strategy alignment at 4-5 on 5-point scale

## **8. GUIDELINES FOR MEDIA REQUESTS**

Commissioner Forbes outlined guidelines for handling media inquiries:

- Individuals cannot speak for the entire BAC
- Commissioners should contact leadership team when receiving media requests

- Responses should reference previously approved BAC positions rather than personal opinions
- Staff offered to coordinate communications training if desired

## **9. OPEN FORUM**

- Commissioner Grimsley noted police audit completion (300 pages) and availability for review
- Staff announced interim finance director appointment: Jan Mazyck (former Oakland employee, Santa Rosa CFO, Treasury Department experience)
- Staff reported letter from Friends of Oakland Public Library regarding Measure C and D maintenance of effort requirements
- Dr. Jennifer Tran, potential District Two appointee, was acknowledged in attendance

## **10. ADJOURNMENT**

**Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:06 PM**

*These minutes were drafted using a large language model based on a transcript of the meeting recording. They were reviewed and edited by a human for accuracy.*

# **CITY OF OAKLAND**

## **BUDGET ADVISORY COMMISSION**

**Meeting of the City of Oakland Budget Advisory Commission (BAC) held  
Wednesday, July 9, 2025, at 6:00 PM.**

**The Budget Advisory Commission meeting was held in Hearing Room 2 in City Hall.**

### **Commission Members:**

Mandela Bliss, Larisa Casillas, Mike Forbes, Ben Gould, Margaret Grimsley, Mike Petouhoff, Jane Yang, Stephisha Ycoy-Walton

### **City's Representative(s):**

Nathan Bassett – Finance Department  
Walter Silva – Finance Department

### **Meeting Minutes:**

#### **1. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

- Present: Commissioners Bliss, Casillas, Gould, Petouhoff, Yang, Ycoy-Walton
- Absent: Commissioner Forbes
- Arrived late: Commissioner Grimsley
- Roll call was conducted by staff member Nathan Bassett with six out of eight commissioners present, establishing a quorum.
- Meeting called to order by Chair Yang at approximately 6:00 PM

#### **2. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES**

Meeting minutes for April, May, and June meetings were deferred to the August 13, 2025 meeting.

#### **3. COMMISSIONERS' PROTOCOL**

Staff provided updates on commission appointments:

- Finance and Management Committee has put forward two nominations: Karen Roy (who previously attended a meeting) and another candidate

- Potentially three appointments total, with one replacement for Commissioner Grimsley
- This would bring commission membership to ten
- Districts 3, 6, and 7 currently lack representation
- 22 applications currently on file with the Mayor's Office
- Staff member Bert Jones (who handled applications) left on June 27th, duty transitioning to new staff member

#### **4. BAC STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS & ALIGNMENT OF ACTIVITIES**

Chair Yang led discussion on aligning commission activities with statutory mandates outlined in Ordinance 13337:

- Primary duties: Report to Finance and Management Committee on fiscal health topics, encourage public participation, improve transparency and accountability
- Membership requirement: Must be residents of the City of Oakland
- Discussion of Consolidated Fiscal Policy mandates including survey review and budget process feedback
- Commissioners discussed need to ensure ad hoc work connects to fiscal health mandate

Key discussion points:

- Survey process improvements for increased participation
- Early engagement with City Administrator's office for next survey cycle
- Current survey is not funded in FY25-26 budget
- Finance and Management Committee discussed roadmap to fiscal recovery
- Mayor's 100-day plan includes charter modernization task force

#### **5. CONSOLIDATED FISCAL POLICY (CFP) PROPOSAL**

Commissioner Gould presented draft proposal to amend CFP regarding Real Estate Transfer Tax (RETT):

- Proposal: Change limit from 15% of general purpose funds to \$70 million adjusted for inflation
- Rationale: Current percentage-based limit allows structural over-reliance on cyclical revenue
- Analysis showed RETT ranges from 6% (recession) to 13-14% (good years) of general fund
- \$70 million represents baseline above current FY25-26 budget of \$68 million
- Excess funds would support one-time expenses, reserve building, and debt reduction

Commissioner feedback:

- Suggested fixed time for re-evaluation not aligned with council terms
- Request for historical visualization showing RETT volatility
- Consideration of broader one-time revenue policy



- Discussion of review timeline in context of fiscal recovery roadmap (October 2026 target)

## **6. PENSION QUESTIONS**

Chair Yang facilitated question-gathering session for future pension expert presentations:

Questions identified:

- Practicality of refinancing pension debt given city's fiscal state
- Size of various liabilities and contribution obligations
- Current vs. projected unfunded liabilities
- Contractual obligations and renegotiation opportunities
- Investment performance and CalPERS returns
- Growth rate of pension liabilities
- City's payment compliance vs. insufficient contribution rates
- Different retirement systems (PFRS vs. CalPERS)
- Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) opportunities
- Stakeholder universe for pension adjustments
- Outstanding audit findings

## **7. AD HOC UPDATES**

Housing/Unhoused Ad Hoc (Commissioner Grimsley):

- Working group continuing to refine encampment proposal
- Identified private and public properties for potential sites
- Need third-party organization to manage liability
- Engaging Homelessness Commission member Candice Elder
- Measure W fund allocation process beginning
- Request for information on encampment cleanup contract expiration
- Timeline: Barbara Lee and Nikki Bas reviewing proposals in 2-3 weeks

Community Engagement Ad Hoc (Commissioner Casillas):

- Planning public meeting at 81st Avenue Library for September
- Goal: Present draft recommendations and gather community input
- Report due September 30th per CFP requirements
- Considering August meeting at alternate location

## **8. OPEN FORUM**

- New interim finance director joining department
- Michelle Phillips returning as Assistant City Administrator
- Commissioner Ycoy-Walton announced event at Temple on the Hill, July 26th

- Commissioner Grimsley requested future presentation on Inspector General's police staffing audit
- August Meeting Planning:
  - Tentatively scheduled for 81st Avenue Library, same time (6:00-8:00 PM)
  - Alternative: Same location if library logistics don't work out
  - Community engagement focus if held at library

## 9. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:40 PM

*These minutes were drafted using a large language model based on a transcript of the meeting recording. They were reviewed and edited by a human for accuracy.*

## **\*\* DRAFT \*\* MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** City of Oakland Leadership

**FROM:** Oakland Budget Advisory Commission

**DATE:** August 13, 2025

**RE:** Assessment and Recommendations for the City's Budget Process

---

This memo provides an assessment of the 2025 budget cycle's community engagement efforts and offers recommendations to strengthen resident participation in Oakland's budget process. We highlight ways the City can make future budget decisions in a more open, inclusive, equity-driven, and community-centered way. While significant improvements were made in transparency and accessibility, opportunities remain to deepen meaningful community input and create more substantive resident involvement in budget decisions.

### **ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT CYCLE: What worked and areas for improvement**

Every two years, the city of Oakland initiates a budget process that, based on the Consolidated Fiscal Policy (CFP), should include budget forums and ongoing community education. The CFP also mandates that the Budget Advisory Commission provide “their analysis of the budget adoption process including, but not limited to: 1) the informational quality of the Proposed Budget; 2) the City Administration's and City Council's attention to engaging the public and its impacts on the budget process and product; 3) the level of transparency and open dialogue in all public meetings dedicated to the budget; and 4) opportunities for improving the process in future years.”

Further, the BAC is required to take into account the following guiding principles to help assess the process:

- **Inclusive Design:** The design of a public participation process includes input from appropriate local officials as well as from members of intended participant communities. Public participation is an early and integral part of issue and opportunity identification, concept development, design, and implementation of city policies, programs, and projects.

- **Authentic Intent:** A primary purpose of the public participation process is to generate public views and ideas to help shape local government action or policy.
- **Transparency:** Public participation processes are open, honest, and understandable. There is clarity and transparency about the public participation process, sponsorship, purpose, design, and how decision makers will use the process results.
- **Inclusiveness and Equity:** Public participation processes identify, reach out to, and encourage participation of the community in its full diversity. Processes respect a range of values and interests and the knowledge of those involved. Historically excluded individuals and groups are included authentically in processes, activities, and decision-making and policymaking. Impacts, including costs and benefits, are identified and distributed fairly.
- **Informed Participation:** Participants in the process have information and/or access to expertise consistent with the work that sponsors and conveners ask them to do. Members of the public receive the information they need, and with enough lead time, to participate effectively.
- **Accessible Participation:** Public participation processes are broadly accessible in terms of location, time, and language, and support the engagement of community members with disabilities.
- **Appropriate Process:** The public participation process uses one or more engagement formats that are responsive to the needs of identified participant groups, and encourages full, authentic, effective, and equitable participation consistent with process purposes. Participation processes and techniques are well-designed to appropriately fit the scope, character, and impact of a policy or project. Processes adapt to changing needs and issues as they move forward.
- **Use of Information:** The ideas, preferences, and/or recommendations contributed by community members are documented and given consideration by decision-makers. Local officials communicate decisions back to process participants and the broader public, with a description of how the public input was considered and used.
- **Building Relationships and Community Capacity:** Public participation processes invest in and develop long-term, collaborative working relationships and learning opportunities with community partners and stakeholders. This may include relationships with other temporary or ongoing community participation venues.
- **Evaluation:** Sponsors and participants evaluate each public participation process with the collected feedback and learning shared broadly and applied to future public participation efforts.

## What Worked

The city demonstrated marked improvement in several key areas:

**Enhanced Communication and Transparency** - The city's communication strategy represented a substantial shift from previous budget cycles, with greater transparency and explicit acknowledgment of the structural deficit. This honest approach helped build trust and provided residents with a realistic context for budget discussions.

**Comprehensive & Accessible Information** - The city provided quality, accessible information through clear charts and foundational materials that helped residents develop a collective understanding of the budget process, deficit challenges, and participation opportunities.

**Distributed Leadership Model** - City Council members took ownership of individual budget forums, creating direct connections with their constituents and ensuring district-level representation in the process.

**Closer Partnerships** - Strong partnership between community organizations, the Budget Advisory Commission, and the City Administrator's office, collection and online posting of resident questions, and improved accessibility measures enhanced the overall process quality.

## Areas for Improvement

**Barriers to Participation** - Interpretation services were only offered if people RSVP'd in advance. This process was inequitable and left out many residents, especially those who did not know there was an advanced registration requirement.

**Limited Input Integration** - Budget forums were hosted in each district by city council members. This was an opportunity for each city council member to share budget priorities with their constituents. Residents were also invited to share their budget priorities in small group settings and to ask questions about the proposed Mayor's budget. **Small group discussions about priorities were not integrated into the forums.** Residents left the budget forums wondering if their budget priorities would be addressed and how they could follow up. We would recommend giving time to residents to share their budget priorities in the forums, so that residents can hear from each other and the city council members can hear directly from their constituents.

**Rushed Timeline** - The City Council adopted the budget two weeks prior to the budget deadline. This compressed timeline prevented ongoing resident input. Even though the

city did a good job of hosting budget informational meetings and budget town halls, resident engagement continues throughout the budget process. While the early adoption of the budget was applauded by some, and we recognize it as a positive in giving the city more financial certainty, it came at the cost of resident input. This shortened timeline created the perception that budget decisions were finalized before community input was solicited.

**Incomplete Information Sharing** - Residents lack ongoing education about year-round budget decisions, the relationship between education funding and city budgets versus school district operations, and the impact of Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) that commit funds outside the formal budget process.

**The following were recommendations to the City for future processes.**

<b>2023-2025 Recommendations</b>	<b>2025-2027 Implementation</b>	<b>ACTION NEEDED</b>
Provide a complete picture of the City's budget.		
Present information in a consistent form that allows comparing and contrasting of budget figures and trends.	Materials and information presented at the informational budget forums and district budget town halls were consistent across the board.	Would like to replicate in the future.
Attach all relevant reports regarding the City's Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) liability to the budget.		
Adopt a budget schedule that prioritizes education and outreach to City residents	The city offered two informational budget forums in March and April.	Would like to replicate in the future, and if possible, offer the forums earlier in the year to perhaps offer more than two.
Share the City's racial equity analysis related to		

the budget at town halls, a process that involves all City departments as well as each City Council member.		
Provide an analysis on which communities are carrying the greatest burden when it comes to paying for services.		
Ensure district town halls are accessible to all individuals by offering interpretation, including American Sign Language (ASL) interpreters, and translation of all materials	Town halls required RSVP's for there to be interpretation, which could have been a barrier to people in need of interpretation. However, all materials were translated and made available at the town halls.	
Offer recordings of town halls for district residents who cannot attend.	Unclear if this happened, but city staff worked hard to share and address all questions from budget forums on the city's website. Informational forums were recorded.	
Report on how consolidation of departments impacts residents.	N/A	

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**Eliminate RSVP Requirements** - Remove advance registration barriers to increase accessibility and spontaneous participation in budget forums. Make it the default to have interpretation available at public meetings. Ensure this information is shared with community members through city council member newsletters, social media, community organizations, etc.

**Improve Information Sharing** - Establish a practice to share small group discussion outcomes directly with City Council members at the budget town halls, ensuring that residents see their input heard by their city council member. Share resident priorities during forums and district-specific gatherings. Categorize issues by district while identifying city-wide themes, enabling better comparison with survey data and trend analysis.

**Start Sooner** - City Council members, city departments, and the City Administrator's office begin the budgeting process in the fall. Begin the informational sessions in tandem with the city's process to allow for substantive resident input before key decisions are finalized. This addresses the core issue of meaningful versus performative engagement.

**Develop Year-Round Budget Education** - Create ongoing resident education about budget decisions that occur throughout the year, clarifying the relationship between various funding streams and decision-making processes.

**Improve MOU Transparency** - Establish processes to inform residents about MOUs and other commitments that impact the budget. Understanding that MOU information is confidential, we do not recommend that the specifics of each MOU be disclosed, but rather the total commitments to give a fuller budget picture.

**Diversify Community Input** - Expand beyond traditional engagement methods to ensure comprehensive representation of community voices and priorities. The city did a good job this year with the informational sessions that were hosted in partnership with the BAC, League of Women Voters, and SPUR. We would like to see a broader partnership with community groups to include communities that are not as represented through traditional outreach efforts, including low-income residents, those who live outside, BIPOC communities from Districts 5 and 7. We look forward to working with the city to make this happen.

## **NEXT STEPS**

Oakland's budget engagement process reflected meaningful improvement in transparency and accessibility. However, to achieve genuine community participation, the city must address structural barriers that limit substantive resident input. The recommendations above focus on creating earlier, more meaningful engagement opportunities while maintaining the successful elements of increased transparency and distributed leadership.



The goal should be transforming the process from informational to participatory, ensuring residents can meaningfully influence budget priorities rather than simply receive information about predetermined decisions.

We recommend the City Administrator's office and City Council consider these recommendations for implementation in the next budget cycle, with particular attention to timeline extension and ongoing community education initiatives.

## **WHAT OAKLAND RESIDENTS CAN DO**

1. **Build a relationship** with your district's City Council member, and attend the budget town halls and forums in your district as they are announced.
2. **Bring your neighbors** and ask questions at all community meetings because your individual and collective input matters. Friends don't let friends advocate alone.
3. **Sign up** for all newsletters and communications from your City Council member and Mayor Barbara Lee.
4. **Visit** [Oakland's city website](#) to watch the meeting recordings and remain informed on vital information if a community meeting or opportunity to engage is missed.
5. **Apply** to serve on a board or commission so your voice and the needs of your community can be uplifted and engaged with.

## **\*\* BORRADOR \*\* MEMORANDO**

**PARA: Liderazgo de la Ciudad de Oakland**

**DE: Comisión Asesora de Presupuesto de Oakland**

**FECHA: 13 de agosto de 2025**

**RE: Evaluación y Recomendaciones para el Proceso Presupuestario de la Ciudad**

---

Este memorando ofrece una evaluación de las iniciativas de participación comunitaria del ciclo presupuestario 2025 y ofrece recomendaciones para fortalecer la participación de los residentes en el proceso presupuestario de Oakland. Destacamos las maneras en que la Ciudad puede tomar decisiones presupuestarias futuras de una manera más abierta, inclusiva, basada en la equidad y centrada en la comunidad. Si bien se lograron mejoras significativas en la transparencia y la accesibilidad, aún existen oportunidades para profundizar la participación significativa de la comunidad y lograr una participación más sustancial de los residentes en las decisiones presupuestarias.

### **EVALUACIÓN DEL CICLO ACTUAL: Aspectos que funcionaron y áreas de mejora**

Cada dos años, la ciudad de Oakland inicia un proceso presupuestario que, con base en la Política Fiscal Consolidada (PFC), debe incluir foros presupuestarios y educación comunitaria continua. El CFP también exige que la Comisión Asesora Presupuestaria proporcione su análisis del proceso de adopción del presupuesto, incluyendo, entre otros: 1) la calidad informativa del Presupuesto Propuesto; 2) la atención de la Administración Municipal y el Ayuntamiento a la participación ciudadana y su impacto en el proceso y el producto presupuestario; 3) el nivel de transparencia y diálogo abierto en todas las reuniones públicas dedicadas al presupuesto; y 4) las oportunidades para mejorar el proceso en años futuros.

Además, la Comisión debe tener en cuenta los siguientes principios rectores para ayudar a evaluar el proceso:

- **Diseño Inclusivo:** El diseño de un proceso de participación pública incluye las aportaciones de los funcionarios locales competentes, así como de los miembros de las comunidades participantes previstas. La participación pública es una parte temprana e integral de la identificación de problemas y oportunidades, el desarrollo de conceptos, el diseño y la implementación de las políticas, programas y proyectos municipales.

- **Intención Auténtica:** Un propósito principal del proceso de participación pública es generar opiniones e ideas públicas para ayudar a definir las acciones o políticas del gobierno local.
- **Transparencia:** Los procesos de participación pública son abiertos, honestos y comprensibles. Existe claridad y transparencia sobre el proceso de participación pública, el patrocinio, el propósito, el diseño y cómo los tomadores de decisiones utilizarán los resultados del proceso.
- **Inclusión y equidad:** Los procesos de participación pública identifican, conectan y fomentan la participación de la comunidad en toda su diversidad. Los procesos respetan una gama de valores e intereses, así como el conocimiento de los involucrados. Las personas y grupos históricamente excluidos se incluyen auténticamente en los procesos, las actividades, la toma de decisiones y la formulación de políticas. Los impactos, incluidos los costos y los beneficios, se identifican y distribuyen de manera justa.
- **Participación informada:** Los participantes en el proceso tienen información y/o acceso a expertos en consonancia con el trabajo que los patrocinadores y convocantes les solicitan. Los miembros del público reciben la información que necesitan, con suficiente antelación, para participar eficazmente.
- **Participación accesible:** Los procesos de participación pública son ampliamente accesibles en términos de ubicación, horario e idioma, y apoyan la participación de los miembros de la comunidad con discapacidad. **Proceso apropiado:** El proceso de participación pública utiliza uno o más formatos de participación que responden a las necesidades de los grupos de participantes identificados y fomentan una participación plena, auténtica, efectiva y equitativa, coherente con los propósitos del proceso. Los procesos y técnicas de participación están bien diseñados para ajustarse adecuadamente al alcance, la naturaleza y el impacto de una política o proyecto. Los procesos se adaptan a las necesidades y problemas cambiantes a medida que avanzan.
- **Uso de la información:** Las ideas, preferencias y/o recomendaciones aportadas por los miembros de la comunidad se documentan y son consideradas por los responsables de la toma de decisiones. Los funcionarios locales comunican las decisiones a los participantes del proceso y al público en general, con una descripción de cómo se consideraron y utilizaron las aportaciones del público.
- **Fortalecimiento de relaciones y capacidad comunitaria:** Los procesos de participación pública invierten y desarrollan relaciones de trabajo colaborativas a largo plazo y oportunidades de aprendizaje con los socios y las partes interesadas de la comunidad. Esto puede incluir relaciones con otros espacios de participación comunitaria, ya sean temporales o permanentes.
- **Evaluación:** Los patrocinadores y los participantes evalúan cada proceso de participación pública y comparten ampliamente la retroalimentación y el

aprendizaje recopilados, aplicándolos a futuras iniciativas de participación pública.

## **Lo que funcionó**

La ciudad demostró una mejora notable en varias áreas clave:

**Mejora de la comunicación y la transparencia:** La estrategia de comunicación de la ciudad representó un cambio sustancial con respecto a los ciclos presupuestarios anteriores, con mayor transparencia y un reconocimiento explícito del déficit estructural. Este enfoque honesto ayudó a generar confianza y proporcionó a los residentes un contexto realista para las discusiones presupuestarias.

**Información completa y accesible:** La ciudad proporcionó información accesible y de calidad mediante gráficos claros y materiales fundamentales que ayudaron a los residentes a desarrollar una comprensión colectiva del proceso presupuestario, los desafíos del déficit y las oportunidades de participación.

**Modelo de liderazgo distribuido:** Los miembros del Ayuntamiento asumieron la responsabilidad de los foros presupuestarios individuales, creando conexiones directas con sus electores y garantizando la representación a nivel de distrito en el proceso.

**Colaboraciones más estrechas:** La sólida colaboración entre las organizaciones comunitarias, la Comisión Asesora de Presupuesto y la oficina del Administrador Municipal, la recopilación y publicación en línea de preguntas de los residentes y las medidas de accesibilidad mejoradas mejoraron la calidad general del proceso.

## **Áreas de mejora**

**Barreras a la participación:** Los servicios de interpretación solo se ofrecían si las personas confirmaban su asistencia con antelación. Este proceso excluía a muchos residentes, especialmente a aquellos que desconocían el requisito de registro previo.

**Integración limitada de aportaciones:** Los miembros del Ayuntamiento organizaron foros presupuestarios en cada distrito. Esta fue una oportunidad para que cada miembro del Ayuntamiento compartiera sus prioridades presupuestarias con sus electores. También se invitó a los residentes a compartir sus prioridades presupuestarias en grupos pequeños y a hacer preguntas sobre el presupuesto propuesto por el alcalde. Las discusiones en grupos pequeños sobre prioridades no se integraron en los foros. Los residentes abandonaron los foros presupuestarios preguntándose si se abordarían sus prioridades y cómo podrían darles seguimiento. Recomendamos dar tiempo a los residentes para que compartan sus prioridades presupuestarias en los foros, de modo

que puedan escucharse entre sí y los miembros del consejo municipal puedan escuchar directamente a sus electores.

**Cronograma apresurado:** El Consejo Municipal aprobó el presupuesto dos semanas antes de la fecha límite. Este cronograma ajustado impidió la participación continua de los residentes. Si bien la ciudad realizó un buen trabajo organizando reuniones informativas y asambleas públicas sobre el presupuesto, la participación de los residentes continúa durante todo el proceso presupuestario. Si bien la adopción temprana del presupuesto fue aplaudida por algunos, y la reconocemos como un factor positivo que brindó a la ciudad mayor seguridad financiera, se produjo a costa de la participación de los residentes. Este cronograma acortado creó la percepción de que las decisiones presupuestarias se finalizaron antes de solicitar la opinión de la comunidad.

**Intercambio de información incompleto:** Los residentes carecen de educación continua sobre las decisiones presupuestarias anuales, la relación entre la financiación de la educación y los presupuestos municipales frente a las operaciones de los distritos escolares, y el impacto de los Memorandos de Entendimiento (MOU) que comprometen fondos fuera del proceso presupuestario formal.

**Las siguientes fueron recomendaciones a la Ciudad para procesos futuros.**

<b>Recomendaciones 2023-2025</b>	<b>Implementacion 2025-2027</b>	<b>ACCIÓN NECESARIA</b>
Proporcionar una visión completa del presupuesto de la Ciudad.		
Presentar la información de forma coherente que permita comparar y contrastar las cifras y tendencias presupuestarias.	Los materiales y la información presentados en los foros informativos sobre el presupuesto y en las asambleas públicas distritales sobre el presupuesto fueron coherentes en todos los ámbitos.	Se desea replicar esta información en el futuro.
Adjuntar al presupuesto todos los informes		

pertinentes sobre la obligación de la Ciudad por Otros Beneficios Post-Empleo (OPEB).		
Adoptar un programa presupuestario que priorice la educación y la divulgación a los residentes de la Ciudad.	La ciudad ofreció dos foros informativos sobre el presupuesto en marzo y abril.	Se desea replicar esta información en el futuro y, de ser posible, ofrecer los foros a principios de año.
Compartir el análisis de equidad racial de la Ciudad en relación con el presupuesto en las asambleas públicas, un proceso que involucra a todos los departamentos de la Ciudad, así como a cada miembro del Concejo Municipal.		
Proporcionar un análisis sobre qué comunidades soportan la mayor carga financiera.		
Garantizar el acceso a las reuniones públicas distritales para todas las personas, ofreciendo servicios de interpretación, incluyendo intérpretes de Lengua de Señas Americana (ASL), y la traducción de todos los materiales.	Las reuniones públicas requerían confirmación de asistencia para la interpretación, lo que podría haber sido un obstáculo para quienes la necesitaban. Sin embargo, todos los materiales se tradujeron y se pusieron a disposición en las reuniones públicas.	

Ofrecer grabaciones de las reuniones públicas para los residentes del distrito que no puedan asistir.	No se sabe con certeza si esto sucedió, pero el personal de la ciudad trabajó arduamente para compartir y responder a todas las preguntas de los foros presupuestarios en el sitio web municipal. Los foros informativos si fueron grabados.	
Informar sobre el impacto de la consolidación de departamentos en los residentes.	N/A	

## RECOMENDACIONES

Eliminar los requisitos de confirmación de asistencia: Eliminar las barreras de inscripción anticipada para aumentar la accesibilidad y la participación espontánea en los foros presupuestarios. Establecer que la interpretación sea la norma en las reuniones públicas. Asegurar que esta información se comparta con los miembros de la comunidad a través de los boletines informativos de los concejales, redes sociales, organizaciones comunitarias, etc.

**Mejorar el intercambio de información:** Establecer una práctica para compartir los resultados de las discusiones en grupos pequeños directamente con los concejales en la reunión presupuestaria. Asambleas públicas, garantizando que los residentes vean sus opiniones escuchadas por su concejal. Compartir las prioridades de los residentes durante foros y reuniones por distrito. Clasificar los problemas por distrito e identificar los temas de toda la ciudad, lo que facilita una mejor comparación con los datos de encuestas y el análisis de tendencias.

**Comenzar antes:** Los concejales, los departamentos municipales y la oficina del Administrador Municipal comienzan el proceso presupuestario en otoño. Iniciar las sesiones informativas simultáneamente con el proceso municipal para permitir la participación sustancial de los residentes antes de que se finalicen las decisiones clave. Esto aborda la cuestión central de la participación significativa frente a la participación performativa.

**Desarrollar la educación presupuestaria durante todo el año:** Crear educación continua para los residentes sobre las decisiones presupuestarias que se toman a lo largo del año, aclarando la relación entre las diversas fuentes de financiación y los procesos de toma de decisiones.

**Mejorar la transparencia de los MOU:** Establecer procesos para informar a los residentes sobre los MOU y otros compromisos que afectan al presupuesto. Dado que la información de los MOU es confidencial, no recomendamos que se divulguen los detalles de cada MOU, sino la totalidad de los compromisos para ofrecer una visión presupuestaria más completa.

**Diversificar las aportaciones de la comunidad:** Expandir los métodos tradicionales de participación para garantizar una representación integral de las voces y prioridades de la comunidad. La ciudad realizó un excelente trabajo este año con las sesiones informativas organizadas en colaboración con el BAC, la Liga de Mujeres Votantes y SPUR. Nos gustaría ver una colaboración más amplia con los grupos comunitarios para incluir a las comunidades que no están tan representadas en las iniciativas tradicionales de divulgación, como los residentes de bajos ingresos, quienes viven fuera de la ciudad y las comunidades BIPOC de los Distritos 5 y 7. Esperamos trabajar con la ciudad para que esto suceda.

## **PRÓXIMOS PASOS**

El proceso de participación presupuestaria de Oakland reflejó una mejora significativa en la transparencia y la accesibilidad. Sin embargo, para lograr una participación comunitaria genuina, la ciudad debe abordar las barreras estructurales que limitan la participación sustancial de los residentes. Las recomendaciones anteriores se centran en crear oportunidades de participación más tempranas y significativas, manteniendo al mismo tiempo los elementos exitosos de una mayor transparencia y un liderazgo distribuido.

El objetivo debe ser transformar el proceso de informativo a participativo, garantizando que los residentes puedan influir significativamente en las prioridades presupuestarias en lugar de simplemente recibir información sobre decisiones predeterminadas.

Recomendamos que la oficina del Administrador Municipal y el Ayuntamiento consideren estas recomendaciones para su implementación en el próximo ciclo presupuestario, con especial atención a la extensión del plazo y a las iniciativas de educación comunitaria en curso.

## **QUÉ PUEDEN HACER LOS RESIDENTES DE OAKLAND**



1. Construya una relación con el concejal de su distrito y asista a las reuniones y foros sobre el presupuesto en su distrito a medida que se anuncien.
2. Invite a sus vecinos y haga preguntas en todas las reuniones comunitarias, ya que su opinión individual y colectiva es importante. Los amigos no dejan que los amigos aboguen solos.
3. Suscríbase a todos los boletines y comunicaciones de su concejal y de la alcaldesa Barbara Lee.
4. Visite el sitio web de la ciudad de Oakland para ver las grabaciones de las reuniones y mantenerse informado sobre información vital si se pierde una reunión comunitaria o una oportunidad de participación.
5. Solicite formar parte de una junta o comisión para que su voz y las necesidades de su comunidad se escuchen y se atiendan.