

From: [Andrea Wang](#)
To: [City Clerk](#); [Manager Manager](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Police budget raised proposal: just don't
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2023 6:56:38 PM

The proposed hiring incentive program from APD is totally outsized relative to both the community need and size of APD.

San Jose PD has 959 officers and recently approved an incentive program of \$10,000 per hire for 15 hires, total budget of \$150,000
Alameda PD, a department less than 10% of San Jose's size, is proposing almost \$1.8 million for their incentive program!!

This year, when considering a hiring incentive program, San Francisco BOS gathered information from multiple regional police departments' programs. Alameda was, at that time, cited as having one of the highest incentive programs. ***If the best program hasn't worked, why would we give it a 40% boost in value?***

The Staff Report cites housing affordability multiple times, however, there's no stipulations in the proposal to ensure that the already high incentive of \$75,000 be used for housing costs.

The Staff Report mentions that lateral transfer incentives have failed over and over again. Why would the City spend almost \$2 million on something that has proven to not work?

Since there continues to be vacancies, and by the Staff report's own admission, some tasks have been subsumed by other departments or entities (while not specified, assumingly the C.A.R.E team pilot program and parking moving to Public Works) - ***can't APD just stick where they are size-wise and divert their \$1.7-\$1.9 million vacancy savings towards external resources, not policing?***

In 2019 Chief Paul Rolleri and City Manager Eric Levitt proposed a \$30,000 hiring bonus on a one year trial. Now, in 2023 we have Chief Nishant Joshi and City Manager Jennifer Ott proposing a \$75,000 hiring bonus on a temporary basis. ***New leaders, same old idea!***

In a recent SF Examiner article, Chris Catren, chief of the Redlands Police Department and president of the California Police Chiefs Association called hiring incentives "a knee-jerk reaction to this crisis, because really what else do you do? ..."

Rather than asking, how can we hire additional, supposedly "higher quality" officers to do the same exact work as they've been doing - let's ask a few different questions.

Have these incentive programs ever worked in Alameda? By the Staff Report's own admission, the answer to that is absolutely not.

Does employing more officers address crime in any meaningful way? Historical APD Clearance Rate data shows that regardless of officer headcount, APD consistently has an aggregate clearance rate for Part 1 "theft" crimes no better than 10%. That means that in the best case situation as defined by APD, just about fully staffed, 10% of the time they're addressing crimes like auto theft, burglary, property theft and robbery.

Does officer headcount do anything to prevent crime? We actually have

no idea! This is not a question that APD is ever required to answer. The best guess by the clearance rate data over time is, NO.

Could the City spend \$1.8 million dollars addressing crime in a different way?

If APD can do the same job with about 70 officers, why not direct the budget savings from vacancies towards a solution that might actually work to address or prevent crime?

From: [Madlen Saddik](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Jennifer Ott](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Trish Spencer](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] support letter for tonight's council meeting
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2023 4:49:15 PM
Attachments: [We sent you safe versions of your files.msg](#)
[Support Letter Agenda Item 7A.pdf](#)

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

Honorable Mayor and councilmembers,
I've attached our support letter for the police department agenda item tonight.

Yours in Commerce and Community
Gratefully
Madlen Saddik
President & CEO
Alameda Chamber & Economic Alliance
[Click Here to Book a Meeting With Me](#)
510-522-0414 (office)
650-954-0848 (mobile)



Alameda Chamber & Economic Alliance
2215-A S Shore Center
Alameda, CA 94501
T: (510) 522-0414
madlen@alamedachamber.com

March 20, 2023

To:

Alameda City
Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft
Vice Mayor Tony Daysog
Councilmember Tracy Jensen
Councilmember Trish Herrera Spencer
Councilmember Malia Vella
City Manager Jennifer Ott

RE: Support for Agenda Item 7A Adoption of Resolution Establishing a Temporary Recruitment and Hiring Incentive Policy of \$75,000 for Lateral, Academy Graduate and Entry Level Police Officers through Use of Existing Salary Savings

Dear Alameda Government Officials,

On behalf of the Alameda Chamber & Economic Alliance , **I write to you today in SUPPORT of Agenda Item 7A, Adoption of Resolution Establishing a Temporary Recruitment and Hiring Incentive Policy of \$75,000 for Lateral, Academy Graduate and Entry Level Police Officers through Use of Existing Salary Savings.** This would reallocate funding to improve recruitment and hiring incentive efforts within the City of Alameda's Police Department.

APD is experiencing a staffing crisis and the current vacancies are at critical lows. Although APD has done significant hiring, it has not kept up with the pace of retirements and resignations. So, APD is not asking the City Council for additional money to the budget. Instead, APD is asking to use salary savings towards a recruitment bonus to attract more candidates. There has been an increase in crime and the business districts account y for a great portion of the crime numbers. By having more staff, APD could provide better coverage in key areas to include the business districts. Again, this proposal is not asking for more money or an increased budget. Rather, APD would like to use the existing savings towards a recruitment bonus to attract more candidates.

In these different times, we need to ensure Alameda is staying on trend to maintain a safe community. We do not want to fall behind so, this is why the **Alameda Chamber & Economic Alliance is in full support of Agenda Item 7A: Adoption of Resolution Establishing a Temporary Recruitment and Hiring Incentive Policy of \$75,000 for Lateral, Academy Graduate and Entry Level Police Officers through Use of Existing Salary Savings.** Thank

you for your consideration and we urge your support when this is discussed during the Alameda City Council meeting.

Sincerely,

Madlen Saddik

Madlen Saddik
CEO/President

Kelly Lux

Kelly Lux
2023 Board Chair

From: [Jennifer Ott](#)
To: [CityCouncil-List](#)
Cc: [Nishant Joshi](#)
Subject: FW: For tonight's meeting
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2023 2:32:05 PM

Mayor and City Council:

Please find below an email from the POA President regarding Agenda Item 7-A.

Thanks,
Jen

From: Kevin Horikoshi <KHorikoshi@alamedaca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2023 1:08 PM
To: Jennifer Ott <jott@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: For tonight's meeting

As the President of the Alameda Police Officers Association, I support the proposal of the recruiting bonus. Like many other cities, we have had staffing issues for several years and have not been able to hire an adequate number of officers. These staffing shortages have caused the Department to force our officers to work mandatory overtime and has not allowed us to provide the level of service that we want to provide to the community and that the community has been accustomed to receiving from us.

I am in support of this proposal and any measures that will help us find the quality police officers that we all want.

Sergeant Kevin Horikoshi S-18

Community Resource Unit
Alameda Police Department
1555 Oak Street
Alameda, CA 94501
Monday-Thursday 7:00 am - 5:00 pm
(Desk) 510-337-8338

From: [Ashley Gregory](#)
To: [Tracy Jensen](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Malia Vella](#)
Cc: [Manager Manager](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-A
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2023 8:59:52 AM

Dear Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Daysog, Councilmember Herrera Spencer, Councilmember Jensen, and Councilmember Vella;

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Alameda Police Department's \$75,000 hiring bonus incentive program.

This proposal needs to go back to the drawing board, there are too many indicators that this is a massive waste of the City's resources. You have the opportunity to focus on a care-driven budget, rather than a fear-driven budget.

I urge the council to consider alternative uses of approximately \$1.8 million dollars. Now is the time to think outside of the police-punishment-fear box and imagine something new, innovative, and people-centered.

Sincerely,

Ashley Gregory
Alameda Community Member

From: [Jennifer Rakowski](#)
To: [City Clerk](#); [Manager Manager](#); [Nishant Joshi](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tracy Jensen](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-A Police Hiring Incentives # 2023-2869
Date: Monday, March 20, 2023 6:32:22 PM

Dear City Council,

The proposed police hiring incentive program is not an efficient use of the city's money or department resources. It is not the right fit for a community of Alameda's size. I urge you to send it back to staff to scale back in cost, scope and structure and bring back to council at the same time as bonuses are considered for current staff so a thoughtful discussion regarding solutions that work for recruitment and retention can be had.

Alameda's per capital median income is currently \$61,380, \$13,620 less than the proposed per officer bonus.

I realize APD's proposed hiring bonus \$75,000 is paid out over 5 years but the proposed total package value is giving me sticker shock!

- 1) The proposed incentive program is larger than departments 10x APD's size.
- 2) Per officer cost are almost double the incentives of Alameda's existing program.
- 3) Alameda's current incentives are some of the highest in the region, with Alameda Police Department specifically highlighted in the last couple of months as a reason to increase incentives with SFPD.
- 4) Expending the program to all recruits instead of lateral transfers, changes the baseline reason for the program away from hiring experience and significantly grows the cost of the program in ways that are not clearly defined in the proposal.
- 5) Local housing cost cited as justification for increase but the incentive is not framed as loan towards renting or purchasing in Alameda.
- 6) There are many lower cost alternative recruitment and retentions strategies that may not grab headlines but will pay off in the long term. Salary's, benefits and job security were least common reason for law enforcement applications (Gibbs 2019)
- 7) Benefit motivations for joining the job are associated with the highest rates of attrition. (Schuck 2020)

Why is new leadership recycling and doubling down on a failed ideas? Alameda

incentive program, has only recruited one lateral transfer since 2019.

Twelve promotions and ten disability retirements are currently the driving forces behind staffing gaps. The city would be wise to address those contritions directly, with planning and attention to employee health and safety.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Rakowski

Regional comparisons to incentives in hiring.

The San Francisco Police Department did an exhaustive search on hiring incentives for regional law enforcement agencies. The information gathered has been provided in the following table.

#	Agency	Starting Salary (Graduates)	Signing Bonus Recipient	Signing Bonus Total	Signing Bonus Stipulations	Retirement	Other Incentives	Proposed Signing Bonus
1	San Francisco PD	\$92,560	Laterals only	\$5,000	\$2.5K after FTO and \$2.5K after probation	3% @ 58	None	
2	Santa Clara PD	\$142,699	N/A			2.7% @ 57	Referral incentive: 30 hrs of comp time or pay	
3	Redwood City PD	\$119,516	N/A			2.7% @ 57	Shortened FTO; Vacation accrual based on years of experience; Up to 200 hours of transferrable sick time	
4	San Mateo PD	\$118,199	Laterals only	\$30,000	\$10K after FTO, \$10K after probation, and \$10K after 3 years of service	2.7% @ 57	None	
5	Daly City PD	\$107,568	Recruits; Laterals	\$10,000	\$5K after probation, \$5K 2 years service thereafter \$5K after FTO, \$5K after probation (2 installments)	2.7% @ 57	None	
6	San Jose PD	\$105,726	N/A			First 20 years of Service: 2.5% per year of service X final compensation (50% maximum)) Next 21-30 years of service: 4% per year	None	
7	Palo Alto PD	\$104,228	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	
8	Alameda PD	\$103,522	Laterals only	\$30,000	Over 3 years, must stay for 3 years, (while funds available)	2.7% @ 57	Vacation accrual commensurate w/experience, 80 bonus hrs of vacation, up to 10 yrs service credit toward retention pay incentives, front loaded sick leave	
9	Livermore PD	\$102,065	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	
10	Hayward PD	\$101,629	Recruits; Academy Grads; Laterals	\$10,000; \$10,000; \$20,000		2.7% @ 57	Referral incentive: \$2K (after new officer hired)	

11	Fremont PD	\$100,769	N/A			2.7% @ 57	Can transfer up to 10 years of service credit (credit counts toward vacation accrual, longevity pay, etc)	
12	Richmond PD	\$100,572	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	
13	Alameda County Sheriff	\$99,861	Recruits; Academy Grads; Laterals	\$10,000 \$12,000 \$15,000	Paid over 4 years (in 4 installments)	2.7% @ 57	None	
14	San Mateo County S.O.	\$97,198	Laterals only	\$30,000	Paid over 4 years	2.7% @ 57	None	
15	Antioch PD	\$96,852 (2020)	Laterals only	\$10,000	\$2,5K upon hire, \$2.5K after probation, \$5K after 3 years of service	2.7% @ 57	Laterals can carry over 200 hours of sick leave, 40 hours of vacation; Referral incentive: \$1K or 20 hour of comp time for referral	Proposed bonus for laterals and recruits: 40K over 3 years, 20K signing, 10K after one year, and 10K after the 3rd year Academy graduates can get 60K loan for purchasing a home in Antioch
16	South San Francisco PD	\$95,451	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	
17	Oakland PD	\$93,243	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	
18	Santa Rosa PD	\$93,032	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	
19	San Rafael PD	\$92,678	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	
20	Fairfield PD	\$90,220	Laterals only	\$10,000	\$2.5K at time of hire, \$2.5K after FTO, \$2.5K after probation, and \$2.5K after 2 years of service	2.7% @ 57	None	
21	Santa Cruz County Sheriff	\$89,128	Laterals only	\$25,000	After FTO	2.7% @ 57	40 hours advanced vacation after FTO	
22	Vallejo PD	\$87,938	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	
23	Sonoma County S.O.	\$87,450	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	
24	Vacaville PD	\$82,942	Academy Grads; Laterals	\$20,000 \$20,000	\$5K upon hire, \$5K after probation, \$5K after 2 years of service, and \$5K after 3 years of service	2.7% @ 57	None	
25	Glendale PD	\$82,787	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	
26	Bart PD	\$82,614	Academy Grads; Laterals	\$15,000	\$5K at hire and \$10K after FTO	2.7% @ 57	None	
27	Escondido PD	\$79,522	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	
28	Oceanside PD	\$79,498	Laterals only	\$15,000	\$5K after FTO, \$2.5K after probation, \$2.5K the following year,	2.7% @ 57	Resident bonus of \$5K; Relocation expenses up to \$2K; Upfront leave bank of 480 hours as	
29	Santa Cruz PD	\$79,344	Citizens	\$2,000	\$1K after grad, \$1K after 6 months of service	2.7% @ 57	"Citizens Hiring Bonus" Citizen/Community Referral incentive: \$2K	
30	Fontana PD	\$79,185	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	

31	Azusa PD	\$77,596	Laterals only	\$15,000	\$7.5K upon completing probation and \$7.5K after 36 month of consecutive employment	2.7% @ 57	None	
32	Chula Vista PD	\$77,205	Academy Grads; Laterals	\$20,000	Eligible up to \$20K	2.7% @ 57	None	
33	Dixon PD	\$76,127	Laterals only	\$30,000	\$5K upon hire, \$5K after 6 months, \$5K after 12 months, \$5K after probation, \$5K after 2 years, \$5K after 2.5 years	2.7% @ 57	None	
34	Elk Grove PD	\$75,465	Laterals only	\$7,500		2.7% @ 57	None	
35	Los Angeles PD	\$74,666	N/A			40% of your Final Average Salary at 20 years of service, plus 3% per year for years 21 through 25, 4% per year for years 26 through 30 and 5% per year for years 31 through 33. The maximum percentag	1.25% Patrol Bonus*	
36	Palos Verdes Estates PD	\$73,728	Academy Grads; Laterals	\$15,000 \$30,000		2.7% @ 57	None	
37	San Diego PD	\$71,614	N/A			3% @ 55	None	
38	Redding PD	\$71,489	Laterals only	\$40,000*	\$20K upon hire, \$10K after FTO, \$10K after probation *(expires Oct 2023)	2.7% @ 57	80 hours of vacation after probation *(expires Oct 2023)	
39	Colton PD	\$71,264	Laterals only	\$15,000	\$2.5K at time of hire, \$2.5K at FTO completion, \$5K after probation, and \$5K one year past probation	2.7% @ 57	None	
40	Folsom PD	\$70,508	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	

41	Los Angeles Airport PD	\$68,173	N/A			40% of your Final Average Salary at 20 years of service, plus 3% per year for years 21 through 25, 4% per year for years 26 through 30 and 5% per year for years 31 through 33. The maximum percentag	None	
42	Mountain View Police	\$110,504	Recruits	\$5,000	Paid in two payments; \$2,500 in your first paycheck and \$2,500 following successful completion of probationary period	2.7% @ 57	Sleeping facility available for officer use. Tuition reimbursement \$2k per year, up to \$20k max lifetime. Life Insurance coverage at 5 times salary, up to \$600k. Retiree medical benefits vest after a period of five years.	
43	Fresno Police	\$67,224	Laterals only	\$10,000		2.7% @ 57	None	
44	Milpitas	\$113,155	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	
45	San Bruno	\$98,784	N/A			2.7% @ 57	None	
46	Petaluma	\$85,529	Laterals only	\$25,000	\$10K upon hire, \$5K after probation, and \$10K after 3 years of service	2.7% @ 57	None	
47	Contra Costa County Sheriff	\$97,754	Laterals only	\$3,000		2.7% @ 57	None	
48	Berkeley PD	\$106,558	N/A			2.7% @ 57	City contributes 2% of the employee's salary (up to a maximum annual salary of \$32,400) into a 401(a) Supplemental Retirement Income	

Source: Websites, Calops, Direct Contact

(Alameda current plan reason SF should increase)

https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/politics/should-sf-match-bonuses-offered-to-cops-by-other-cities/article_648f662a-9b7d-11ed-b071-db38817d1f1e.html

(Alameda plan larger than San Jose's)

<https://www.sfgate.com/news/bayarea/article/San-Jose-Spotlight-City-Council-Approves-Hiring-17527401.php>

(Incentives compared as complied by SFPD)

<https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:86096950-567d-4fbd-9fff-ee736f4c60aa>

From: [Is Sullivan](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-A on 3/23/2023 Agenda
Date: Monday, March 20, 2023 6:17:37 PM

Dear Council,

I urge you to vote against this resolution. APD's current hiring incentive program is already generous. APD offers hiring bonuses on par with or higher than 7 out of 10 of the cities cited in the resolution. If the current program hasn't helped in retaining sworn officers, then it does not make sense to double down on that program, and a \$75,000 incentive is honestly outrageous.

Instead of spending all of APD's vacancy savings on the incentives program, that \$1.7 to \$1.9 million should be given back to the community. With the CARE team responding to many of the calls that APD used to take, APD's surplus should be directed there. Furthermore, we know that the best way to prevent crime is to meet everyone's universal needs. Why not divert this money to programs that already help fulfill Alamedans' universal needs?

Thank you for your consideration,
Is Sullivan

From: [Savanna Cheer](#)
To: [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tracy Jensen](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#); [Manager Manager](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 7-A - March 21, 2023 City Council Meeting
Date: Monday, March 20, 2023 5:38:15 PM

Hello:

I'm writing to oppose item 7-A at tomorrow evening's City Council meeting. The hiring incentive program that APD is proposing is completely outsized for a police department of APD's size and the proposal does not meet the needs of the community.

Conveniently left out of the staff report was information on how police hiring incentive programs look in large Bay Area cities. This omission means that the program APD is proposing can't be put in proper context. For example, [San Jose just approved](#) a hiring incentive program for lateral hires in their police department with a total budget of \$150,000 (\$10,000 for 15 hires). The San Jose Police Department is over ten times as big as APD, employing over 900 sworn officers. APD is suggesting filling 24 vacancies with this bonus of \$75,000 applying to each hire. That works out to a program 12 times as big as San Jose's with a price tag of \$1.8 million. \$1.8 million!!

With a closer look, this seems like a last-ditch effort from APD to spend surplus dollars created through these staff vacancies. You have a fiduciary responsibility to the people living in Alameda to not excessively spend money on ill-proven efforts. \$1.8 million could address myriad community needs and improve the lives of lots of Alamedans while avoiding investment in a failed policy.

Here are some specific reasons why you should vote NO on item 7-A tomorrow:

- The staff report repeatedly mentions housing cost as a barrier to hiring officers. The report says that it would be useful to have officers living in or very close to Alameda, but that hasn't been possible due to cost of living in Alameda. However, nothing in the proposed program policy requires that the hiring incentive money be spent on housing. Why wouldn't a new hire with APD take the huge \$75,000 bonus and get themselves a much bigger house in a more affordable city outside Alameda? ***It's irresponsible to make a claim around a program with this big of a price tag that can't be substantiated in any way and has no built-in assurances.***
- Per the staff report, written by the Chief of Police, these types of hiring incentives have not resulted in any meaningful boosts to APD staffing in the

past. ***If a \$30,000 bonus failed to produce results a couple years ago, why would an increase of 40% be a good answer so soon after?*** It feels more like a gamble than a surefire solution. \$30,000 is already at the very high end of what other police departments around the Bay Area and CA are offering.

- The staff report acknowledges that operational efficiencies have been gained at APD because some services that previously fell under police purvey no longer do. This is likely a reference to the implementation of the C.A.R.E. team program and moving parking enforcement to Public Works. It's not a leap of logic to then assume there would be dollars attached to these operational efficiencies. Rather than operate under the assumption that APD needs a specific number of officers, why not look at the current conditions and see if it actually makes sense!? ***This seems particularly imperative when you're deciding whether to spend \$1.8 million on a program that is inadequately justified in the staff report.***

Overall, this feels an awful lot like a “throw everything at the wall to see what sticks,” approach to a problem that hasn't clearly been defined as a problem. Clearance rate data from APD would show that regardless of how many officers APD employs, the police department doesn't prevent crime from happening (theft related crimes are pretty steady over time) and definitely doesn't “solve” these crimes (clearance rate for theft-related Part 1 crimes hovers around 7% from 2014-2022). It seems like we're all dancing around the crux of the issue - it's time to invest in new solutions in public safety. Why is APD not alone in facing staffing shortages? That's a question you should be asking. Perhaps policing isn't cutting it and has fallen out of favor with the broader public. Of course this will be a hard reality to face for many. But just because something is hard, doesn't mean it can be avoided. Be bold and chart a new path for Alameda tonight by saying NO to excessive, ineffective police spending!

Thanks,
Savanna Cheer
Alameda resident