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Problem Analysis (1): Introduction and Purpose

• A “problem analysis” is a set of data collection & analysis exercises designed to support the implementation of partnership-based violence reduction strategies, including Ceasefire.

• This analysis establishes a common understanding of the local violence problem that guides and informs the work of civic, community, and criminal justice leaders to reduce violence.

• The problem analysis identifies the groups and individuals within a community who are at greatest risk of violence, and helps tailor an intervention to reduce that risk.

• The problem analysis method has been developed and refined over the past 20 years, as Ceasefire interventions have been tested in numerous cities across the U.S. and internationally. For more information on problem analyses, see slide 60.

• Though its methodology is informed by research, the analysis is primarily a practice document with implications for local policy.
Problem Analysis (2): Methodology

- The problem analysis produces a comprehensive and detailed understanding of local violence by focusing on a particular aspect of that problem, in this case homicide.

- The problem analysis examines homicide incidents rather than nonfatal incidents because homicide investigations offer a more detailed, in-depth, and reliable pool of information from which to draw.

- The analysis looks at this problem from two important angles:
  a. Quantitative and qualitative data from public agency records
  b. The expertise of staff from agencies and organizations with working knowledge of homicide incidents, and the individuals and groups involved in the incidents
Problem Analysis (3): Objectives

1. Provide a detailed understanding of local serious violence during a specific period of time: January 2012 – June 2013.

2. Understand the demographics of who is at highest risk of violence and their justice system involvement.

3. Understand the near-term drivers of violence, including circumstances and the role of groups and networks (for example, sets, teams, cliques and gangs) in violence.

4. Identify patterns of violence, and the geographic and social concentration of violence within groups and networks.

5. Build capacity for Oakland partners to conduct real-time analysis of violence dynamics on a regular basis. These ongoing analytic exercises are key to successful implementation of the partnership-based violence reduction strategy.
Problem Analysis (4): Activities

1. Analyze basic contextual and trend data regarding violence in Oakland.

2. Review and analyze suspect and victim demographics and criminal histories to understand how they are coming to the attention of the criminal justice system.

3. In-depth review of each homicide incident – who was involved, what happened, circumstances and motive, role of group membership and relationships.

4. Analysis of group dynamics including relationships within and across groups, involvement in violence, other activities, and any turf associations.

5. Map homicides and shootings.

6. Synthesize this information into a unified document that identifies the highest risk population & guides the Ceasefire partnership’s work.
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Summary of Contextual and Trend Data

• Oakland’s violence problem has been stable over the last 44 years. Multi-year annual homicide averages (3-, 5-, 10-, 44-year) all hover around 107-109 homicides.

• In recent years:
  - Oakland’s violent crime rate has been 3x – 4x the state rate
  - Oakland’s homicide rate has been 3x – 6x the state rate
  - Oakland’s violent crime rates tend to resist state and national downward trends
Trend Data: Oakland Homicides

Homicides, 1969 - 2012

Homicide Averages:
- 44-year = 107.04
- 10-year = 108.9
- 5-year = 107.8
- 3-year = 106.67
Violent Crime Rate per 100,000: Oakland v. California
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Homicide Rate per 100,000: Oakland v. California

![Graph showing homicide rates in Oakland and California from 2000 to 2012. The graph displays blue bars for Oakland and red bars for California.]
Trend Data Comparison: Violent Crime Rate, 2000-2012
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Summary of Basic Demographic Data of Those Involved in Homicides

- 84% of victims and 94% of suspects are male
- While only 28% of Oakland’s population, approximately 80% of victims and suspects are Black
- Highest concentration among ages 18-34
  - 67% of all individuals involved in homicide (both victims and suspects)
  - 66% of all victims
  - 69% of known suspects
  - 76.25% of victims known to be group involved
Basic Victim and Suspect Info, Citywide Homicides, January 2012 – June 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Victims N = 171</th>
<th>Suspects N = 67</th>
<th>Oakland Population, 2010 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>8%*</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Oikos University killing of 7 people (4%) contributes to an uncharacteristically high percentage of Asian victimization during the review period. Without this mass shooting, the percentage of Black and Hispanic victims would likely be higher.
### Age, Victims and Suspects, Citywide Homicides, January 2012 – June 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Victims N = 171</th>
<th>Known Suspects N = 67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Distribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 and under</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and older</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Age</strong></td>
<td>30.25</td>
<td>26.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age, All Known Individuals Involved in Homicide, Citywide Homicides, January 2012 – June 2013
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Age, All Victims and Known Suspects, Citywide Homicides, January 2012 – June 2013

![Bar chart showing age distribution for victims and suspects.](attachment:image.png)
Age, Victims Known to be **Group Involved**, Citywide Homicides, January 2012 – June 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Distribution</th>
<th>Victims Known to be Group Involved, N = 80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 and under</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24</td>
<td>48.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and older</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>24.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age, Victims Known to be Group Involved, Citywide Homicides, January 2012 – June 2013

- 18-24: 48.75%
- 25-34: 27.5%
- 35-44: 7.5%
- 45 & Older: 3.75%

Victims Known to be Group Involved (N = 80) tend to be younger than victims overall.
### Criminal Histories of Victims and Suspects, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known to the CJ system prior to the incident</th>
<th>Victims</th>
<th>Suspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Known to the CJ system prior to the incident</td>
<td>69.84%</td>
<td>90.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of those known to the CJ system</td>
<td>N = 88</td>
<td>N = 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>28.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # of prior arrests</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # of felony arrests</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior probation</td>
<td>79.55%</td>
<td>76.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active probation at time of incident</td>
<td>19.32%</td>
<td>36.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior parole</td>
<td>31.82%</td>
<td>25.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Incarceration</td>
<td>84.10%</td>
<td>82.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicted of Felony</td>
<td>73.86%</td>
<td>72.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criminal Justice System Involvement of Homicide Victims and Suspects, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Victims (N = 88)</th>
<th>Suspects (N = 47)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Probation</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Probation</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Incarceration</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicted Felon</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criminal Histories of Victims and Suspects, 2012

Of those known to the system prior to the homicide, average # of arrests for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Victims</th>
<th>Suspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent offenses (without firearm)</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent offenses with firearm</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolent firearm offenses</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Industry</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Group Member Involvement, Citywide Homicides, January 2012 – June 2013

- Yes: 59% (N = 101)
- No: 16% (N = 27)
- Unknown: 25% (N = 43)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Member Involved</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Conflict Between Groups</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Internal to Group (general, respect, money, loyalty)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Conflict Between a Group and an Individual</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Dispute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Business (includes drug robbery, drug turf disputes)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Non-drug Business (includes sex industry, money owed, sales)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant Dispute</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motive Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Homicide Circumstances and Group Membership (2), January 2012 – June 2013, Total N = 171

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Member Involvement Unknown or Not Confirmed</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Dispute</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery (includes residential robbery)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Business (includes drug robbery)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motive Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant Dispute</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness Intimidation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Homicide Circumstances and Group Membership (3), January 2012 – June 2013, Total N = 171

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Group-member Involved</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant Dispute</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Robbery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motive Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other* (Oikos Shooting)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Homicide Circumstances:
**As Percentage of Homicides Citywide and Percentage Group Member Involvement (GMI) Across Each Circumstance Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstance</th>
<th>Total % of Homicides</th>
<th>% GMI</th>
<th>% GMI Unknown/Not Confirmed</th>
<th>% No GMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Conflict Between Groups</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Dispute</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery (includes residential robbery)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Business</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant Dispute</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motive Unknown</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Business (Non-drug)</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary Highlights: Homicide Circumstances

• 59% (N = 101) of all homicides involve group members as victims, suspects or both.
  ➢ Most, 40% (N = 70), are running group feuds, personal disputes between group members or internal group disputes.
  ➢ The balance, 19% (N = 31), are instances where group members use violence to resolve other kinds of disputes.

• Another 25% (N = 43) may involve group members as suspects and/or victims.

• Disputes over drugs, drug turf or drug business are relatively rare: 13% (N = 22) of all homicide.

• Risk of involvement in homicide is concentrated within and among groups and their networks.
Group Involvement Comparison for Victims and Suspects, Citywide Homicides, January 2012 – June 2013, (1)

• While 59% - 84% of incidents involve a victim and/or a suspect who is group involved, there are variations between victim group involvement and suspect group involvement in homicides.

• Disaggregating group involvement of victims and suspects demonstrates the following differences between their group involvement:
  - Just under half, 47% (N = 80), of victims are group involved
  - Just over half, 53% (N = 90), of suspects are group involved
  - Group involvement is unknown/not confirmed for 9% (N = 16) of victims
  - Group involvement is unknown/not confirmed for 27% (N = 47) of suspects
Victims who are not group involved include victims of:
- Incidents that had no group member involvement
- Incidents in which the victim was caught in crossfire
- Incidents in which suspects are unknown, or are group involved but victims are not

Suspects who are not group involved include individuals who perpetrated:
- Incidents that had no group member involvement
- Incidents in which the victim was group involved but the suspect was not
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Framing Observations (1): Oakland Group Dynamics

• Groups are involved in 59% - 84% of homicides in Oakland. Therefore, a more detailed understanding of group dynamics in Oakland is needed.

• The following observations are drawn from interviews and research regarding groups involved in violence over the review period.
Framing Observations (2): Oakland Group Dynamics

Among groups that are primarily black:

• Group affiliation can change over time depending on age and residence; it can also change very quickly. Group names can also change over time, or very quickly.
• Personal relationships often determine if groups get along, commit crimes together, or feud.
• There are a number of groups with longstanding, group-wide feuds or alliances.
• While groups often include individuals who have more influence than others, they often lack a formal hierarchy or structure.
• Individuals may identify with multiple groups and/or multiple groups in an area, and/or may just identify with the area overall.
• Personal connections made in custody can affect the street dynamic of groups.
Framing Observations (3): Oakland Group Dynamics

Among groups that are primarily Latino:

• Primarily Latino groups in Oakland fall under one of three general groups: Norteño, Border Brother, or Sureño. These three groups do not get along.

• As a Norteño, Border Brother, or Sureño, individuals must be part of a specific group; there are no “general” Norteños, Sureños, etc.

• Within each of these general groups, specific groups of Norteños, Border Brothers, and Sureños in Oakland primarily operate in isolation of one another. When groups work together, it is because of personal relationships and/or proximity, rather than a formal alliance.

• While there are certain individuals of influence in each group who may work to shape the activities of the group, the groups for the most part lack a regimented hierarchy or structure.
Framing Observations (4): Oakland Group Dynamics

General Dynamics Driving Feuds

• Causal factors involved in long-standing group feuds, personal disputes, or instant disputes include the following dynamics:
  ➢ Familial relationships
  ➢ Associative relationships (i.e. not blood relations but individuals with long-standing relationships)
  ➢ Connections to neighborhoods or areas

• Defining "teams": when individuals are killed, they are often memorialized by friends, associates, and other group members who form a "team" and take it upon themselves to avenge the death of their deceased loved one or associate.
Framing Observations (5): Oakland Group Dynamics

Differences Across City Areas

• Group affiliations and risk of violence are more stable in West and North Oakland than in East Oakland; the violence dynamic in East Oakland is more complicated and fluid.

Summary

• Though relationships within and across groups are complex, risk of violence is concentrated among these groups and the networks they consist of, which reflect a very small number of people.

➢ Focusing on these networks is key to reducing violence in Oakland.

➢ While group characteristics may vary, the concentration of violence in Oakland among groups and their networks is not significantly different from other cities.
West and North Oakland Groups, Primarily Black

Associations change frequently; Updated December 2013

Legend

= predictable conflict

= predictable alliance

= unpredictable alliance
Central and East Oakland Groups, Primarily Black

Associations change frequently; Updated December 2013
Group Member Involved Homicides, Citywide, Groups with 3 or More Incidents, Jan 2012 – June 2013

*When specific Norteño or Border Brother set is known, those incidents are counted twice—within “all sets”, and separately by set.
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Group Member Involved Homicides, Citywide, Groups with 2 or Fewer Incidents, Jan 2012 – June 2013
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West and North Oakland Groups, Highlighting Groups Involved in 3 + Homicides January 2012–June 2013

Legend

= predictable conflict
= predictable alliance
= unpredictable alliance
Central and East Oakland Groups, Highlighting Groups Involved in 3 + Homicides January 2012–June 2013
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Choropleth Density of Homicides and Nonfatal Shootings, 2009 – November 20, 2013
Choropleth Density of Homicides and Nonfatal Shootings During Review Period, January 2012 – June 2013

Legend
Shootings and Homicides by Beat 2012-2013
Count as a Percent of Total
17.0169% - 0.7880%
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Summary of Findings (1): Group Violence, City Areas

• Groups play a significant role in driving serious violence at the citywide level. At least 59% and up to 84% of homicides citywide are group member involved.

• While approximately 1/3 of the city’s area, East Oakland—High St. to San Leandro Border—accounts for 53% of homicide over the review period.

• During the review period, violence was most concentrated in Beats 26Y, 27Y, 29X, 30X, 30Y, 33X, 34X, and 35X—all of which are in East Oakland.

• The remaining 47% of homicide is distributed primarily across West Oakland—bounded by the 580, 880, and 980/24 freeways—and Central Oakland—Lake Merritt to High St.

• In West Oakland, as indicated on the heat maps, this occurs mostly in Beats 02Y, 02X, 04X, 05X, 06X, 07X, and 08X. In Central Oakland, this occurs mostly in 17Y, 19X, 20X, 21X, 21Y, 23X, 24X, and 24Y.
Summary of Findings (2): Social Concentration

- There are approximately 50 violent groups in Oakland, with an estimated active membership of 1000 – 1200 people. This is approximately 0.3% of the entire city’s population.

- Of active groups in Oakland, at any one time, only a small subset of the groups are at highest risk of violence. During the review period, 18 groups citywide were associated with a majority of group-involved violence.
Summary of Findings (3): Criminal Justice System Involvement

• Approximately 70% victims and 90% of suspects have come into contact with the criminal justice system prior to the homicide incident.

• Homicide victims and suspects come into contact with the criminal justice system frequently and for a variety of offenses:
  - Arrested an average of 10 times prior to their homicide victimization or perpetration
  - Approximately 7 of all their arrests are felony arrests
  - Approximately 73% have been convicted of a felony
  - 76% - 80% have been on probation
  - Approximately 84% have been incarcerated
  - Have high averages of violent offenses, and also have high averages of other offenses, particularly drug and property.
Summary of Findings (4): Age Trends

• Serious violence is most concentrated among individuals ages 18-34
  ➢ 67% of all individuals involved in homicide (both victims and suspects)
  ➢ 66% of all homicide victims
  ➢ 69% of known homicide suspects
  ➢ 76.25% of homicide victims known to be group involved
  ➢ The average age of an individual involved in homicide is 29.15.
  ➢ The average age of victims is 30.25 and the average age of suspects is 26.36.
Summary Observations

The following summary observations are relevant to quality implementation of Oakland Ceasefire:

1. Risk of involvement in violence in Oakland tends to be highly concentrated among young men ages 18-34 that are involved in fluid and complicated but recognizable groups and networks.

2. These young men tend to come into contact with the criminal justice system frequently.

3. Making progress on reducing the risk these young men present to themselves and the community depends on making them a joint and sustained focus of the full range of Ceasefire partners.

4. Oakland has experienced especially high rates of violence for several decades. Continued progress will require intensive sustained effort.

5. Maintaining progress on violence reduction in East Oakland should be factored into any consideration of expanding full implementation of Ceasefire to other areas of Oakland.
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## Data Sources by Slide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slides</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Oakland Police Department; Bureau of Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reports</td>
<td>For the purposes of this analysis, we used UCR data when available. Data points 1969-1984 provided by OPD; Data points 1985-2012 are from UCR. There are slight differences in UCR vs OPD totals for certain years 1985 and later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Bureau of Justice Statistics, Uniform Crime Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>Oakland Police Department; California Department of Justice; U.S. Census Bureau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>California Department of Justice; Oakland Police Department; Parole LEADS</td>
<td>While there are consistent categorization principles that apply to criminal history coding, due to the volume of PC codes, variance among charges, and inconsistency of data entry across criminal histories, the coding process is an imperfect and subjective one. That said, the local process maximized accuracy by concentrating coding responsibilities within one trained analyst, and double-checking a random sample of both victim and suspect criminal histories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>Oakland Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-50</td>
<td>Oakland Police Department; Forensic Logic; City of Oakland Office of Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Further work to be done (1)

Note: the problem analysis is a living document; revisions and/or corrections are made regularly. Please contact Reygan Harmon, Ceasefire Project Manager, RHarmon@oaklandnet.com for the most up-to-date version.

1. Enhanced analytic capacity and routinization of analytic exercises are required to support interventions focused on violence:

   - Regular and frequent “real-time” review of violent incidents, the individuals involved in those incidents, and the groups & networks they may be part of is necessary to ensure the analysis is accurate, comprehensive and up-to-date. “Shooting reviews” are one key way to facilitate this.

   - The analysis of social networks of individuals at highest risk of violence is an important complement to this problem analysis. This “Social Network Analysis”, currently facilitated by Andrew Papachristos of Yale University under the auspices of the California Partnership for Safe Communities, should be completed.
Further work to be done (2)

2. As Realignment progresses, individuals at very highest risk of violence are increasingly likely to be under local supervision and/or in local custody. Both the problem analysis & shooting reviews should focus on opportunities for better understanding and reducing the risk of violence this population faces. This process would be a natural extension of the partnership-based violence reduction strategy work currently under way.

3. Anecdotal information suggests that the involvement of street groups in human trafficking and the violence associated with it has been underestimated. Understanding the relationship between human trafficking, street groups, and violence will benefit from further data collection and analysis.