

RACIAL INEQUITIES IN POLICE RESPONSES TO VICTIMS' NEEDS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Over the past 30 to 40 years, assessments of the criminal justice system have increasingly considered the victims of crime. Although the focus understandably remains on crimes committed, apprehending suspected perpetrators, and bringing criminal charges through the courts, public policy has emphasized the status of victims – understood not only as the persons injured by crime, but as vital participants in establishing justice following in the wake of their trauma.

In California, victims' rights are enshrined in the state constitution as Marsy's Law, approved by voters in 2008. Decades earlier, California created the nation's first victims compensation program, now administered by the California Victim Compensation Board (CalVCB). The board today is responsible for implementing a program designed not only to provide compensation to victims, but also for administering state law requiring liaisons with the police, outreach efforts to victims, and other related programs.

The grand jury examined several programs and policies dedicated to recognizing the role of victims in the administration of justice. Our specific focus, based on a complaint received from a concerned citizen, was on racial disparities in the ways support and assistance are provided to crime victims in Alameda County, and specifically in the City of Oakland. We investigated compliance with a state law requiring the police to designate a victim liaison officer, the racial dimensions of victim compensation award decisions, and the unsolved homicide rate in Oakland.

The grand jury found that the Oakland Police Department (OPD) has not generally provided the level of attention and support for victims contemplated by current law and policy. For example, OPD had failed to appoint a victim liaison officer, even though the role has been mandated by state law since 2019¹. Our investigation also found concerning racial inequities in the granting of awards of compensation to victims of crime, specifically involving the denials of awards based on a victim's "cooperativeness" with the police. When considered in the context of the extreme racial disparities in crime and crime victimization in Oakland, the general inattention to victims evidenced by our findings raises important questions of racial inequality in another aspect of the criminal justice system.

¹ The position was filled in April 2021.

BACKGROUND

The national focus on racial justice and policing that followed the murder of George Floyd in May 2020 struck a familiar chord with many residents of Alameda County. For years, the City of Oakland and its police department have been the subjects of a series of controversies involving accusations of police misconduct, including officer-involved shootings, racial profiling, and civil rights violations. Since 2003, the Oakland Police Department has operated under an independent monitor appointed by a federal judge, part of a negotiated settlement agreement mandating reforms that OPD has yet to fully implement. Efforts

to rebuild community trust have continued in the face of these challenges as city and police leaders cope with repeated confrontations and incidents, staff turnover, limited budgets, and political pressures. Notably, these controversies have been set against a backdrop of significant racial disparity in rates of crime and victimization evident across the city's neighborhoods. For example, of the 948 victims of Oakland homicides between 2008 and 2017, 38 were Asian, 53 were white, 147 were Latinx, and 691 were Black².

The grand jury sought to understand levels of racial disparity in serving the needs of crime victims and their families, particularly in the context of evident disparities in rates of crime and victimization in the City of Oakland.



Emergency Responders at an Oakland Crime Scene

Over this period, several studies and initiatives have examined and sought to improve OPD's practices and community relationships. Studies generated for OPD have aimed to improve how OPD provides information and services to victims of violent crimes and their families. In 2017, a partnership between the Urban Institute and the Urban Peace Institute was formed to review and assess OPD's response to shootings and homicides. Participants included family members of homicide victims, shooting survivors, officers and investigators who respond to shootings and homicide scenes. In part, the study found survivors and family members did not always perceive that they were treated fairly, or that OPD was transparent and impartial in its actions and decisions.

² Based on the most recent available data provided to the grand jury by OPD.

In January 2020, the University of California-Berkeley, School of Law published *Living with Impunity: Unsolved Murders in Oakland and the Human Rights Impact on Victims' Family Members* (UCB Report). The report chronicles how the families of 16 Oakland murder victims experienced police interactions as their unthinkable tragedies unfolded, and afterward. The UCB Report found OPD severely lacking in practices and policies critically needed to address crime victims and family members, and that these gaps create an additional level of racial injustice on communities of color already burdened by the highest rates of violence and victimization in the city. The report's authors recommend that OPD, together with city officials and victims' services providers, implement a series of collaborative actions centered on victims and their family members, and identify ways that police policies and methods can be changed to reduce, rather than exacerbate, challenges faced by crime victims, particularly in the areas of the city hardest hit by violent crime.

INVESTIGATION

The grand jury sought to understand levels of racial disparity in serving the needs of crime victims and their families, particularly in the context of evident disparities in rates of crime and victimization in the City of Oakland. In our investigation, we focused on the victim compensation component of the victim service programs in Oakland and Alameda County and the personnel responsible for delivering them. We wanted to learn how, when and from whom victims and their families receive information about services and benefits. In California, victim compensation and support programs are regulated by state law and implemented at the county level.

In Alameda County, victim services programs are administered by the District Attorney's Office Victim-Witness Assistance Program. This program includes a victim advocacy group which focuses on victims' needs and follow-up services, and a victim compensation claims group that focuses on processing claims for compensation to victims of violent crime based on state mandated guidelines. In this report, we refer to the victim compensation claims group as the "claims group." We focused our investigation on the racial disparities in compensation awards. We sought to understand the interdependency among agencies, the ways they share information, and how their practices impact crime victims. For example, we examined the interactions among crime victims, the claims group, and police departments when processing applications for compensation.



Lake Merritt, Oakland, CA

During our investigation we interviewed nine witnesses, including current and former officials of OPD, the City of Oakland, the Oakland Police Commission, the Alameda County Sheriff's Office and Coroner's Bureau, the District Attorney's Office Victim-Witness Assistance Program, and leading community organizations focused on victim services. We also examined relevant policies, records and public access websites of those and other county and municipal agencies, including several police departments, as well as statistical data obtained from the claims group on victim compensation awards relating to crimes in Alameda County since 2015. We reviewed the requirements and processes crime victims and family members must follow to request compensation, and the most common reasons for denying these requests. We consulted relevant provisions of the California Government Code and related regulations governing requirements for victim-police liaisons as well as victims' compensation. Finally, we reviewed research that may point the way to change, offering strategies to improve policing in ways specifically addressing victims' experiences, including the report of the Urban Institute/Urban Peace Institute and the UCB Report.

Issues Involving the Requirement for a Victim Liaison Officer



Oakland Street Sign

Recognizing the benefits that flow from an enhanced focus on victim support, California law requires every law enforcement agency in the state to help publicize and support victim compensation programs and services. State law also requires law enforcement agencies to designate a victims of crime liaison officer. This is a designated member of the police department, as distinct from staff of the District Attorney's Office who may be known as "victim liaisons." The liaison officer is required to implement various procedures designed to assist victims in applying for compensation and to obtain other support services. Regulations require police to notify all victims of crimes (or their dependents)

about victim assistance programs at the time of the crime or as soon as possible afterwards. The notice must be given in person or by email, or in conjunction with local victim-witness assistance centers. Regulations also require that new police officers must be informed by their superiors about victim services programs upon entering service, and that the program must be part of new officer training.

In addition to these state law requirements, OPD policies (General Orders O-07, effective November 10, 2000) include a directive defining the duties of a victims of violent crime liaison officer. These include a number of responsibilities consistent with the role required by state law. Much of the OPD directive mirrors that of the state-mandated position and appears intended to have a connection.

Although the designation of a victims of crime liaison officer has been mandatory under state law since January 1, 2019, OPD had not complied either with the state mandate or its own policy requirements until after the issue was raised by the grand jury in early 2021. At the time of their interviews, witnesses stated that OPD intended to fill the position and had received grant funding for it but were unsure when the role would be filled. Another witness said OPD previously maintained a liaison officer position that liaised with the District Attorney's Office, but that this position has not existed for the past ten years. Members of the District Attorney's Office who liaise with OPD in connection with the compensation applications they process from victims were not aware of a designated liaison officer at OPD prior to the recent hiring. In many cases, they primarily relied on non-sworn personnel to gather information from detectives in connection with victim requests for compensation. Witnesses who were candid about organizational strengths and weaknesses were often surprised to learn about legal requirements for the victim liaison officer.

Although the designation of a victims of crime liaison officer has been mandatory under state law since January 1, 2019, OPD had not complied either with the state mandate or its own policy requirements until after the issue was raised by the grand jury in early 2021.



Oakland Police Department

In a racially diverse city where the majority of victims of violent crime are Black, the failure to address all victims' rights and needs becomes a matter of racial justice. OPD has shown the organizational capacity to provide these kinds of resources in response to felt policing needs. For example, in early 2021, following several crimes in Oakland's Chinatown district, OPD Chief LeRonne Armstrong and Mayor Libby Schaaf announced the assignment of a liaison officer to the Chinatown neighborhood. At the same time, Chief Armstrong announced a liaison officer for the Fruitvale district in response to an increase in robberies and

homicides in that area. These recent events illustrate OPD's ability to assess a problem, allocate designated resources, and quickly execute a program to address community issues. Given this ability, it is unclear why a state-mandated position devoted to the same purposes went unfilled for over two years.

OPD must move quickly to embrace the victims of crime liaison officer position. In addition to complying with a state law and its own policy requirement, a liaison officer enables OPD to

take advantage of training and materials that the California Victim Compensation Board provides to every law enforcement agency annually.

Racial Disparities in Victim Compensation Denials

The claims group reimburses eligible victims of violent crimes for specified crime-related expenses. Reimbursable expenses include income loss, funeral and burial expenses, mental health counseling services, and relocation, among others. The program is funded by restitution payments and fines paid by criminal offenders, which are continually appropriated to the program, as well as federal funds. In 2019, the claims group granted approximately \$3.1 million in victim compensation to Alameda County residents (and non-county residents in connection with crimes that occurred in the county). Compensation awards average around \$1,000, and roughly \$2,000 on average for homicide-related claims. The maximum award payable for any claim is \$70,000.

To apply for financial assistance, claimants must file an application for victims of crime compensation. To qualify, requirements include:

- the crime must result in physical injury or a threat of injury to the victim;
- the crime must be reported to law enforcement;
- the victim/family must cooperate with law enforcement;
- the victim must not have contributed to the events which lead up to the crime; and
- the filing deadline is generally seven years from the date of the crime/incident.

The claims group evaluates the applicant's information (application, police report, and other pertinent documents) and will often assist the crime victim or family in getting their bills paid by their insurance company, worker's compensation or Medi-Cal. The average processing time based on data reviewed by the grand jury is approximately 72 days; state law requires a processing time of no more than 90 days on average and no more than 180 days for any individual application. After reviewing the applicant's information, a decision is made by the claims group to deny or pay the claim. Applications can be denied for one or more reasons, including if the review determines that the victim failed to reasonably cooperate with law enforcement or the claims group, or that the victim was involved in events leading to the crime.

Why are Compensation Requests Denied?

The grand jury reviewed statistical breakdowns of Alameda County applications for victim compensation received for the five-year period from 2015 through 2019, including applications in connection with homicides (*See Appendix A for detailed data breakdown*). Over the five-year period, Black applicants (based on voluntary self-identification on the application form) filed a total of 5,241 applications (34.6% of all such applications), compared

to 1,677 applications filed by white claimants (11.1% of the total). The data reveal several concerning disparities in the denial rates between Black and white applicants:

- Overall, Black applicants received 42.2% of all denials, whereas white applicants received 10.3%. Considered as a percentage of applications submitted by each racial group, 26.8% of Black applicants were denied compared to 20.3% of white applicants. Over the five-year period, the overall denial rates for Black applicants were consistently higher than for white applicants.
- Focusing on specific reasons for denials, Black crime victims and family members applying for compensation were more than twice as likely as white applicants to have their applications denied for “lack of cooperation with law enforcement” (9.8% of Black applicants denied for this reason compared to 4.7% of white applicants). Black applicants made up approximately 51.8% of all those denied funding for this reason, compared to 7.9% for white applicants.
- Similar disparities were observed in applications that were denied for “lack of cooperation” with the claims group. Black applicants were again more than twice as likely as white applicants to be denied for this reason (4.1% of Black applicants compared to 1.9% of white applicants). Black applicants made up approximately 51.4% of those denied for this reason, compared to about 7.6% for whites.
- Disparities were also observed in denials based on “involvement in events leading to the crime.” Black applicants were almost twice as likely as white applicants to be denied for this reason (7.1% of Black applicants compared to 3.9% of white applicants). Black applicants constituted approximately 49.7% of all applicants who were denied for this reason, compared to about 8.9% for white applicants.

“Lack of cooperation with law enforcement” and “involvement” denials are based to a greater extent on subjective judgments of law enforcement compared to other reasons for denial. As a result, there is a greater risk that overt and implicit bias will affect these determinations to the applicant’s detriment.

Factors Involved in “Cooperation” and “Involvement” Determinations

“Cooperation” and “involvement” denials stood out to the grand jury compared to other decisions and actions that do not reflect similar levels of disparity among racial groups. For example, Black applicants received 34.6% of all victim compensation awarded over the five-year period, commensurate with the percentage of all applications submitted by Black applicants (white applicants received 13.5% of funds awarded during the five-year period). Similarly, application processing times were on average roughly the same for Black and white

applicants, and application denials for “lack of preponderance of evidence” or for “not covered crime” were likewise roughly similar for Black and white applicants.

The more significant disparities in compensation denials based on “lack of cooperation” and “involvement” indicate these specific reasons are the primary causes of the overall racially disparate outcomes in victim compensation award decisions. Hence, the grand jury sought to understand the basis for these determinations and concluded that several factors may play a role.

- First, the claims group relies on information provided by law enforcement to determine whether an applicant “reasonably cooperated” with law enforcement or was involved in events leading to the crime. In the application process there is generally little or no opportunity for the applicant or victim to provide information relevant to these determinations.
- Second, as a matter of practice, the claims group does not take responsibility to resolve (nor does the claims group appear responsible for resolving) disagreements or misunderstandings between applicants and law enforcement on questions of “cooperativeness.” This is even though, under state law, the claims group is responsible for objectively establishing the reason for denying an application. An applicant may not be aware of an “uncooperativeness” determination until a denial decision has been made. At that point, the victim’s only recourse is to appeal within 45 days of the denial. However, the appeal process will generally not revisit the basis for the original denial unless the victim can successfully introduce new evidence in support of his or her original “cooperativeness.” If applicants disagree with information provided by police that led to an uncooperativeness denial, the claims group personnel generally do not weigh in on the question. To the extent there is already a lack of trust between communities of color and the police, this approach is unlikely to resolve errors, misunderstandings or misplaced assumptions underlying police conclusions about cooperativeness or involvement.
- Third, “lack of cooperation with law enforcement” and “involvement” denials are based to a greater extent on subjective judgments of law enforcement compared to other reasons for denial. As a result, there is a greater risk that overt and implicit bias will affect these determinations to the applicant’s detriment. The grand jury consulted with a local expert knowledgeable about OPD’s practices as well as victims’ experiences. This

Greater emphasis by OPD and city officials on the programs mentioned in this report may lead not only to improved compliance with state mandates and progressive policing practices, but may also improve traditional measures of law enforcement performance.

witness stated that a police officer's conclusion that a victim or family member is uncooperative necessarily attributes a state of mind to the person, which is more likely to reflect overt or implicit biases on the part of the person drawing the conclusion. Individual racial bias (including overt prejudice as well as implicit bias) and systemic racial bias are more likely to be reflected in such subjective determinations, as compared to more objective reasons for denying victim compensation claims, such as filing an untimely application or claiming compensation for a crime that is not covered by the program. Further analysis is needed on the specific methods and language used by police to understand the effects of overt, implicit, and systemic bias on law enforcement determinations of cooperativeness and involvement.

- Finally, state law requires that several mitigating factors must be considered when reaching conclusions about the reasonableness of a victim or family member's cooperation. These factors include the victim or family member's age, physical condition, psychological state, cultural or linguistic barriers and any compelling safety concerns, such as the victim's fear of retaliation. Under the state statute, due consideration must be given to the degree of cooperation that the victim is capable of, in light of the presence of any of these factors. It is unlikely that information provided by law enforcement, which strongly influences cooperation determinations, adequately reflect these required considerations. To the contrary, one witness reported the experience of an OPD officer questioning a shooting victim soon after the crime. The victim was on a hospital gurney in the hospital emergency room. In physical distress from the shooting as well as intoxicated, the victim was unwilling to speak to the officer. The witness reported that such events can often lead to determinations of uncooperativeness, pointing to the need for more awareness training for law enforcement.

Victims Compensation Group Awareness of Disparity Issues

The grand jury learned that the claims group has been aware of the disparities discussed above for some time but has not yet determined the specific reasons for the disparities or any actions in response. The grand jury is not aware of any actions that have been taken or that are planned to address the concerns evident from the data.

Resource Notification Issues

Under a state law known as Marsy's Law, police are required to notify victims or their families of the existence of victim-witness assistance centers. In addition, according to OPD's Departmental General Order O-07, a resource card must be issued to all victims of violent crime. Based on the description in General Order O-07, we believe the resource card contains the information required by Marsy's Law. Based on witness testimony, the grand jury was not

able to confirm that OPD documents comply with the requirement to provide the Marsy’s Law/resource card.

According to the CalVCB website, “many law enforcement officers are not aware of the Victim Compensation Program or their duty to inform victims of the compensation assistance available to them.” The grand jury reviewed claims group application data that tend to support this belief. For example, only 16.9% of referrals come from sources associated with law enforcement, whereas 38.4% are from other or unspecified sources. The low percentage of referrals from law enforcement suggests police could play a more effective role in enhancing awareness of resources. As an example, CalVCB developed a three-minute video providing an overview of the program to enhance police understanding and awareness.

Unsolved Homicide Closure Rates

Based on witness testimony, there are between 2,000 and 2,500 unsolved homicide cases in OPD’s files. The grand jury reviewed homicide data provided by OPD for the ten-year period from 2008 through 2017, the last year for which comparative data were available. During that period, there were a total of 948 homicides in Oakland, 441 (47%) which were solved (documented as closed) and 507 (53%) of which remained open at the end of the period. The grand jury sought to understand possible racial disparities in the closure rates of these cases. The table below shows the results of our review:

Race/ Ethnicity of Victim	Number of Homicides (2008-2017)		Cases Closed by End of 2017		Cases Open at End of 2017		Case Closure Rate
	N	% of Total	N	% of Total	N	% of Total	%
Asian	38	4.0%	28	6.3%	10	2.0%	73.7%
Black	691	72.9%	286	64.9%	405	79.9%	41.4%
Latinx	147	15.5%	72	16.3%	75	14.8%	49.0%
Native American	1	0.1%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Pacific Islander	4	0.4%	3	0.7%	1	0.2%	75.0%
Other	14	1.5%	8	1.8%	6	1.2%	57.1%
White	53	5.6%	43	9.8%	10	2.0%	81.1%
Total	948		441		507		46.5%

Most apparent from the data we reviewed are the extreme racial disparities in crime victimization in Oakland already discussed in previous parts of this report. Almost 90% of homicide victims over the period were Black or Latinx (annual figures are consistent with this

figure, ranging from 79% to 93% with a median of 90%). Moreover, while the data show obvious racial disparities in case closure rates, focusing solely on case closures misses other important aspects evident in the data. For example, although the case closure rates for Black homicide victims is the lowest among the groups tracked by the data, because there are so many Black homicides, OPD solves many more Black than white homicides every year—almost seven times as many over the 10-year period. At the same time, when looking through each figure in the open case column, and thinking of the families behind each homicide statistic, the extreme racial disparity among families left without answers is clear.

Seen from the victim and victim-family perspective, the low closure rate for Black homicides—in the context of extreme disparity in victimization to begin with—reveals a dire need for additional victim support and services from OPD, and a greater focus on racial equity in the delivery of those services. It seems clear that virtually any effort to improve the level of support for victims in the Oakland communities hardest hit by violent crime will result in improved community relationships and the prospect of higher closure rates.

OPD’s User-Unfriendly Public Access Website

During our investigation, while researching information online at OPD’s website, the grand jury consulted websites of police departments throughout Alameda County to research their policies and procedures. Like most police departments, OPD posts its policies and procedures online. However, the website’s organization and search tools make it difficult to locate policies, practices, and procedures. Since 2000, state law (Penal Code § 13650) has required that police departments “conspicuously post on their internet web sites all current standards, policies, practices, operating procedures, and education and training materials.” Moreover, according to state law, making police policies and regulations easily accessible to the public “helps educate the public about law enforcement policies, practices, and procedures, increases communication and community trust, and enhances transparency, while saving costs and labor associated with responding to individual requests for this information.”

One witness explained that the posting of OPD policies and procedures is under the control of the City of Oakland as part of its overall city website, and that OPD itself has no capability of modifying or restructuring that website. The grand jury found this explanation unsatisfactory given that, internally, OPD has access to IT systems that enable staff to easily search department policy and procedures and related documents.

CONCLUSION

The legitimacy of any system of justice relies on broad public support. The “quality” or “effectiveness” of the justice system is traditionally understood in terms of crimes and punishments. The focus is on apprehending perpetrators and holding them accountable for the consequences of their wrongful acts. These are legitimate concerns of course, but the

traditional perspective tends to overlook the victims of crimes—understood not only as persons injured or damaged by criminal conduct, but also as key participants in the establishment and maintenance of justice in our communities.

As with the justice system generally, assessments of police policy and conduct—including assessments of overt or systemic racial bias and inequity in law enforcement—must remember the victims. Further research is needed into the reasons for the disparate rates of cooperativeness and involvement denials for victim compensation. Greater emphasis by OPD and city officials on the programs mentioned in this report may lead not only to improved compliance with state mandates and progressive policing practices, but may also improve traditional measures of law enforcement performance, such as arrest and closure rates. Attention to these issues as part of a broader effort to address racial equity in law enforcement would likely improve community support for the police and would be an important step in improving fairness and equality in the criminal justice system.

FINDINGS

Finding 21-10:

The Oakland Police Department failed to fill the victims of crime liaison officer in accordance with Cal. Gov. Code § 13962(c) and 2 CCR § 649.36 and by OPD’s own general orders, in a timely fashion, causing lost opportunity for the victims of violent crime to obtain needed support. The Oakland Police Department was aware of the directive and in April 2021 complied with the requirement.

Finding 21-11:

Failing to have a victims of crime liaison officer for years, the Oakland Police Department missed out on relevant and available training mandated by Cal. Gov. Code sec. [13962(d).]

Finding 21-12:

Racial disparities exist in the number of applications for crime victim compensation that are denied for lack of cooperation with law enforcement, lack of cooperation with the claims group, and involvement in events leading to crimes. Black applicants receive a disproportionate number of denials for these reasons compared to applicants in other racial/ethnic categories.

Finding 21-13:

The claims group relies on information from law enforcement as the basis of their determinations that an applicant or victim has failed to cooperate or was involved in events leading to crimes.

Finding 21-14:

Determinations about cooperativeness and involvement include subjective judgments on the part of police and other law enforcement personnel that could lead to a denial of victim compensation funds, and consequently are relatively more likely to be influenced by overt or implicit bias, among other factors.

Finding 21-15:

The Oakland Police Department's website is maintained in an opaque fashion with no provision for globally searching for any particular policy or procedure.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 21-10:

The Oakland Police Department must fulfill the expectations of the victims of crime liaison officer role immediately, while providing the contact information to the Victim-Witness Assistance Division and related public sector partner organizations who focus on victim advocacy and victim compensation programs.

Recommendation 21-11:

The Oakland Police Department must enhance awareness and training of officers and other personnel in victim support, particularly in areas of the city with the highest rates of violent crime.

Recommendation 21-12:

The Oakland Police Department must work with the Victim-Witness Assistance Division to investigate the causes of racially disparate outcomes in compensation award decisions, specifically the policies, procedures, methods and language used by law enforcement to communicate with the claims group and victim compensation decisions.

Recommendation 21-13:

The Oakland Police Department must require all personnel involved in sharing information with the Victim-Witness Assistance Division to undergo periodic training, with the goal of increasing awareness of the California Victim Compensation Board programs, increasing awareness of the duty of law enforcement to inform victims of the compensation assistance available to them, and minimizing the incidence of racially disparate outcomes in victim compensation award decisions.

Recommendation 21-14:

The Oakland Police Department must ensure that the victim of crime liaison officer receives and disseminates available training materials provided in accordance with Cal. Gov. Code sec. 13962(d).

Recommendation 21-15:

The Oakland Police Department must review and ensure compliance with legal requirements, policies and methodologies used to document the issuance of the Marsy’s Law/resource card.

Recommendation 21-16:

The Oakland Police Department and the City of Oakland, to the extent applicable, must post its policies and procedures on the City of Oakland’s website in such a manner that it is globally searchable and user friendly.

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES

Pursuant to California Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05, the grand jury requests each entity or individual named below to respond to the enumerated Findings and Recommendations within specific statutory guidelines, no later than 90 days from the public release date of this report.

Responses to Findings shall be either:

- Agree
- Disagree Wholly, with an explanation
- Disagree Partially, with an explanation

Responses to Recommendations shall be one the following:

- Has been implemented, with a brief summary of the implementation actions
- Will be implemented, with an implementation schedule
- Requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a completion date that is not more than 6 months after the issuance of this report
- Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation

RESPONSES REQUIRED

Oakland Police Department

Findings 21-10 through 21-15

Recommendations 21-10 through 21-16

APPENDIX A

Applications Received for Victim Compensation and Reasons for Denying Applications

<i>Claims Received by Race/Ethnicity</i>	<u>All applications received (All Alameda Co., 2015-2019)</u>		<u>Denied, any reason</u>		
	N	% of total N	N	% of total N	% of subgroup's applications
American Indian/Alaska Native	100	0.7%	22	0.7%	22.0%
Asian	799	5.3%	136	4.1%	17.0%
Black/African American	5,241	34.6%	1,405	42.2%	26.8%
Hispanic or Latino	5,242	34.6%	994	29.9%	19.0%
Multiple Races	175	1.2%	39	1.2%	22.3%
Native Hawaiian and Other PI	29	0.2%	5	0.2%	17.2%
Not Reported	1,654	10.9%	328	9.9%	19.8%
Some Other Race	223	1.5%	56	1.7%	25.1%
White Non-Latino/Caucasian	1,677	11.1%	341	10.3%	20.3%
TOTAL	15,140	100.0%	3,326	100.0%	22.0%

<i>Claims Received by Race/Ethnicity</i>	<u>Denied, lack of cooperation with Claims Group</u>			<u>Denied, lack of cooperation with law enforcement</u>		
	N	% of total N	% of subgroup's applications	N	% of total N	% of subgroup's applications
American Indian/Alaska Native	6	1.4%	6.0%	8	0.8%	8.0%
Asian	19	4.5%	2.4%	44	4.4%	5.5%
Black/African American	217	51.4%	4.1%	516	51.8%	9.8%
Hispanic or Latino	112	26.5%	2.1%	269	27.0%	5.1%
Multiple Races	6	1.4%	3.4%	12	1.2%	6.9%
Native Hawaiian and Other PI		0.0%	0.0%	1	0.1%	3.4%
Not Reported	23	5.5%	1.4%	54	5.4%	3.3%
Some Other Race	7	1.7%	3.1%	13	1.3%	5.8%
White Non-Latino/Caucasian	32	7.6%	1.9%	79	7.9%	4.7%
TOTAL	422	100.0%	2.8%	996	100.0%	6.6%

<i>Claims Received by Race/Ethnicity</i>	<u>Denied, involvement in crime</u>		
	N	% of total N	% of subgroup's applications
American Indian/Alaska Native	5	0.7%	5.0%
Asian	32	4.3%	4.0%
Black/African American	370	49.7%	7.1%
Hispanic or Latino	190	25.5%	3.6%
Multiple Races	8	1.1%	4.6%
Native Hawaiian and Other PI	1	0.1%	3.4%
Not Reported	61	8.2%	3.7%
Some Other Race	12	1.6%	5.4%
White Non-Latino/Caucasian	66	8.9%	3.9%
TOTAL	745	100.0%	4.9%

Claims Received by Race/Ethnicity	Denied, not covered crime			Denied, late		
	N	% of total N	% of subgroup's applications	N	% of total N	% of subgroup's applications
American Indian/Alaska Native	6	0.5%	6.0%	1	1.2%	1.0%
Asian	55	4.6%	6.9%	5	5.9%	0.6%
Black/African American	445	37.4%	8.5%	28	32.9%	0.5%
Hispanic or Latino	377	31.7%	7.2%	35	41.2%	0.7%
Multiple Races	12	1.0%	6.9%	8	9.4%	4.6%
Native Hawaiian and Other PI	1	0.1%	3.4%	1	1.2%	3.4%
Not Reported	144	12.1%	8.7%	7	8.2%	0.4%
Some Other Race	21	1.8%	9.4%		0.0%	0.0%
White Non-Latino/Caucasian	129	10.8%	7.7%		0.0%	0.0%
TOTAL	1,190	100.0%	7.9%	85	100.0%	0.6%

Claims Received by Race/Ethnicity	Denied, lack of preponderance of evidence			Denied, Residency		
	N	% of total N	% of subgroup's applications	N	% of total N	% of subgroup's applications
American Indian/Alaska Native	14	0.8%	14.0%	14	66.7%	14.0%
Asian	75	4.1%	9.4%			0.0%
Black/African American	711	38.9%	13.6%			0.0%
Hispanic or Latino	582	31.8%	11.1%	5	23.8%	0.1%
Multiple Races	26	1.4%	14.9%	1	4.8%	0.6%
Native Hawaiian and Other PI	3	0.2%	10.3%			0.0%
Not Reported	181	9.9%	10.9%	1	4.8%	0.1%
Some Other Race	33	1.8%	14.8%			0.0%
White Non-Latino/Caucasian	203	11.1%	12.1%			0.0%
TOTAL	1,828	100.0%	12.1%	21	100.0%	0.1%