



MEMORANDUM

TO: James P. Beere,
Interim Chief of Police

FROM: Omar Daza-Quiroz, A/Deputy Chief
OPD, Bureau of Investigations

SUBJECT: OPD Crime Lab Biometrics
DNA Analysis Technology
2025 Annual Report

DATE: April 2026

Background

Oakland Municipal Code (OMC) 9.64.040: Surveillance Technology “Oversight following City Council approval” requires that for approved surveillance technology items (by the Privacy Advisory Commission per OMC 9.64.020 and by City Council per OMC 9.64.030), city staff must present a written annual surveillance report for Privacy Advisory Commission (PAC). OMC 9.64.040 requires that, after City Council approval of surveillance technology, OPD provide an annual report for PAC review before submitting to City Council. After review by the PAC, the PAC shall make a recommendation to the City Council that considers and articulates:

- The benefits to the community of the surveillance technology outweigh the costs and that civil liberties and civil rights are safeguarded; or
- Reasons that use of the surveillance technology cease; or
- Proposed modifications to the corresponding surveillance use policy that will resolve any concerns.

Legislative History

The PAC recommended City Council adoption of the “Oakland Police Department (OPD) Criminalistics Laboratory DNA Instrumentation and Analysis Software Biometric Technology Use Policy on October 1, 2020; following the PAC’s vote, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 88388 C.M.S. on December 1, 2020. This resolution approved OPD’s use of Criminalistics Laboratory DNA Instrumentation and Analysis Software Biometric Technology. An updated Biometric Technology Use Policy and Impact Report were approved along with the required annual report adopted under:

- Resolution No. 89458 C.M.S. filed October 20, 2022
- Resolution No. 89931 C.M.S. filed September 14, 2023
- Resolution No. 90365 C.M.S. filed June 26, 2024

This memorandum is intended to serve and comply with the annual reporting mandate.

2025 Data Details

- A. A description of how the surveillance technology was used, including the type and quantity of data gathered or analyzed by the technology:

General Overview

The Oakland Police Department (OPD) Criminalistics Laboratory's (Crime Lab) Forensic Biology/DNA unit utilizes specialized DNA collection and analysis instrumentation and software to perform forensic DNA testing. During this lengthy and complicated process, one step removes and purifies DNA from cells (digestion/extraction), another quantitates how much DNA is present and lastly, by amplifying and analyzing Short Tandem Repeats (STR) in the DNA using Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) and separated by Capillary Electrophoresis (CE), forensic DNA profiles are generated. Software is involved in the following processes: (i) collection and processing of STR DNA fragment data; (ii) interpretation of DNA data into DNA profiles used for comparison purposes. At the end of all processes, a determination can be made as to whether a DNA sample collected from a crime scene can be associated with a known individual through a comparison of evidentiary (crime scene) and known reference DNA profiles. Statistical weight is provided for all inclusion comparisons.

Specifics: How DNA testing was used in 2025

The Forensic Biology Unit analyzed 414 requests between January 1, 2025 to December 31, 2025. Over 2165 items of evidence were examined, from which 5153 samples were subjected to digestion and extraction using the Versa and EZ1/2 instruments. Scientist subjected 5199 samples to quantitation analysis using the SpeedVac, Qiagility, and QuantStudio 5 instruments and 1908 samples were subjected to amplification and typing methods using the ProFlex and 3500 instruments. The DNA profiles were processed with FaSTR and ArmedXpert software.

- B. Whether and how often data acquired through the use of the surveillance technology was shared with outside entities, the name of any recipient entity, the type(s) of data disclosed, under what legal standard(s) the information was disclosed, and the justification for the disclosure(s):

Discovery to the Alameda County District Attorney's Office was provided in 43 cases. A standard discovery packet includes the reports, technical and administrative review sheets, case notes, attachments, contact log, resume, interpretation guidelines, photographs, electronic data, and any supporting documents.

- C. Where applicable, a breakdown of what physical objects the surveillance technology hardware was installed upon; using general descriptive terms so as not to reveal the specific location of such hardware; for surveillance technology software, a breakdown of what data sources the surveillance technology was applied to:

The Biometric Use Policy covers the specific technology covered. In general, the digestion, quantitation, normalization/amplification, typing, interpretation and databasing are housed in the laboratory of the Police Administration Building (PAB). Database equipment is located in a secure location elsewhere in the PAB as disclosed in the Use Policy. Currently, no equipment resides outside of these locations.

D. Where applicable, a breakdown of where the surveillance technology was deployed geographically, by each police area in the relevant year:

All evidence was analyzed at the laboratory located in the PAB. No other locations are authorized. The laboratory services crimes that occur in all areas of the City of Oakland.

E. A summary of community complaints or concerns about the surveillance technology, and an analysis of the technology's adopted use policy and whether it is adequate in protecting civil rights and civil liberties. The analysis shall also identify the race of each person that was subject to the technology's use. The Privacy Advisory Commission may waive this requirement upon making a determination that the probative value in gathering this information to evaluate the technology's impact on privacy interests is outweighed by the City's administrative burden in collecting or verifying this information and the potential greater invasiveness in capturing such data. If the Privacy Advisory Commission makes such a determination, written findings in support of the determination shall be included in the annual report submitted for City Council review:

No community complaints or concerns were communicated to staff. The laboratory did not receive any complaints through its feedback process.

The laboratory request for services form does not collect race information. It could be argued that requiring information that is not necessary for analysis, such as race, could be biasing; indeed, it would be a great invasion of privacy to capture this data since it is irrelevant to the analyses performed. Furthermore, the race of individuals subject to the DNA analysis technology's use is not revealed during evaluation of evidence as non-coding regions of DNA are typed and do not contain this information. Therefore, staff recommends that the PAC waive the requirement to identify the race of each person subject to the technology's use and make a determination that the probative value in gathering this information to evaluate the technology's impact on privacy interests is outweighed by the potential greater invasiveness in capturing such data.

F. The results of any internal audits, any information about violations or potential violations of the Surveillance Use Policy (SUP), and any actions taken in response unless the release of such information is prohibited by law, including but not limited to confidential personnel file information:

All Forensic Biology personnel and relevant management were required to review and sign that they understood and would abide by the Surveillance Use Policy and the Impact Reports. Under accreditation, the Laboratory actively seeks feedback from its customers and no concerns were conveyed regarding violations or concerns around the SUP. Lastly, the Laboratory has a means to identify risks through Incident Response. Staff are encouraged to participate in Incident Response by filing Incident Alerts where there were concerns. No violations or potential violations were identified by any of these routes.

G. Information about any data breaches or other unauthorized access to the data collected by the surveillance technology, including information about the scope of the breach and the actions taken in response:

The laboratory maintains an active security program where the security of alarmed portions of the laboratory are tested and results recorded. There were no unexplained alarm events and there were no faults in the alarmed systems that were tested. There were no breaches to the laboratory space nor to the physical equipment that it houses.

The CODIS server is on a dedicated intranet line that uses encryption on both the sender and receiver ends of any communication from/to the server. There was no indication of security lapses in this system.

H. Information, including crime statistics, that helps the community assess whether the surveillance technology has been effective at achieving its identified purposes:

The efficacy of the OPD Criminalistics Laboratory DNA analysis program is illustrated by citing the following compelling statistics:

The laboratory completed 414 requests in 2025. These are further broken out by crime type in Table 1 below

Table 1: OPD Crime Laboratory DNA Analysis Requests in 2025

Crime Type	Number of Requests
Homicide/ Attempted Homicide	97
Sexual Assault/Kidnapping	208
Assault/Other Criminal	29
Robbery/Burglary/Auto Theft	17
Hit and run/Carjacking	20
Weapons	42
Cold Case (prior to 2008)	1
Total	414

CODIS hits in 2025 – One hundred twenty-two DNA profiles were uploaded to the CODIS database. The laboratory had 239 associations (hits); 66 hits to named individuals whose identity were unknown, four hits to unsolved forensic cases, and 58 hits to previously solved forensic cases.

Thus, forensic DNA analysis is an important tool to investigate and provide potential leads for a variety of crimes that occur in the City of Oakland.

I. Statistics and information about public records act requests regarding the relevant subject surveillance technology, including response rates:

There were no public record requests for DNA cases in 2025.

J. Total annual costs for the surveillance technology, including personnel and other ongoing costs, and what source of funding will fund the technology in the coming year:

Procurement of instruments is costly and is typically amortized over many budget cycles. Ongoing maintenance is imperative to ensure reliability of the instruments is remediated quickly should a problem occur. The reagents/kits and supplies to conduct testing are also steep.

The primary funding source for annual maintenance are federal grants; however, when grant funding falls short general funds are utilized. The total costs of procuring and maintaining the equipment are shown by Category of testing and platform below:

Digestion/Extraction

- EZ1: \$63,000 to purchase and \$5,570 annual maintenance
- EZ2: \$61,250 to purchase (x2 instruments = \$122,500) and \$6,774 to maintain; 2 instruments for \$13,548 annual maintenance
- Versa 1100: \$85,000 to purchase and \$12,000 annual maintenance

Liquid Handler

- Qiagility: \$33,100 to purchase (x3 instruments = \$99,300) and \$6,492 to maintain; 3 instruments for \$19,476 annual maintenance
- Hamilton STARlet: \$108,000 to purchase (x2 instruments = \$216,000) and \$14,339 annual maintenance (\$11,213 for full year for 1 instrument and \$3,126 prorated for the 2nd instrument)

DNA Quantitation

- QuantStudio 5: \$57,000 to purchase (x2 instruments = \$114,000) and \$7,530 to maintain; 2 instruments for \$15,060 annual maintenance

DNA Normalization / Amplification

SpeedVac: \$4,000 to purchase, no maintenance

ProFlex Thermalcyclers: \$14,000 to purchase (x2 instruments = \$28,000), no maintenance

DNA Typing

3500: \$135,000 to purchase, \$13,900 annual maintenance

DNA Interpretation

STRmix: \$66,000 to upgrade, \$24,970 annual maintenance

FaSTR: \$37,000 to purchase, \$8,750 annual maintenance

ArmedExpert: \$15,000 to purchase, no maintenance

The cost of testing reagents/kits was approximately \$210,000, however, this does not include consumables such as scalpels, masks, gloves, plastics, slides nor serological test kits.

Total purchase cost (born over several years): \$1,110,800

Total maintenance cost, 2025: \$127,613

Total testing cost reagents/kits, 2025: \$210,000
Estimate of consumables: \$150,000

K. Any requested modifications to the Surveillance Use Policy and a detailed basis for the request:

The 2024-approved Surveillance Impact Report (SIR) and Biometric Technology Use Policy (SUP) were reviewed. There are no requests to substantively modify the SIR outside of placing the annual cost updates into an Appendix.

OPD is committed to providing the best services to our community while being transparent and instilling procedural justice through daily police activity. This report is compliance with these OPD commitments. OPD hopes that this report helps to strengthen our trust within the Oakland community.

For any questions with this report, please contact, Criminalistics Laboratory Manager, at opdcrimelab@oaklandca.gov.

Reviewed by:
Omar Dara-Quiroz, A/Deputy Chief
OPD, Bureau of Investigations

Tracey Jones, Police Services Manager
OPD, BRM, Research and Planning

Prepared by:
Bonnie Cheng, A/Crime Lab Manager
Forensic Biology Unit Supervisor
OPD, Criminalistics Laboratory

Rebecca Jewett, Forensic Biology Unit Technical Leader
OPD, Criminalistics Laboratory