

OCTOBER 4, 2006

REGULAR MEETING

The Police Commission of the City and County of San Francisco met in Room 421, City Hall, #1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, at 12:14 p.m., in Closed Session.

PRESENT: Commissioner Renne, Campos, DeJesus, Lee, Marshall, Sparks, Veronese

PUBLIC COMMENT ON ALL MATTER PERTAINING TO CLOSED SESSION

Carl Olsen, Attorney for SF Chronicle, stated the decision, footnote 27, does draw a distinction between a right to attend hearings and the records of completed hearings. Mr. Olsen stated it expresses no opinion regarding whether *Copley* has a constitutional right to attend hearings. Mr. Olsen stated that until and unless there is an explicit ruling saying that the public and press cannot attend Commission hearings, those hearings should be open.

Commissioner Renne asked what to do with the provision of the Police Officers Bill of Rights that establishes fines for violations of the Police Officers Bill of Rights. Mr. Olsen stated that the section cited in the letter, which is 33.5(E), states that upon a finding that a public safety department maliciously violate any provision of this chapter with the intent to injure the public safety officers, the public safety department shall be liable for civil penalty not to exceed \$25,000. Mr. Olsen stated that he cannot imagine any judge in the City and County finding that the Commission would have acted maliciously if it continued to hold open hearings and if it interpreted something that was expressly left open by the *Copley Press* decision.

Commissioner Campos asked if the transcript would be confidential under *Copley*. Mr. Olsen stated he does not think so.

Commissioner DeJesus asked if the reach of *Copley* takes records that were meant to be public and kind of implies that they are no longer public if they are part of the disciplinary hearing. Mr. Olsen stated that he sees it as an interpretation of 832.7 and 832.8 which are the Pitches Statutes in the Penal Code.

VOTE ON WHETHER TO HOLD CLOSED SESSION

Motion by Commissioner Marshall, second by Commissioner Veronese to hold Closed Session. Approved 7-0.

CLOSED SESSION

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - Anticipated Litigation
Discussion of Supreme Court's decision in *Copley Press, Inc. v. Superior Court of San Diego County*, No. S128603

PUBLIC COMMENT: regarding foot patrol

Edna James asked that the Commission takes the foot patrol into consideration and asked that the Commission go to the community.

(The Commission reconvened to open session at 2:44 p.m.)

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION FOR FINAL ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION URGING THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND THE MAYOR TO PETITION THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE TO AMEND STATE LAW

Continued to later for public comment.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION FOR A DEPARTMENT

GENERAL ORDER CONCERNING COMMUNITY POLICING, INCLUDING ESTABLISHING POLICY, PROCEDURES, AND AREAS FOR FOOT PATROLS

Commissioner Renne gave the Commission copies of a draft of a general order and a Housing Authority resolution for their review. Commissioner Renne explained that the background is the legislation before the Board of Supervisors, virtually every supervisors is saying how many beat patrols they want, where the routes are, et cetera, and it is virtually impossible for the Department to follow that. Commissioner Renne stated that if the Commission would consider a general order insuring the importance of foot patrols, what the Commission is going to look for to have followed, that might be a direction the Commission might want to go. She also stated that on the Housing Authority, the Chief and the Housing Authority have a resolution adopted about a year ago but now there may be more money for foot patrols in the Housing Authority. She suggested having the Chief and the Housing Authority go back to the Commission with a plan and possibly having a joint Housing Authority/Police Commission hearing to talk about how it can be coordinated.

Commissioner Sparks asked about the Commission adopting a general order specifically foot beat patrols as opposed to an overall general order on community policing.

Commissioner Renne stated that there three ways that the Commission can go. First is a general order on community policing; second is a foot beat patrol general order; and, third instead of having this in the form of a general order, it could simply by a field operations order or statement of policy.

Commissioner Sparks asked Deputy City Attorney Molly Stump about something in the Charter that talks about all new officers shall be directed into community policing or something like that. Deputy City Attorney Stump stated that the reference that Commissioner Sparks is thinking of is the reference to foot patrol.

Commissioner Sparks asked how do the Commission deal with that since there is already a reference in the Charter about foot patrols. Ms. Stump stated that what is being proposed is a more detailed policy statement about how foot patrols are to be done and what considerations are to be reviewed in determining where they are to be set up and how to staff them and it is not inconsistent with the Charter.

Commissioner Renne stated that the Commission should have a chapter devoted to community policing of which foot patrols would be one part.

Commissioner Renne also talked about district boundaries. Commissioner Sparks asked if the Commission should have some type of public hearing on the district boundaries and, as part of that, discuss foot patrols.

Commissioner Renne stated that there has been no discussion about foot patrol and it was simply a question of a pilot project. But now the discussion in the community and the Board of Supervisors has moved beyond that to issue of what foot patrol beats should be on every single district and the more pressing question that needs to be addressed is how to do all of these and not adversely impact response time. Commissioner Renne stated that hopefully when this item is discussed tonight that there will be maps showing what is being done now, with the increase overtime, the additional foot patrols that are in Bayview, Western Addition, and Mission, and if there can be additional officers, how they can be utilized.

Commissioner Sparks asked Commissioner Renne if she is saying that in order to provide the foot patrols as suggested by the Board of Supervisors, the Department would have to increase overtime. Commissioner Renne stated

that to continue it, yes.

Commissioner Sparks asked Deputy Chief Shinn if he made the statement that by instituting this particular policy by the Board of Supervisors, it would impact response time, i.e. public safety. Deputy Chief Shinn stated that yes, he did make that statement. Commissioner Sparks stated that she would like the Department to elaborate on that statement and to possibly look at where non-essential services could either be decreased or eliminated so that those officers can be directed into these foot patrols such that the public safety is not impacted because of the foot patrols.

Deputy Chief Shinn explained that 33 additional officers is an incorrect number. Chief Shinn explained that if you are in a high-crime area walking that beat, there usually are two officers walking that beat. So that is four officers to walk that shift, additional four officers to cover during the days off to walk that shift, eight officers per station times 10 stations so that is about 80 additional officers.

Commissioner Sparks stated that talking to the supervisors, this legislation is going to pass and she suggested that maybe the Commission should be talking about how to implement.

Commissioner Renne stated that the Commission will have a full discussion about foot patrol at about 6:00.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETINGS OF SEPTEMBER 13TH AND 20, 2006

Taken out of order.

Motion by Commissioner Campos, second by Commissioner Marshall.
Approved 7-0.

COMMISSION ANNOUNCEMENTS

Taken out of order.

- a. **Assignment of disciplinary case no. C06-131 SL to an individual Commissioner for the taking of evidence on a date to be determined by the Commissioner.**
Assigned to Commissioner David Campos.
- b. **Assignment of disciplinary case no. C06-132 SL to an individual Commissioner for the taking of evidence on a date to be determined by the Commissioner.**
Assigned to Commissioner Petra DeJesus.
- c. **Assignment of disciplinary case no. C05-094 JCT to an individual Commissioner for the taking of evidence on a date to be determined by the Commissioner.**
Assigned to Commissioner Yvonne Lee.

SCHEDULING OF ITEMS IDENTIFIED FOR CONSIDERATION AT FUTURE COMMISSION MEETINGS

Commissioner DeJesus asked that the Language DGO be placed back on the calendar. Chief Fong explained that a department bulletin has been issued.

Commissioner Sparks asked that the public hearing for placement of cameras be agendized.

Commissioner Veronese asked for an update regarding collapsible batons.

Sergeant Reilly stated that the Juvenile DGO and the Patrol Special issues are still pending.

Commissioner DeJesus would like an update regarding recruitment.

(Commission recessed at 3:29 p.m. and reconvened at 5:13 p.m., in Room 400.)

PRESENT: Commissioners Renne, Campos, DeJesus, Lee, Marshall,
Sparks, Veronese

**VOTE TO ELECT WHETHER TO DISCLOSE ANY OR ALL
DISCUSSION HELD IN CLOSED SESSION**

Commissioner Renne stated that the Commission had met in Closed Session to discuss the implications of the California Supreme Court Case *Copley Press v. Superior Court of San Diego County*. Commissioner Renne stated that they have asked the City Attorney to develop procedures in light of said case to provide the Commission with as much reporting as possible.

Motion by Commissioner Marshall, second by Commissioner DeJesus for non disclosure. Approved 7-0.

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION FOR FINAL ADOPTION OF
A RESOLUTION URGING THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND
THE MAYOR TO PETITION THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE TO
AMEND STATE LAW**

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

Commissioner DeJesus suggested changes on paragraphs 2 and 6 of the resolution.

Commissioner Sparks asked that this item be put over for one week to allow the public the opportunity to read it.

Motion by Commissioner DeJesus to have the City Attorney make changes to paragraphs 2 and 6 of the resolution. Second by Commissioner Campos. Approved 7-0.

Motion by Commissioner Sparks to continue this item for one week, second by Commissioner DeJesus. Approved 7-0.

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO GRANT OR DENY
MOTION FOR DISMISSAL OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES FILED IN
CASE NOS. C06-030 SL, C06-031 SL, C06-032 SL, C06-033 SL, C06-034
SL, AND C06-035 SL UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE 3304(d)**

Motion by Commissioner Marshall, second by Commissioner Lee to go into closed session. Approved 7-0.

Commissioner Renne explained that the Commission is compelled to go into Closed Session because of the *Copley* decision.

Commissioner Renne stated that “The Commission absolutely is completely upset about the *Copley* decision. It is contrary to years of the way in which this Commission, at least, has undertaken disciplinary matters. Nevertheless, the California Supreme Court has spoken and we recognize that it is the highest Court in the State and as a result we have a duty and obligation to follow that ruling. Having said that, I can also say that we intend to follow that decision as closely as possible and as narrowly as we possibly can so that the public, to the extent that we are able to do so, will have as much

transparency as is possible. That is why we have asked the City Attorney, as I indicated in the beginning, to take a look to see what procedures we can follow so that we can be as transparent as possible despite the *Copley* decision. That is why I believe next week at the full and fair reading, I believe the Commission will want to adopt the resolution that will be before us urging the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to take whatever action they can to overturn legislatively the *Copley* decision.

The California Supreme Court, in reaching the decision it did, made it very clear that they are only only only reaching the decision that they were because they felt compelled by the legislature – I emphasize by the legislature – to make the decision that they did. If the legislature believes in public knowing how their police department operates, it seems to me that they will wish to reverse the *Copley* decision. The burden is on them.

So, we, at least with regard to item 7 and hearings, believe we are compelled by the *Copley* decision to hold a closed session unless counsel want to waive that right. But we do so, I must say, kicking and screaming, unhappy that we're the ones who have to deal with the fallout, if you will, in the *Copley* decision. But we are a Police Commission, we did take an oath to uphold the constitution and the law.

The arguments that members of the press have made to us as to why we need not follow the *Copley* decision were made in the *Copley* California Supreme Court hearing virtually every single argument and the Court rejected those arguments on the ground that it was the legislature – I repeat, the legislature – that bares the full responsibility of that decision, and it will be up to the legislature to change that decision. This Commission wants to proceed as a full and fair ways we always have. So it is with the greatest, greatest regret that we feel compelled to follow the *Copley* decision.”

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Olsen asked if explorations are being made of ways in which hearings can be open at least in part and what is the Commission's intentions to disclosure of items that do take place in closed session if the Commission is going to have closed sessions. Commissioner Renne explained that the Commission has asked the City Attorney to explore any and all ways that will achieve the greatest amount of transparency to the public.

Mr. James Lassart stated that he believes *Copley* states the law as it has been continually. He stated that it's always been an issue as to the individuals who have been charged with the Commission as to whether or not they are going to seek closure, and it was a tactical decision to leave it open. He stated that these are police officers' personnel matter and that he believes that one of the things that happens before this Commission as a result of the public information that comes out about the individual officers in the cases is that the Commission hear public comments. Mr. Lassart stated that they're asking the Commission to sit there as a judge and divide what is heard from public comments to what the law is required with the facts.

(The Commission reconvened in Open Session at 7:16 p.m.)

TAKING OF EVIDENCE BY THE COMMISSION, AND POSSIBLE DISCUSSION AND ACTION TO ACCEPT STIPULATED DISPOSITIONS IN THE MATTERS OF OCC FILE NOS. C04-119 JWF, C04-120 JWF, C04-121 JWF, C04-122 JWF, C04-123 JWF, C04-124 JWF, AND C04-125 JWF

Motion by Commissioner Campos, second by Commissioner DeJesus to continue this item for next week. Approved 7-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

OCC DIRECTOR'S REPORT

a. Review of Recent Activities

Taken out of order.

None

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION FOR A DEPARTMENT
GENERAL ORDER CONCERNING COMMUNITY POLICING,
INCLUDING ESTABLISHING POLICY, PROCEDURES, AND AREAS
FOR FOOT PATROLS**

Continued from earlier discussion.

Commissioner Renne explained that there was a matter that came before the Commission as a pilot program with regard to beat patrols in the Western Addition and since then that legislation has mushroomed to now pilot projects in eight different districts in the city. Commissioner Renne stated that the question is whether or not the Department could do everything the legislation asks in all eight districts. Commissioner Renne explained that she asked the City Attorney to draft a general order for the Commission to discuss. She stated that it could be in the form of a general order, or a resolution, or in the form of a field operations general order.

Deputy Chief Shinn, Field Operations Bureau, discussed foot patrols within the San Francisco Police Department. Chief Shinn stated that the Police Department has active foot beats in all of its police districts. Chief Shinn stated that each district Captain determines his/her foot beats based on a variety of information, most importantly, it is the input from the community. Chief Shinn stated that one of the biggest challenges of the Department is the lack of sworn personnel. He stated that the Department is well over 250 officers from its minimum staffing level of 1971 full duty officers. The number 1971 minimum staffing was derived in 1994. Chief Shinn stated that with the tremendous growth of the city, the shortage of officers can and does impact the patrol division. Chief Shinn stated that the future plan is as staffing level grows, there will be more officers dedicated to foot patrols. There is currently two academy classes in progress and with the adopted budget, the Department anticipates five more police academy classes to commence with the 2006/2007 fiscal year. It is the Department's intent to deploy more foot beat officers within all the districts of the city as it move towards the minimal staffing level. Chief Shinn stated that there may be safety issues involved with officers working primarily foot beats. Chief Shinn gave the following reasons: Officers may have a difficult time in responding to a report of a violent crime in a timely manner if they are a distance away from that call and this can create a safety issue with citizens requesting help and also for officers not having adequate backup to this particular call. Chief Shinn stated a major concern is the time it takes for an officer to arrive for a citizen's request for help. He stated that the Department does maintain its foot beats with on-duty resources and some overtime dedicated to anti-violence proposals.

Chief Shinn showed a map which describes foot patrols in every district of the city. Commissioner Renne stated that the proposed legislation would have, by ordinance, impose different beats from what is being done now. Chief Shinn stated that with the proposed legislation, in Northern and Park, it makes it less flexible for a Captain to decide where those beats should be. Chief Shinn stated that in certain districts, with this legislation, the Department can accommodate that but in a lot of districts the Department cannot. Chief Shinn stated that in a lot of districts, when the Department cannot fill a sector car because the foot beat has to be filled, foot beats are good as far as a small geographical area but a sector car covers a much larger area and it allows an officer to get to a 911 call much quicker than a foot beat officer. In certain districts, the Department has to pull a sector car and place a foot beat area in that small geographical area. Because of that the Department will suffer in response time to a 911 call. Chief Shinn stated that might affect other city services such as the fire department. Chief Shinn also stated that

there is a lot of research done in maintaining what foot beats are going to be run on a regular basis and many times foot beats are regularly run on a Monday through Friday. In certain districts, in order to maintain the proposed legislation, the Department would have to remove officers from another beat to work that particular beat.

Commissioner Sparks pointed out some clarifying sentences put in the ordinance responding to the issue about specific beats. Commissioner Sparks stated that what the ordinance is suggesting is there has to be certain amount of beats but the Department has the flexibility to assign those beats wherever the need presents itself. Deputy Chief Shinn stated that on the ordinance it puts the geographical area where some of the beats already exists but it doesn't give the flexibility where it's supposed to be run on two different shifts, seven days a week. Commissioner Sparks stated that if there is a staffing issue, then that is what needs to be addressed and where in the department that don't directly, on a daily basis, impact public safety can officers be taken and assign them to these foot patrols until the Department can graduate officer from the academy to backfill those other positions, non critical positions like possibly in the Administration Bureau or in Traffic that may be non critical so that the Department is not risking the public welfare by not staffing radio cars.

Commissioner Renne stated that there is no question that everybody wants foot patrols. The question is how does the Department handle it and if there isn't staffing, what are we going to rob. Deputy Chief Shinn stated that the Department is dedicating a lot of the officers out to the stations already.

Commissioner Sparks stated that what she is suggesting is, until there is staffing, that the Department need to seriously look at some of the functions that weren't in place when the 1971 number was put into the charter. Commissioner Sparks stated that the Chief had mentioned 15 or 20 functions, representing over 200 officers, that weren't in place back then, and that maybe those are the functions the Department needs to look at to pull officers out of until they can be restaffed.

Commissioner Campos stated that the Department should be looking at creative ways in order to get this accomplished. Deputy Chief Shinn stated that the Department is not trying to make excuses. The Department is in favor of foot patrols but not at the expense of response time by the sector car officers. Chief Shinn stated that there are foot beats operating in every single district of San Francisco and the Department is working towards providing more foot patrol officers when the staffing becomes available but the Department have to maintain a balance between officers who are in motorized patrol who are responding to 911 calls and that has to be taken into account based on staffing on each of the individual station during that particular day and if the Department has to take officers from motorized patrols, it is going to have an effect on the response time that officers go to on 911 calls.

Commissioner Campos stated that he does not think that it's ideal for anyone to micro manage the operations of the police department. He stated that people are trying to respond to what they see as a crisis in their neighborhoods. He stated that the Department need to look like we understand that and that the Department will do their best to join forces to respond to that crisis.

Commissioner DeJesus stated that the Commission need to be more positive and say how can we implement this and how can we make it work. In the areas where it's not going to work, it is just not going to work. Commissioner DeJesus stated that if you don't have the manpower, you certainly do not want to jeopardize the public safety and stated that she thinks there are things that can be done and thing that can be looked at to make this work especially in the areas that have been identified as the most critical areas in the city.

Commissioner Lee stated that the Commission needs to know what the

challenges are for the Department to implement this ordinance. She would like a more realistic number of officers that would be required to meet the minimum requirement under the ordinance.

Commissioner Veronese asked about civilianization. Chief Shinn stated that, through the Mayor's budget, the Department has been granted 8 vehicle maintenance officers and also 10 police service aides. The Department is in the process of interviewing and hiring those individuals now.

Commissioner Sparks asked about patrol specials. Deputy Chief Shinn stated that patrol specials are already being utilized where they are in charged of private industries and are being paid for by them. Chief Shinn stated there are legal issues that need to be research and derived.

Commissioner Campos suggested inviting Supervisor Mirkirimi and/or other supervisors and members of the public to come and discuss this issue.

Commissioner Renne talked about the Housing Authority. Commissioner Renne asked the Chief and the Housing Authority to draft a plan to how additional money, if it is otherwise available, could be used, and then have a joint meeting with the Housing Authority to discuss the plan and what if any reactions there ought to be between the two.

Continued to next week.

CHIEF'S REPORT

a. Update on significant policing efforts by Department members

Chief Fong reported on the supplemental budget that is going to go before the Board of Supervisors. Chief Fong stated that in the supplemental the Department has requested another 10 Police Service Aides. Chief Fong stated that hopefully the 10 PSAs that are requested in the supplemental will further the Department's ability to deploy more foot beat officers. The second area of the supplemental has to do with the augmented staffing deployed in the hot spot areas in the city in order to respond to the homicides and the shootings. Chief Fong stated that this is a supplemental pending before the Board and asked that the Commission send a letter to the Board requesting that it be calendared as soon as possible. The dollar amount of the supplemental for the Department is \$2,096,179.00.

Commissioner Renne asked Sergeant Reilly to prepare the letter to the Board of Supervisors.

Deputy Chief Tabak reported on events during the past weeks. He talked about a gun running ring that started in Arizona and provided guns to gang members in San Francisco. He stated that the Department tracked 58 firearms that were purchased, to date, 18 had been recovered in San Francisco, a couple in Oklahoma. Chief Tabak stated that two persons have been indicted and charged. Chief Tabak stated that it has been a positive thing in San Francisco and should have long-term impact.

Chief Tabak also talked about the nomination for the International Association of Women Police Officers' Award in community service. Chief Tabak stated that out of several hundred nominations, Inspector Milanda Moore, Hate Crimes Unit, was selected and recently honored in Saskatoon, Canada, for her achievement and her work in hate crimes in San Francisco.

Chief Tabak also talked about the nomination for the Attorney General's Community Partner Award. The Department nominated Community United Against Violence (CUAV) and they were selected after 20 nominations from the State.

Chief Tabak also talked about an article in the SF Weekly last Wednesday, that accused the Department and Chief Tabak of violating the First Amendment, of conducting a cloak-and-dagger investigation, a witch

hunt, and of secret phone monitoring. Chief Tabak stated that the article grossly misrepresented the facts surrounding a criminal investigation that took place and was conducted during this period. Chief Tabak stated that it is flawed and not accurate and does not provide a balanced perspective and does a huge disservice to the police department and to the city. Chief Tabak stated that he wants to set the record straight. Chief Tabak explained that when he was a lieutenant in charge of the Special Investigations Division, in February 14, 2003, he was directed by then Deputy Chief Dave Robinson to initiate the criminal investigation surrounding the unauthorized release of an internal personnel document. This was a memorandum written by a patrol sergeant documenting disciplinary type behavior on the part of a member. Personnel files and documents such as this one involved are protected under Penal Code Section 832.7 and their release is governed by the Evidence Code 1043 that outlines the legally required protocols that must be adhered to in order to obtain those personnel file and that information and the release outside of this process is unauthorized and a potential criminal violation. Chief Tabak stated that the criminal investigation focused on the period of time believed the document was unlawfully released to the media. Chief Tabak stated that in order to obtain additional evidence and to corroborate some of the evidence that already have been developed, the investigators decided to review the department's phone records for investigative leads. The City Attorney's office was made aware of all the facts surrounding this investigation and nothing was done prior to receiving advice from them. Chief Tabak stated that initially only the phone numbers of certain police units were requested and not of the press. It was not until such time that additional evidence were developed that showed a pattern of phone use going to the Press Room phone that they requested these additional phone numbers. Chief Tabak stated that these phone numbers are city phones controlled by and paid for by city funds and housed within the city building. Chief Tabak stated that at no time did they engage in any actual monitoring of any conversation. This was a review of the phone bills and focused on a very narrow period of time amounting to 10 hours on the date the document was believed to be unlawfully released. Chief Tabak stated that they conducted a thorough, ethical, and highly professional criminal investigation of department members suspected of criminal conduct and not of members of the press.

Commissioner Sparks asked if Chief Tabak asked any of the members of the press whether or not they will talk to him and to find out where they got the information prior to looking at the phone records. Chief Tabak stated yes. Commissioner Sparks stated that she is satisfied, based on the explanation of the City Attorney and what Chief Tabak said, that there was no laws violated and is within department general orders based on them being city phones but Commissioner Sparks asked wouldn't the question have arisen in someone's mind that it might not be right to be examining phone records that were made by members of the press. Chief Tabak stated that they did nothing without consulting the City Attorney first. He stated that was a primary concern, not only the perception, but also the legality and the protocol. Chief Tabak stated that the answer they received is that they were looking at their own phone bills, they were not gleaning information of conversations, they were not trying to identify who was talking to who. Chief Tabak stated that what they were trying to do was following a lead to determine if the document in question was faxed, released that way, phone calls prior to and during the release, and it would lead us to additional persons that can be interviewed.

Commissioner Sparks stated that, in her opinion, it showed poor judgment on behalf of the Department. Chief Tabak stated that one of the goals of an investigation is to conduct as thorough of an investigation as possible and the purpose is to get at the truth and to find out who did what and who did nothing.

Commissioner Campos stated that, in his opinion, there is something unique about records that involve to or from the press and stated that he, as a member of this Commission, would rather not have the Department's resources expended, in terms of public policy, expended on these types of

efforts.

Commissioner DeJesus stated that she agrees with Commissioner Campos and stated that maybe a sign may be posted stating that these lines are city lines. Chief Tabak stated that notices were provided to the media stating exactly that.

Commissioner Veronese stated that he is glad that some sort of notice had gone out and stated that the article is not good for media relations between the Department and the news agencies and stated that this is something that the Department needs to work on because the media has a huge effect on morale.

Commissioner Sparks asked about an incident regarding marijuana raids across the city. Chief Tabak stated that the raids were centered in and/or around the 700 block of Tennessee. Chief Tabak stated that this was a DEA operation and that SFPD did not participate whatsoever. Chief Tabak stated that the Department was notified after the fact that the raids had taken place.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Jedd stated that he hopes community policing can reduce school violence and read letters written regarding violence in schools.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Campos, second by Commissioner DeJesus to adjourn the meeting.

Thereafter, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Sergeant Joseph Reilly
Secretary
San Francisco Police Commissioner

1497/rct