

**ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF
THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT:
A TECHNICAL REPORT**

FINAL REPORT

December 2008



The Police Executive Research Forum
1120 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 930
Washington, DC 20036

San Francisco Police Department Organizational Assessment

December 2008

Contact information:

**Police Executive Research Forum
1120 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 930
Washington, DC 20036
202-466-7820
www.policeforum.org**

For additional copies of the report visit:

www.sfpolicereivew.org

Or

**San Francisco Controller's Office
City Hall Room 316
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
controller@sfgov.org
415-554-7500
www.sfgov.org/site/controller_index.asp**

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
THE NATURE OF THIS STUDY: WHAT PERF WAS CONTRACTED TO DO	5
THE PROCESS PERF USED TO CONDUCT THIS STUDY	6
SUMMARY.....	9
PERF'S MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	10
A. <i>Expanding Community Policing, Problem-Solving And Community Engagement To Prevent And Control Crime And Improve The Quality Of Neighborhood Life</i>	11
B. <i>Creating And Managing A Workforce And An Organization That Reflects The City And Its Values</i>	16
C. <i>Ensuring Accountability And Transparency</i>	19
D. <i>Building Leadership And Developing Personnel</i>	24
E. <i>What Happens Next—Implementation And Moving Forward</i>	24
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND STAFFING OVERVIEW	26
SUMMARY: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE.....	27
A. <i>Methodology</i>	27
B. <i>Chief's Office</i>	31
C. <i>Field Operations Bureau (FOB)</i>	32
D. <i>Investigations Bureau</i>	34
E. <i>Administration Bureau</i>	35
F. <i>The Airport Bureau</i>	36
G. <i>Summary Optimal Staffing</i>	36
ORGANIZING AND STAFFING THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF POLICE	45
A. <i>Organizing the Office of the Chief of Police</i>	45
B. <i>Staffing the Office of the Chief of Police</i>	47
ORGANIZING THE FIELD OPERATIONS BUREAU	54
STAFFING THE FIELD OPERATIONS BUREAU	56
A. <i>Administration</i>	56
B. <i>Special Services Division</i>	57
C. <i>Community Outreach Division</i>	71
D. <i>The Police Districts Division</i>	73
E. <i>District Organization</i>	75
F. <i>Staffing The Districts</i>	78
ORGANIZING THE INVESTIGATIONS BUREAU	117
A. <i>Crimes Against Persons Division</i>	119
B. <i>Crimes Against Property Division</i>	120
C. <i>Special Victims Division</i>	123
D. <i>Vice/Narcotics Division</i>	126
E. <i>Special Operations Division</i>	127
F. <i>Forensic Services Division</i>	128
STAFFING THE INVESTIGATIONS BUREAU	130
A. <i>Investigative Staffing and Methodology</i>	132
B. <i>Investigations Bureau Support Staff</i>	139
C. <i>Operations Center (OC)</i>	142
D. <i>Forensic Services Division</i>	143
E. <i>Summary: Investigative Bureau Staffing</i>	145
ORGANIZING THE ADMINISTRATION BUREAU	147
A. <i>The Administrative Commander</i>	149
B. <i>The Fiscal Division</i>	150
C. <i>Information Services Division</i>	152
D. <i>Report Management Division</i>	154
E. <i>Staff Services Division</i>	155

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

F. Support Services Division	160
G. Training And Education Division	163
H. Summary Administration Bureau Staffing.....	169
ORGANIZING THE AIRPORT BUREAU	170
A. Airport Bureau Staffing.....	172
B. Summary: Airport Bureau Staffing	182
HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEMS OVERVIEW	183
A. The Ideal SFPD Officer	183
B. Recruitment.....	184
C. Selection.....	192
D. Basic Academy Training	198
E. Field Training	210
F. Sergeant/Inspector	214
G. Promotions.....	217
H. Rotation.....	220
I. Training And Professional Development	222
J. Reserve Officers	227
K. Chief Of Police Tenure	230
L. Overtime.....	231
OVERVIEW: USE OF FORCE	235
A. Methodology for Use of Force Policy Review.....	236
B. SFPD General Order 3.10 – Firearm Discharge Review Board.....	236
C. SFPD General Order 5.01 – Use of Force	240
D. SFPD General Order 5.02 – Use of Firearms	248
E. SFPD General Order 8.03 – Crowd Control.....	250
F. SFPD General Order 8.11 – Investigation of Officer Involved Shootings and Discharges.....	251
G. SFPD General Order 10.02 – Equipment.....	255
H. SFPD Field Operations Bureau General Order 03-11 Use of Extended Range Impact Weapons (effective 12/18/03) and SFPD Field Operations Bureau 05-02 – Use of Extended Range Impact Weapons during Crowd Control Situations (effective 8/24/05)	256
I. Special Weapons and Tactics Team.....	259
J. Specialized Populations and Use of Force.....	265
K. Canine Unit.....	265
EARLY INTERVENTION SYSTEM.....	270
APPENDIX 1 ABOUT THE POLICE EXECUTIVE RESEARCH FORUM	278
APPENDIX 2 LIST OF EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW AND FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS 	287
APPENDIX 3 LIST OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED TO EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS.....	288
APPENDIX 4 ABOUT THE VISION STATEMENT	295
APPENDIX 5 SAMPLE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR POLICE OFFICERS.....	298
APPENDIX 6 PERF CED GUIDELINES FOR CONSIDERATION AND GLOSSARY OF TERMS.....	307
APPENDIX 7 USE OF TASERS IN CONTROLLING HUMANS TRAINING AND OTHER PREREQUISITES 	319
APPENDIX 8 SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS, AUGUST 2007	324
APPENDIX 9 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS	330
APPENDIX 10 CITY COMPARISON	340
APPENDIX 11 SAMPLE: USE OF FORCE REPORTING FORMS	348

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This executive summary describes:

- The nature of this study: What the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) was contracted to do in San Francisco.
- The process PERF used to conduct its study. The process was designed to ensure that the study and recommendations would not only reflect PERF's best judgment about ways to improve the San Francisco Police Department, but would also reflect the priorities of a wide range of San Franciscans about what they want from their police department, as well as the views of SFPD employees about the future of the department.
- PERF's major findings and recommendations.
- What happens next—implementation and moving forward.

**THE NATURE OF THIS STUDY:
WHAT PERF WAS CONTRACTED TO DO**

The Police Executive Research Forum was hired by the City of San Francisco to evaluate the San Francisco Police Department in four areas that are often examined in police management studies: organizational structure; staffing; human resource processes; and the department's approach to use of force and its Early Intervention System.

On a more fundamental level, PERF was also tasked with helping to develop a "Vision Statement" for the city's Police Department—a concise statement of what the SFPD aspires to be. PERF was then directed to make recommendations that are designed to implement that Vision Statement, especially the Vision's components that commit the SFPD to more effectively addressing the city's crime and quality of life problems that are a continuing concern for all San Franciscans.

The Vision Statement was used as the primary standard to examine the department. Thus, the recommendations strongly reflect the Vision Statement's emphasis on community policing and problem-solving policing as the department's approach to crime-fighting, as well as the Vision's focus on creating a SFPD that reflects the city and its values, that is accountable and transparent, and that provides excellent career development opportunities for its employees.

THE PROCESS PERF USED TO CONDUCT THIS STUDY

PERF is proud of its recognized expertise in evaluating the policies, practices, and organizational structures of police departments across the country. This expertise is based on our experience having conducted more than 130 such studies, as well as our daily contacts with police executives through our status as a membership organization of police chiefs, sheriffs, other law enforcement leaders and academics. (A more in-depth description of PERF's qualifications is included as an Appendix to this report.)

However, this San Francisco study could not rely merely on PERF's expertise. PERF was hired to evaluate the SFPD *in terms of what San Franciscans and SFPD officers want to see from their department.*

Thus, PERF undertook a comprehensive program of consulting with San Francisco residents, members of the SFPD, and community leaders to create a solid base of knowledge about the priorities of these "stakeholders"—the people who have a real stake in the future of policing in San Francisco. The people who are served by the department were asked what kind of a police department they want, and how that compares to the type of department they think they currently have. And the members of the police department, who have the critically important inside perspective on how the department functions and how it can be improved, were asked to offer their candid observations and guidance on how to shape a long-term future for the department.

Accordingly, PERF began its work by arranging for a variety of focus groups and individual interviews to be conducted with members of the San Francisco community and the police department, as well as with community leaders and local officials. Community members and police also were invited to post comments about the future of the police department on a website created for this project. Working with the San Francisco Office of the Controller and our local partners on the San Francisco project, Pendergrass Smith Consulting and Barbary Coast Consulting, we asked questions about the strengths and weaknesses of the police department, the challenges it is facing, the crime problems in the city, and what kind of a police department people would like to see in the future.

PERF's process of soliciting the views of San Francisco community members, members of the police force, and community leaders regarding the future of the SFPD included the following:

1. Community Input

a) **Strategic Review Committee:** A Strategic Review Committee, established to provide feedback on draft recommendations, was made up of approximately 20 community representatives from a broad range of groups, including faith-based groups, senior and disability organizations, immigrant groups, "watchdog" groups, violence prevention groups, and labor and business organizations. The Committee offered valuable input and recommendations throughout the Organizational Review of the San Francisco Police Department. Additionally, its members have provided the study with a consistent level of community input to

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

ensure that the study met its stated goals. The first Strategic Review Committee meeting was held in January 2008, and committee members provided input on their vision for the SFPD. Committee members were selected by the project's Steering Committee and were invited to participate in the Organizational Review process by San Francisco Police Commission President Theresa Sparks and Police Chief Heather Fong.

b) External Stakeholder Interviews: Barbary Coast Consulting conducted interviews of key individuals identified by the project team and Steering Committee as having a special interest in the Organizational Review and/or representing key SFPD constituencies. These individuals included heads of city departments and agencies, leaders of local nonprofits, as well as elected and appointed city officials and other community members from key constituent groups. Barbary Coast conducted 44 interviews between October 2007 and February 2008, with three more conducted by PERF staff. The information gathered through these interviews was intended to complement the public feedback gathered through other means, such as the project website, focus groups, and the Strategic Review Committee.

c) Focus Groups: Under the leadership of Pendergrass Smith Consulting, six focus groups were conducted in October-November 2007 to gather input across different categories. These focus groups were held in different areas of the city, and participants came from a mix of neighborhoods. Session members included professionals, working-class residents, and homeless persons. Over 100 community members contributed to the sessions and were able to provide direct input. Details of the focus groups are below.

- Session 1 was held in the Bayview-Hunters Point neighborhood and had 18 participants.
- Session 2 was held downtown at the Shinnyo-en Foundation and had 13 participants.
- Session 3 was held in Chinatown and had six participants.
- Session 4 was held in the Southeast sector of the city at the Global Exchange and had 16 participants.
- Session 5 was held in the Western Addition neighborhood of the city and had 28 participants.
- Session 6 was held in the Richmond District and had 17 participants.

Separate smaller sessions were held with 15 more members of the community.

d) Citywide Outreach: Barbary Coast and PERF developed a number of opportunities to solicit input from the general public through several broad outreach campaigns. In collaboration with project team and Steering Committee

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

members, we developed a contact database of 870 interested individuals serving community-based organizations with whom we communicated regarding the Organizational Assessment's findings. Approximately 350 of those individuals were notified of the project via a mass e-newsletter. Through the newsletter and other communications, the team also provided opportunities for interested parties to provide online feedback via the project website, and by telephone through a project hotline. The San Francisco Police Effectiveness Review website, www.sfpolicereview.org, allowed interested stakeholders to respond to the same battery of questions that were used during the focus groups and stakeholder interviews. This feedback mechanism was also available in Chinese, Spanish, and Russian, allowing a broader audience to provide input to the study. We also encouraged selected individuals who were unable to participate in the interviews and focus groups to provide online feedback.

2. Internal Input

a) SFPD Interviews: The PERF team met with representatives from the San Francisco Police Commission, including the Office of Citizen Complaints, as well as members of the police department. In addition to the Office of the Chief, command staff and civilian directors from all four Bureaus of the department were interviewed. SFPD officers in charge of Bureau subdivisions and units were also included in the interview process.

b) Internal Focus Groups: In the interest of engaging a diverse cross-section of police department personnel -- diverse in terms of both objective circumstances (gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, time in the department, position in the department, etc.) as well as ideas and perspectives -- PERF conducted four focus groups with San Francisco Police Department personnel. These focus groups are outlined below:

- Group 1 participants included civilian, line-level employees representing all Bureaus. Members were from several different divisions and units including Report Management, Property Control, Staff Services, Planning, Technology, and Fiscal.
- Group 2 participants included sworn, first-line supervisors. Each patrol watch was represented, as were investigations, the airport, and specialized support units.
- Group 3 participants included sworn mid-managers. Lieutenants and one sergeant serving in an acting lieutenant capacity participated in the session.
- Group 4 participants consisted of line-level participants, sworn and non-sworn, representing the Field Operations and Investigations Bureaus and members of specialized support units.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

c) **SFPD Online Feedback:** In an effort to maximize opportunities for involvement, police department members not contacted as part of the internal focus groups or interviews were able to provide input online. Online participants were asked the same questions as those used in the internal focus groups. The online feedback was hosted on an independent website to allow personnel to provide input when and where it was most convenient. SFPD personnel were alerted to the opportunity through notification in the department's A-Bulletin, postings on the department's Intranet, command staff and roll call briefings, and by PERF staff, who were on-site during the week of November 26, 2007.

SUMMARY

Significant effort was dedicated to obtaining input from a broad and diverse cross-section of San Francisco. (More details about those interviewed are in an Appendix to this report. Many themes emerged during this process and those topics are reflected in the Strategic Vision provided to the city by the PERF team and approved by the Police Commission on July 16, 2008. With commitment and enthusiasm from the community, the police department, and government officials, the recommendations made in this study are achievable.

PERF'S MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Because this management study is centered around the SFPD's newly adopted Vision Statement, PERF's findings and recommendations must begin with that statement. (Additional guidance can be found in an "About the Vision Statement" commentary, which is included as an Appendix to this report.)

THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT VISION STATEMENT

The San Francisco Police Department is committed to being a world-class police department and a leader among urban police departments by hiring and promoting talented officers and professional staff, employing the highest standards of accountability, performance, best practices in policing, and reflecting the values of the world-class city it serves.

San Francisco has an international reputation for its commitment to human values: compassion, fairness, diversity, human rights, and justice. These values must be at the forefront of the SFPD as it fulfills its public safety mission.

The San Francisco Police Department strives to adhere to the highest standards and reflect the diversity of its community members. The people of our communities and members of the Police Department must be united in their commitment to addressing crime, violence, and quality of life issues by engaging one another and all city agencies in problem solving partnerships.

Police strategies and tactics must be driven by accurate, timely and reliable information supplied by current and emerging technologies and supported by the Department's systematic engagement of all of San Francisco's diverse neighborhoods.

The Police Department strives to maintain the trust of San Francisco community members by actively engaging with the neighborhoods it serves. The Police Department seeks to make its policies and operations as open as possible. When there are complaints involving the police department, both the public and the police are best served by a system of accountability that is expeditious and fair to all involved.

To make this vision a reality, the Police Department must reward the hard work, ingenuity, and resourcefulness demonstrated by its employees, and must offer state-of-the-art training, development and career opportunities for advancement and retention. This will ensure that employees see the Police Department as a lifelong career and strive to become the department's next generation of leaders.

A close reading of the Vision Statement reveals four major themes:

Expanding community policing, problem-solving and community engagement to prevent and control crime and improve the quality of neighborhood life.

Creating and maintaining a workforce and an organization that reflects the city and its values.

Ensuring accountability and transparency.

Building leadership and developing personnel.

With that in mind, the following are PERF's key findings and recommendations in each of those categories:

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

**A. EXPANDING COMMUNITY POLICING, PROBLEM-SOLVING AND COMMUNITY
ENGAGEMENT TO PREVENT AND CONTROL CRIME AND IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF
NEIGHBORHOOD LIFE**

Recommendation: Create a high-level office to ensure that the Vision remains a top priority: A critical factor in helping to make the Vision a reality is that the department must create a high-level group responsible for implementation of the Vision and specific accompanying recommendations. PERF recommends that the department create a “Strategic Management Division” reporting directly to the Assistant Chief of Police. The role of this new division should be to oversee the changes to the department that will be needed to implement the recommendations of this study and other studies of the SFPD. The Strategic Management Division should be led by a commander to ensure that there is the necessary organizational weight to drive implementation. This commander’s position should be a high-visibility appointment, since this person will be responsible both for implementing the study and report recommendations and for overseeing citywide strategies for crime reduction.

Recommendation: Combat crime and improve quality-of-life more effectively by integrating community policing, problem-solving, and CompStat: Embedded in the department’s Vision is the SFPD’s commitment to engaging the San Francisco community in dealing with crime and disorder problems. To achieve this Vision, the department should embrace a policing style that integrates community policing, problem-solving, and CompStat. This policing style requires a keen focus on preventing crime, identifying offenders, and assisting victims, with the active participation of both the police and residents of the city’s neighborhoods working together.

The CompStat model originated in the early 1990s in the New York City Police Department and is widely credited as a primary contributor to substantial crime decreases there, and in many other jurisdictions where it has been implemented. CompStat has four components: accurate, timely intelligence; rapid deployment; effective tactics; and relentless follow-up and assessment.

In other words, the SFPD must maintain up-to-the-minute data on crime trends and quality-of-life issues, detailing where and when crimes are being committed. Police districts must be formally tasked with using that information to discover the parameters of local crime and disorder problems, and to devise ways of addressing them. The information and the initiatives

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

that are undertaken must be shared at department-wide CompStat meetings—in order to hold local district commanders and officers accountable while also spreading knowledge about which countermeasures work best. And CompStat crime analysis must be conducted at the local level as well as on a citywide basis.

The SFPD already has a mechanism for recording efforts to solve crime and disorder problems, through the use of an internal form known as SFPD Form 509. However, PERF found that each element of the problem-solving process needs to be dealt with more thoroughly than is possible with the Form 509 system. PERF makes a number of recommendations detailed in the full report to bolster this process and implement a full-fledged CompStat system in the SFPD.

Recommendation: Create an Information Utilization

Strategic Plan: The SFPD has a number of new technology initiatives underway. Planning for these projects has been based on the department's technological needs and infrastructure. This process should be supplemented by a strategy that describes who needs what information, when they need it, and the format it should be in. This strategy should describe information needs for each level in the organization and how these needs will be met.

Recommendation: To improve the use of technology, create an enhanced Information Services Division:

PERF recommends the creation of a new Information Services Division in the Administration Bureau, to replace the Technology Division. The Information Services Division should bring together not only the information technologies needed to support CompStat, but also other technologies such as radio and data communications, cameras, and "shot spotters." The division, commanded by a Chief Information Officer (CIO), should also have a Chief Technology Officer (CTO). The CIO should focus on ensuring that the department's systems are responsive to the general question, "Who needs what information, when, to make what decisions?" The CTO should be responsible for more technical issues and for the day-to-day management and maintenance of the SFPD's technology systems, as well as for evaluating new technologies to determine their usability for the SFPD. PERF makes specific recommendations for increased staffing of this Division. Successful efforts to prevent and control crime and disorder are vitally dependent on getting the right information to the right people at the right time.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Recommendation: Set district officer staffing levels according to a community engagement target: Key structural, staffing and management changes will need to be made to implement the community engagement segment of the Vision. Community engagement, fundamentally, requires that officers spend time with neighborhood residents in contexts other than responding to calls for service or engaging in vehicle stops and checks of pedestrians. To implement community policing, officers must have some portion of their on-duty time available to get to know community residents, find out about the local crime and disorder problems that residents are concerned about, and to work with community members to devise solutions.

However, the time that officers have available for community engagement is limited. San Franciscans, like residents of any other city, also expect the police to respond to 911 calls in a reasonably prompt manner. Furthermore, officers' time is consumed by administrative duties, court appearances, and other necessary tasks.

To quantify these considerations, PERF conducted a detailed analysis of the amount of time that San Francisco police officers currently spend on responding to calls for service, broken down according to the 10 San Francisco police districts, by day of the week, by hour of the day, and so on.

Citywide, PERF found the average time consumed by calls for service is 42.5 percent. This figure varied substantially, from a low of 30 percent in the Park District to a high of 50.7 percent in the Mission District.

There are no nationally accepted standards for what percentage of a police officer's time should be spent responding to calls for service, as opposed to other activities, including community policing and problem-solving efforts. Local demographics, crime and disorder problems, and a department's philosophy of policing all have an impact on the demands on patrol officer time. Some departments set an informal target for the amount of patrol officer time that is consumed by calls for service at 30 to 40 percent. Other departments may set targets at 50 or 60 percent.

To guide the SFPD and the City of San Francisco in deciding how much time the SFPD should provide for sector officers to engage in community policing and problem-solving, PERF analyzed the current staffing levels of each of the 10 police districts, along with each district's current percentage of officer time consumed by responding to calls for service. PERF then developed four options, with decreasing calls-for-service percentages. As the portion of an officer's time that is devoted to calls for service declines, the opportunities for community engagement, community policing, and problem-solving policing increase.

Because the departmental Vision covers the entire department, and because our focus groups and interviews of residents showed that increased community engagement was a strong consensus

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

priority across the city, PERF's targets are based on the premise that the percentage of sector officers' time consumed by calls for service should be the same across all 10 police districts. Following are the four options for the city to consider:

- An average of 50 percent of sector officers' time consumed by calls for service for each district. This could be accomplished with 110 fewer sector patrol officers than are currently assigned. Although this target would still provide adequate officers for calls for service response, the decrease in sector patrol officers runs counter to the desire for increased community engagement.
- 40 percent of sector officers' time—slightly lower than the current-status figure of 42.5 percent—consumed by calls for service for each district. To meet this target, seven districts would require additional officers, and three would need fewer. Overall, the department would need to add 32 officers to sector patrol to meet this target.
- 35 percent of sector officers' time consumed by calls for service for each district. To reach this target, only two districts would need fewer officers, and the total number of sector patrol officers would need to be increased by 152.
- 30 percent of sector officers' time consumed by calls for service for each district. This target would require an additional 268 sector patrol officers.

Choosing among these targets is an important policy decision, especially in a city like San Francisco that wishes to make community policing a high priority. It would be inappropriate for PERF to recommend a specific target for this critical variable, because it is a policy decision that city officials will need to make. On a practical level, this decision will undoubtedly be influenced in coming months by the weakening national economy, which will affect the SFPD's budget and overall staffing levels.

Recommendation: Standardize sergeants' span of control: Another critical aspect of integrating sector patrol officers into community policing and problem-solving is supervision. The department should assign to sector patrol enough sergeants to satisfy both accepted practice for "span of control" (the number of people being overseen by a single supervisor) and to ensure that patrol officers use their available time to actively engage their communities and participate in the problem-solving process. Using a general ratio of one sergeant per eight officers, PERF found that additional sergeants will be required in some districts on some shifts.

The issue of span of control not only has an impact on supervision in the police districts, but also in the Investigations Bureau. Without first-line supervisors, lieutenants currently must directly supervise up to 25 investigators. The department should add supervisory sergeants to investigations to more closely monitor personnel and case activity, thereby establishing the vital link between case management and CompStat that is necessary to increase the solvability of

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

crimes and improve clearance rates. Effective crime control requires both a community policing, problem-solving approach along with enforcement activities to hold offenders responsible within the criminal justice system.

Recommendation: Make community policing, community engagement, crime fighting and problem-solving an integral part of training: Another element that will be crucial in the success of the department's renewed emphasis on battling crime and quality-of-life issues through community policing and problem-solving will be training. The department currently provides training on community policing and problem-solving in its Basic Academy and as part of its Field Training program, but it should re-examine its efforts to make sure that community engagement, crime fighting, community policing, and problem-solving are dominant themes of recruit academy and field training, rather than just "add-on" modules.

Recommendation: The structure of the Police Department must reflect an emphasis of crime control through community policing: A number of structural changes are necessary to improve the department's anti-crime approach via community policing and problem-solving. Each of the 10 districts should have the same basic structure, although the number of people assigned will vary according to the nature of the district and the district's workload. PERF recommends that each district, in addition to having sections devoted to patrol and administrative functions, should have a new Community Policing/CompStat Section.

The Community Policing/CompStat Section should be designed to assemble the resources needed in the districts to help sector officers identify and analyze crime and disorder problems and design countermeasures. Headed by a lieutenant in each district, this section should have a crime analyst, school resource officers, problem-solving teams, housing and parks officers, and foot beat officers. Each of these elements plays an important part in the problem-solving process.

Changes are also needed in the structure of the Field Operations Bureau (FOB) to better support community policing and problem-solving. All 10 districts should report to a single FOB commander who reports to the Deputy Chief in charge of the FOB. Although this commander's span of control will be wide, it is important that the department seek consistency and a common approach to fully implementing its enhanced community policing, problem-solving and CompStat approach. Each district will have different problems and different approaches to

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

addressing them, but all of the districts should use a common, rigorous problem-solving methodology to define and analyze their crime and disorder problems. This FOB commander should be supported by a Community Policing/CompStat support unit, consisting of a lieutenant and two analysts, to assist in looking for crime and disorder patterns that transcend district boundaries.

To further support the structural change needed to sustain community policing and problem-solving, the department should create a centralized CompStat and Crime Analysis Section which should report to the Assistant Chief of Police. The responsibility of this unit will be to lead a formalized CompStat process designed to enable the districts to focus their problem-solving efforts on “hot spots” and other specific crime and quality-of-life problems. The CompStat and Crime Analysis Section will assist the districts in using the best information available to define and analyze problems, design responses, and assess results of district-based problem-solving efforts.

Recommendation: Make community policing and crime-fighting expertise a requirement for career advancement: The department should include, in its professional development program, opportunities and incentives for employees to develop their knowledge and expertise regarding structuring anti-crime programs by utilizing community engagement, community policing and problem-solving. Mastering such skills should be a requirement for progression in a professional development program that is recommended by PERF.

B. CREATING AND MANAGING A WORKFORCE AND AN ORGANIZATION THAT REFLECTS THE CITY AND ITS VALUES.

The San Francisco Police Department uses a variety of techniques to attract prospective officers to the department. The SFPD is facing considerable attrition in its ranks (currently at 109 officers per year). Of the current sworn officer complement, over 25 percent are eligible for retirement. Consequently the department could lose up to 500 officers over the next few years. Given that the department reports a 4-percent selection ratio (only four of 100 applicants are selected for hire), and the attrition rate during the academy and the FTO program currently stands at over 30 percent, keeping up with attrition alone, with no consideration of growth, requires 3,900 applicants a year.

The recruitment strategy undertaken by the department is multi-faceted and well thought out and includes 25 to 40 recruitment events each month. The department’s wide array of recruitment initiatives employed has, so far, been effective at producing the large numbers of acceptable police officer candidates needed to fill its hiring goals. But as the competition for the best applicants becomes increasingly fierce, the department will need to continuously improve its efforts.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Recommendation: Create a corps of officer “mentors” to encourage aspiring officers from various groups: It is clear that the department is interested in recruiting from all the groups represented in San Francisco’s population. Measurable success is seen among most protected class groups. The department should direct additional focus at attracting greater numbers of Hispanic and female applicants. Additionally, the department recognizes its responsibility to ensure the inclusion of the Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/ Transgendered community in its recruitment effort. Representation of this community among the makeup of the department and the applicant pool cannot be accurately tracked. It was suggested that the LGBT community represents about 10 percent of the city’s population, but only about 1 percent of the department’s membership. The list of events currently attended in hopes of attracting LGBT applicants is formidable.

Two of the most effective recruitment efforts are the Internet and referrals from current members. The department should build on these methods and create a corps of officers of various gender orientations and ethnicities who are willing to serve as pre-employment mentors for potential applicants who are uncertain about joining the department. By linking these potential applicants with officer-mentors who may have once faced the same anxieties, the department may be able to address their concerns and thereby cast a wider recruitment net. In addition, the SFPD should make a clear statement on its recruitment Web page that all qualified persons are encouraged to apply and that current officers of various ethnicities and gender orientation are available as pre-employment mentors to any potential applicant who would desire such contact for reassurance about the department as an employer.

Recommendation: Maintain the accelerated hiring program: In 2007, the Accelerated Police Officer Hiring Program was adopted to expedite the selection/hiring process and place qualified candidates in the Police Academy as quickly as possible. This has proven to be successful. The process was designed to identify which applicants are best suited to be San Francisco police officers. Under this program, hiring announcements are written in English, Spanish, Russian, and Chinese (although recruits must be U.S. citizens). Minimum hiring criteria include a high school diploma, GED, or California High School Proficiency exam. Applicants must be at least 20 years old and must pass a background investigation before being eligible for service. The accelerated selection

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

process is regarded by PERF as a national policy “best practice” and should be continued.

Recommendation: Reform the selection system for investigators and supervisors: The department should create a selection process that clearly differentiates between investigators and supervisors. The two positions are not equivalent; and the skills, knowledge and abilities required to be successful in one position do not necessarily translate to the other.

Recommendation: Expand mandatory rotation to all sworn personnel: The goal of the SFPD’s current Mandatory Rotation Policy is very much in keeping with the department’s Vision. The department is striving to enhance officers’ knowledge of the diversity of the city and its residents. Yet the rotation policy is limited to only new hires and new promotions. For the policy to have its desired impact, the department should extend it to all sworn personnel. This policy should include veteran officers and sergeants as well as lieutenants, captains, commanders, and deputy chiefs. However, the rotation policy should include a provision that allows the Chief to exempt some positions from mandatory rotation to make sure the department can maximize its investments in certain highly specialized jobs.

Recommendation: To enlarge the pool of highly qualified potential managers in the department, initiate a leadership developmental plan: The department should create leadership development plans for middle and top managers – lieutenants and civilian equivalents and above. The plan should be multi-year and should include appropriate police management education, seminars, and conference opportunities that will enhance the skills and professional knowledge of department managers. Each manager should be afforded opportunities for professional development outside of the department, not only to enhance her/his own professionalism, but also to bring information to the department about approaches, programs, and projects that are working well in other police agencies.

Recommendation: To provide stability in the top leadership, establish a contract for the chief of police: San Francisco should create a system in which the Chief of Police has a five-year contract. It is difficult for a police

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

department to undergo long-term significant change when questions concerning a chief's tenure are raised constantly. A large city police department undergoing major reform and change needs stable, consistent leadership. A five-year contract with renewal possibility offers the needed stability, but also ensures that the chief is responsive to the needs of the city's residents as expressed through the political process.

C. ENSURING ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

The Vision statement emphasizes that the Police Department must be accountable to its community members and its employees. Fundamentally, police actions must be authorized by the community and viewed as appropriate and legitimate. Society gives the police the legal authority to use force and to deprive people of their liberty when necessary; therefore, the police must be held to the highest standards and must be accountable and open to review of their actions. The police must be judicious in using their power—and must act properly in all of their daily activities.

Recommendation: Speed up the disciplinary system and increase the Chief's authority: One of the best ways for the police to obtain community trust is to establish strong systems of accountability that allow community members' complaints to be aired in a fair and expeditious manner. Community members and police officers alike desire a disciplinary system that reaches timely conclusions. There is no doubt that a system that takes years to reach conclusions serves neither the public nor officers. The City and all stakeholders must establish and maintain a disciplinary system that is fair, transparent and expeditious.

Because the City has already conducted recent reviews of the Office of Citizen Complaints and other aspects of the disciplinary process, discipline was not part of the scope of this study. However, issues with the current process were a frequent topic in the interviews PERF conducted, both inside and outside the department. Concerns that should be considered in an ongoing review of discipline include the timeliness of the disciplinary system and increasing the authority of the chief of police. Too often, it was reported, investigations take a year or more to resolve, and matters that could be settled quickly are delayed, leading to a sense of frustration on the part of both those filing complaints and officers subject to them.

Recommendation: Use the assistant chief's position to help the Chief with oversight of day-to-day operations: The structure of the department should provide for the division of labor and specialization that will enhance the accountability of members of the department as well as enable the organization to operate more effectively.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Recently, the Assistant Chief's position was filled after being vacant for an extended period of time. The organizational structure of the Office of the Chief should include specific responsibilities for the Assistant Chief. Under the PERF proposed structure, the Assistant Chief would oversee the day-to-day operations of the department, which would enable the Chief to provide overall leadership and implementation of the department's Vision. The chief can then also provide strategic direction to the department as well as focus on external relationships, protect the agency's credibility, and preserve the community's trust.

Recommendation: Give the Investigations Bureau a "specialists" structure: PERF is recommending a new structure for the Investigations Bureau designed to encourage investigators to work in collaboration with others to address crime, violence, and quality-of-life issues. Headed by a deputy chief, the Investigations Bureau should be organized into six Divisions under the command of five captains and a civilian forensic director. PERF recommends a new alignment with the following divisions: Crimes Against Persons, Crimes Against Property, Special Victims, Vice/Narcotics, Special Operations, and Forensic Services. Sections and specialized subunits have been aligned based upon offense type, taking into account that investigative synergies may develop by the grouping of like units. This configuration groups people together according to similarities in their positions so they can easily communicate and share information with each other and learn from one another's experiences. A more "specialist" approach will allow staff members to increase their expertise in their assignments, thereby improving effectiveness and case-clearance rates.

Recommendation: Assign sergeants to the Investigations Bureau as supervisors. Currently, due to an anomaly in the SFPD structure, there are no first-line supervisors assigned in the Investigations Bureau. Sergeants, with a span of control ratio of one sergeant for every 10 detectives, should be assigned to provide the supervision of personnel and case management required for an efficient investigative operation.

Recommendation: Further restrict the Use of Firearms policy regarding shooting at moving vehicles. Shooting at moving vehicles is inherently dangerous in highly populated areas such as San Francisco. The department's firearms policy should prohibit discharging a weapon at a moving vehicle unless a person in the vehicle is

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

immediately threatening the officer or another person with deadly force by means other than the vehicle itself. Officers should employ all reasonable means available to move to an area of safety if a vehicle becomes a threat, and should not intentionally place themselves in harm's way by standing or moving in front of a vehicle, standing directly behind, or reaching inside an operating vehicle.

Recommendation: Create a new Police Investigative Aide position: A new Police Investigative Aide (PIA) position should be integrated into the Investigations Bureau. This position will be used to perform the administrative and routine work of detectives. The purpose of this highly specialized and trained position is to do the initial workup of cases and to coordinate with the detective throughout the investigation. In this manner, detectives may spend their time following leads and arresting offenders rather than performing administrative and clerical activities.

Recommendation: Create an Office of Officer-Involved Shootings: One of the key areas for making the SFPD a more accountable and transparent department is the use of force. The department should design a new and separate Use of Force Report to be completed by all members of the department any time force is used. This form should be used not only to more thoroughly document the particular use of force, but also to allow for maintaining records and statistics on use-of-force incidents and the effectiveness of uses of force.

The circumstances that cause an officer to discharge a weapon are independent of whether or not the intended target is struck. It is therefore prudent for the department to investigate all incidents in order to assure adherence to policy, identify training opportunities, and maintain the confidence and trust of the community.

The department should establish an Office of Officer-Involved Shootings headed by a lieutenant and staffed with two sergeants. This new office, within the Internal Affairs Section, should report to the Director of Risk Management, who should be under the direct command of the Assistant Chief of Police. It would be the responsibility of this office to respond and conduct the administrative investigation into

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

all discharges of weapons other than in the performance of training or disposing of an animal. The office would also conduct the administrative investigation of in-custody deaths. This initiative would provide for the timely investigation and review of incidents in which officers discharge a weapon.

Recommendation: Include Conducted Energy Devices as a force option: The department should deploy CEDs as a less-lethal force alternative for selected field personnel. The use of CEDs has the potential to reduce officer and suspect injuries that would normally occur when officers go “hands-on” to control and apprehend a suspect. The device has proved effective among police departments that are searching for less-lethal weapons. The integration of CEDs by the department should be done thoughtfully and should include a community education component along with an implementation plan that gradually introduces CEDs into the workforce.

Recommendation: Use of the carotid restraint should be designated the second highest use-of-force option, just before firearms: The categories of force deployed by members of the SFPD as outlined in General Order 5.01 should be modified to reflect the carotid restraint as the second highest use of force option, just before firearms. PERF considered several factors in reviewing the use of the carotid restraint by the San Francisco Police Department, including: national and regional policing practices, case law, training and testing practices, effectiveness and frequency of use, and reporting practices. PERF found that the use of the carotid restraint by the San Francisco Police Department is an effective tool that has been used in a minimal number of incidents. The department conducts rigorous training and testing on its application and aftercare procedures. PERF concluded the department should continue in its policy of providing the carotid restraint as an approved use of force technique, providing that:

- The use of the carotid restraint control hold by members of the San Francisco Police Department should be restricted to only those incidents in which other control techniques are either ineffective or not appropriate and deadly force may become objectively reasonable if the carotid restraint is not applied.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Medical attention should continue to be provided to all subjects against whom the carotid restraint control hold has been applied.
- Use of the carotid restraint control hold shall be immediately reported to a supervisor who should respond to the scene and document the event, including medical attention.
- All employees should continue to be re-certified in the carotid restraint control hold every 24 months as part of their Continuing Professional Training (CPT) in perishable skills.

Recommendation: Change canine policy to “Bark and Hold”: The department should change its canine policy from “Grab and Hold” to “Bark and Hold.” This significant modification is in keeping with national best policing practices and recommendations by the U.S. Department of Justice. Although the number of canine bites is a small fraction of the instances in which a dog is deployed, the exposure to liability for the department is great. The department’s current update of the Canine Manual should be completed in the next six months and should reflect this change. In incidents where a canine bite occurs, a canine sergeant should respond and conduct an administrative investigation into the matter.

Recommendation: Expedite implementation of the Early Intervention System: In 1994, the San Francisco Police Department initiated an Early Warning System (EWS) to identify and address performance issues or behaviors of employees that, if continued, could potentially lead to disciplinary action. The department committed to transition the EWS into an Early Intervention System (EIS) in 2005. This change, though seemingly subtle in nature, marked a significant philosophical change, away from warning supervisors about potential “problem officers” and toward a comprehensive analysis of behavior designed to *help* members of the department. The EIS has been designed as a non-disciplinary system to improve the performance of the department and its individual members through coaching, training, and other types of professional development.

- The Professional Standards Unit (PSU) has made great strides in developing its capability to retrieve information necessary for the program. As of July 2008, the department now

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

has the interim capability to capture information on all 10 indicator categories and 10 of the 14 associated factors. The department should take steps to promptly implement the Early Intervention System using the 10 indicator categories and the 10 available associated factors.

- As the reliability of the four remaining associated factors' data becomes acceptable, they may be integrated into the system. If it becomes apparent that reliable information will never become available and there is no other way to retrieve the information, those individual factors should be eliminated. The PSU should continue to communicate updates to the department on the accessibility of the remaining factors.

D. BUILDING LEADERSHIP AND DEVELOPING PERSONNEL

Embedded in the Vision's emphasis on developing the department's own employees is that the department must provide "state-of-the-art training, development and career opportunities for advancement and retention."

Recommendation: Create a professional development program to nurture employees and cultivate tomorrow's leaders: Currently the San Francisco Police Department has no formal career or professional development system. In order to accomplish the portion of the Vision relating to employee development, the department should create and implement a formal professional development program. Education, training, experience, and high-quality performance should be key aspects of such a program for all SFPD employees, both sworn and civilian, at all levels – line, supervisory, management and executive.

E. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT—IMPLEMENTATION AND MOVING FORWARD

This technical report offers dozens of detailed recommendations for altering the structure, staffing, policies, and practices of the San Francisco Police Department. What the recommendations, large and small, have in common is that they are specifically designed to implement the city's new Vision Statement for the department, especially those components that will make the department work more effectively and efficiently to reduce crime and enhance the quality of life in the city's neighborhoods through community engagement and problem-solving, enhance accountability and transparency, provide opportunities for growth and advancement to SFPD employees, and create a department that reflects the city and its values of compassion, fairness, diversity, human rights, and justice.

The recommendations in this report are interconnected. What they all have in common is that they are designed to accomplish one or more of the key elements in the city's new Vision for the Police Department.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

For example, the Vision provides that “the Police Department must address crime, violence and quality-of-life issues by engaging communities, neighborhoods and other criminal justice agencies in problem-solving partnerships” and that “police strategies and tactics must be driven by accurate, timely and reliable information.” That prompted PERF to recommend an expansion of the SFPD’s technology division. And when technology provides the desired information about crime patterns, the information must be used effectively. That means having structures in place that *require* officers, sergeants, lieutenants, captains and commanders to come together in certain defined ways to discuss crime patterns, identify potential solutions, work collaboratively with the community and later to review the results and spread the word about what worked and what did not work. Thus, PERF made key recommendations to develop CompStat policing in the SFPD.

In general, because police departments deal with crises every day, it is easy to get caught up in the day-to-day management of whatever is happening at the moment. But the type of thoughtful, community-based, problem-solving approach desired by the residents of San Francisco and the men and women of the SFPD demands a more tightly organized system. The detailed changes that PERF is recommending are designed to produce that result.

This study has been a massive undertaking, but it is just the first step in the process. Next, PERF will work with the project Steering Committee, the Police Commission, the Chief of Police, and the Office of the Controller to develop the top priorities for beginning the implementation of the study recommendations over the coming year. Of high importance will be recommendations that will most enhance the ability of the SFPD to work with San Francisco residents to decrease crime and improve neighborhoods’ quality of life. PERF will provide technical assistance to the Chief to refine the implementation process. The new Strategic Management Division of the SFPD recommended by PERF, which will report directly to the assistant chief, will play a key role in overseeing the changes to the department that will be needed to implement the recommendations of this study and other studies of the SFPD.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND STAFFING OVERVIEW

The recently completed strategic Vision established for the San Francisco Police Department lays out a path for the future. The SFPD has made a commitment to being a world-class police department that reflects the values of the world-class city it serves. Not only will the department be committed to the human values of the city's populace, it also will unite with the people of the city's communities "in their commitment to addressing crime, violence, and quality-of-life issues by engaging one another and all city agencies in problem-solving partnerships."

The department is committed to using strategies and tactics that "must be driven by accurate, timely and reliable information supplied by current and emerging technologies and supported by the Department's systematic engagement of all of San Francisco's diverse neighborhoods." Furthermore, the Vision statement explains:

"The Police Department strives to maintain the trust of San Francisco community members by actively engaging with the neighborhoods it serves. The Police Department seeks to make its policies and operations as open as possible. When there are complaints involving the Police Department, both the public and the police are best served by a system of accountability that is expeditious and fair to all involved."

The department's vision also describes an important commitment to its employees: "To make this vision a reality, the Police Department must reward the hard work, ingenuity, and resourcefulness demonstrated by its employees, and must offer state-of-the-art training development and career opportunities for advancement and retention."

Each of these elements of the department's vision has important implications for how the department should be structured. This section of the report makes recommendations for a number of alterations in the current structure and staffing of the department, each aimed at improving the department's structure and enhancing its ability to implement its vision.

SUMMARY: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

F. METHODOLOGY

PERF's approach to analyzing the organizational structure of the SFPD was based on three sets of criteria:

- Is the SFPD structure in keeping with the structure of comparable agencies?
- Does the SFPD structure correspond to what the professional knowledge of the study team has discovered to be efficient and effective – in terms of efficient allocation of personnel and effective matching of organizational units to tasks?
- What alterations are needed in the structure to help the department implement its strategic vision?

Comparability: The overall organization of the SFPD is comparable to those of other U.S. police agencies. The Chief of Police and the Chief's Office oversee four Bureaus – Field Operations, Investigations, Administration, and the Airport. San Francisco does differ from other similar departments in having an Airport Bureau, but in the local context this makes sense because of the separate funding source for policing the San Francisco Airport.

Some similar agencies also have four Bureaus but they typically are Field Operations, Investigations, Administration, and Support. In such police departments an administration Bureau may be staffed almost entirely with civilians while the support Bureau has a staff of both sworn and civilian employees. A four-Bureau configuration is used to narrow the span of control of executives. There is no single best high-level police organizational structure; each management configuration should match local circumstances and the service delivery expectations of the people the organization serves.

The top levels of the SFPD are composed of the Chief, Assistant Chief and the four Deputy Chiefs. This allocation is comparable to other agencies of similar size. Similar agencies include:

San Diego, CA

Agency size: 2,675 (1,924 officers, 751 civilians)

Chief of Police

Executive Assistant Chief

Four Assistant Chiefs, one Manager (Fiscal Services)

Honolulu, HI

Agency size: 2,548 (2,049 officers, 499 civilians)

Chief of Police

Two Deputy Chiefs

Six Assistant Chiefs

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Boston, MA

Agency size: 2,810 (2,170 officers, 640 civilians)
Police Commissioner
Superintendent in Chief
Two Superintendents, one Bureau Chief

Seattle, WA

Agency size: 1,775 (1,273 officers, 502 civilians)
Chief of Police
Two Deputy Chiefs
Five Assistant Chiefs, one Chief Administrative Officer (nonsworn)

Milwaukee, WI

Agency size: 2,649 (1,936 officers, 713 civilians)
Chief of Police
Assistant Chief of Police
Three Deputy Chiefs of Police

Baltimore, MD

Agency size: 3,684 (2,963 officers, 721 civilians)
Commissioner
Two Deputy Police Commissioners
Third level - unavailable

Oakland, CA

Agency size: 1,108 (722 officers, 386 civilians)
Chief
Assistant Chief
Three Deputy Chiefs, one Deputy Director (non-sworn, position vacant)

Portland, OR

Agency size: 1,259 (989 officers, 270 civilians)
Chief of Police
Three Assistant Chiefs
9 Commanders, 3 Managers (civilian)

San Jose, CA

Agency size: 1,784 (1,396 officers, 388 officers)
Chief of Police
Assistant Chief of Police
Four Deputy Chiefs of Police

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

San Francisco, CA

Agency size: 2,361 (2,130 officers, 231 civilians)

Chief of Police

Assistant Chief of Police

Four Deputy Chiefs of Police

Efficiency: In the Staffing Analysis portion of this study, each unit is assessed in terms of the number of employees assigned compared to the amount of work that needs to be performed. Where inefficiencies were discovered, additions or deletions are recommended.

Another assessment that determines organizational structural efficiency is *Span of Control*, a key element of proper police staffing and personnel allocation. Span of control is an organizational-level factor (Walker 2006)¹ detailing how many officers a supervisor can be expected to effectively control. While there is no hard-and-fast figure, experts (Walker 2006, Hale 2004, Lane 2006)² tend to agree on a ratio of roughly eight officers per supervisor. Hale specifically states that "...it is highly unlikely that a single supervisor could effectively supervise more than eight patrol officers" (2004). A larger ratio would more than likely result in too many officers to effectively supervise, while too small a ratio would not be an optimal use of supervisory resources. Lane (2004)³ notes that in a study of 140 police agencies, spans of control ranged up to a ratio as large as 1:15 in a "very large" agency; however, the average span of control of those agencies participating in the survey was 1:7.

The Public Safety Strategies Group noted in its study "District Station Boundary Analysis" that the span of control ranged from 1:3.7 to 1:6.7. In the Staffing Analysis, each district is examined and assessed in terms of both line and supervisory personnel ratios. The general measure that PERF will apply is 1:8, although if a supervisor works the same schedule as her/his subordinates – i.e., the supervisor sees the work of each subordinate each day that the squad works – that ratio can be expanded to 1:10.

Another aspect of structural efficiency is the rank structure or hierarchy. The San Francisco Police Department has eight levels:

- Chief
- Assistant Chief
- Deputy Chief
- Commander
- Captain/Civilian Director
- Lieutenant/Civilian Managers
- Sergeant/Inspector/Civilian Supervisor
- Officer

¹ Walker, Sam. 2006. Police Accountability: Current Issues and Research Needs. Paper presented at the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) Policing Research Workshop: Planning for the Future, Washington, DC, November 28-29, 2006. <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/218583.pdf>

² Hale, Charles D. 2004. Police Patrol: Operations and Management, Third Edition. Chapter 9 "Patrol Force Organization and Management." P. 309. Prentice Hall. Upper Saddle River, NJ.

³ Lane, Troy. 2006. Span of Control for Law Enforcement Agencies. October. Police Chief Magazine. http://policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display_arch&article_id=1022&issue_id=102006

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

The ranks of Assistant Chief, Deputy Chief, and Commander are appointive ranks which provide the Chief of Police with the opportunity to assemble a senior management team that will support the Chief's initiatives and direction for the organization. The ranks of captain and below are filled through a civil service process that involves testing and competitive assessments.

Deputy Chiefs direct Bureaus; Commanders assist in Bureau direction but may also have specific oversight over some organizational components; Captains/Civilian Directors are in charge of Divisions or Districts; Lieutenants/Civilian Managers oversee Sections; and Sergeants/Civilian Supervisors manage Units.

Although the department has long had the position of assistant chief, until recently the position was vacant. PERF recommends that the department continue to have an assistant chief. In San Francisco, as in many similar cities, the chief of police has two primary jobs. One job, which includes substantial external effort, is to explain the operations of the department to the public at large, to community groups, and to elected and appointed public officials, and to give strategic direction to the department. In San Francisco, this role is uniquely time-consuming. Government in San Francisco is very process-driven, and it is important that San Francisco governmental functions be as open and inclusive as possible.

The other role that a chief of police must play is to manage and lead the employees of the agency and oversee strategic change. The SFPD is undergoing much study and is changing internally to better meet its mandates and community expectations. This requires careful stewardship and a substantial commitment of time.

It is difficult, if not impossible, for a chief to perform all of these roles well over the long run without help from an Assistant Chief. Consequently, the appointment of an Assistant Chief is an important element in helping the department move forward both externally and internally.

Each of the four Bureaus is headed by a deputy chief, a configuration that is typical of departments similar to San Francisco. San Francisco also has the rank of commander reporting to the Deputy Chief. One purpose of this rank is to allow Deputy Chiefs to seek out personnel who have the potential to be the next generation of leaders in the department and mentor them as they learn about the issues that are part of the duties of the senior management team. In the discussions of each Bureau below, the need for commanders is examined.

The remaining civil service ranks are appropriate for the scale and complexity of the San Francisco Police Department.

Effectiveness: Another standard to measure a police organizational structure is effectiveness. Do the units match the tasks that need to be performed? A department that frequently pulls people from existing units for ad hoc operations or to form new special units erodes organizational stability. Although it is desirable to have a flexible organization, frequent departures from the existing structure tend to characterize a reactive organization rather than one that is looking strategically to anticipate problems and find solutions that work with the community to provide high-level services.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

PERF's assessment of much of the current structure determined that there is generally a good match between units and functions. However, the effectiveness of the organizational structure can be improved by adjusting the structure to help the department implement its strategic vision. Detailed explanations of each of PERF's recommended structural changes are provided in sections presenting a proposed new organizational chart and optimal staffing for each Bureau. The following discussion summarizes recommended structural changes.

G. CHIEF'S OFFICE

PERF recommends that two additional divisions be added to the Chief's office which will report directly to the assistant chief – the Risk Management Division (moved from the Administration Bureau), and the newly created Strategic Management Division.

- **Risk Management Division:** The department's Vision pledges that to maintain community trust, the department must make its policies and operations as open as possible, and complaints against the police are best dealt with through a system that is expeditious and fair to all involved. Under PERF's recommendations, the Risk Management Division will add the Written Directives Section to the existing sections of Professional Standards, Internal Affairs, Legal, and Equal Employment Opportunity. These operations are the core of the department's effort to maintain transparency and investigate complaints. They help to ensure that the department maintains its commitment to human values – compassion, fairness, diversity, human rights and justice. These components should be not more than one organizational layer removed from the chief of police, and hence PERF is recommending that the section be moved from reporting to the Administration Bureau Deputy Chief to report directly to the Assistant Chief.
- **Strategic Management Division:** The role of this new division recommended by PERF is vital to the implementation of the Vision and to implementing recommendation of this study and other studies of the SFPD. The Strategic Management Division should be led by a commander to ensure that there is the necessary organizational weight to drive implementation. This commander's position should be a high-visibility appointment, since this person will be responsible both for implementing the study and this report's recommendations and for overseeing citywide strategies for crime reduction.

Recommendation: The Strategic Management Division should have three components: the Implementation Section, the CompStat and Crime Analysis Section and the Written Directives Section which was formerly in the Planning Division of the Administrative Bureau..

Once the study findings are completed and there is consensus on the recommendations, the Implementation Section should be charged with taking action on the reports and studies that have been commissioned.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

The second part of the Strategic Management Division is CompStat and Crime Analysis. The Vision includes a commitment to driving police tactics and strategy “by accurate, timely and reliable information supplied by current and emerging technologies and supported by the Department’s systematic engagement of all of San Francisco’s diverse neighborhoods.” The responsibility of this unit will be to lead a formalized CompStat process designed to enable the districts to focus their problem-solving efforts on “hot spots” and other specific crime and quality-of-life problems. They will assist the districts in using the best information available to define and analyze problems, design responses, and assess results of district-based problem-solving efforts.

The final component of the division is the Written Directives Section. It is anticipated that with the implementation of recommendations from the various studies of the department along with the integration of Comp Stat and crime analysis throughout the agency, written policies and procedures will need to be updated. By aligning the Written Directives Section within the Strategic Management Division, these policy issues may be identified, written, coordinated and disseminated in an organized and timely manner.

H. FIELD OPERATIONS BUREAU (FOB)

The Vision Statement describes a department that works with its diverse communities and other city agencies to address crime, violence and quality-of-life issues through problem-solving partnerships. Some of these problems will be discovered via the CompStat process, others through community/police interaction and engagement. This will require that the 10 police districts have adequate time and staffing to both define problems and address them on a consistent basis at the local level. Local problems will be best solved with local solutions. Patrol officers are in contact with the people in their district daily. The locus of problem-solving should be at the “grass roots” as district personnel work with their neighborhoods to define and solve problems. To accomplish this, recommendations are offered to change the structure of the police districts and of the Field Operations Bureau.

Because of the large number of people assigned to this Bureau, the FOB – headed by a deputy chief – should have two commanders and two lieutenants directly reporting to the deputy chief.

Recommendation: One commander should lead a proposed Special Services Division. This division brings together key operations that, primarily, should be oriented to provide support to the district-based problem-solving

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

process. These sections include Homeland Security, Traffic, and Tactical. The operations of the Traffic and Tactical sections should be driven by problems that arise from the districts and the CompStat process so that there is general agreement on their assignments. Their targets should be established by negotiation among the districts for their resources rather than by the units themselves. PERF also recommends that the responsibility for the investigation of hit and runs be moved from the Investigations Bureau to the Traffic Section of Special Services within the Field Operations Bureau.

Recommendation: The second commander should lead the Police Districts, with help from a Community Policing/CompStat support unit and Field Captains (to have citywide command responsibility during times when no other resource is scheduled.) Although the commander's span of control is wide, it is important that the department seek consistency and a common approach to fully implementing its enhanced community policing, problem-solving and CompStat approach. Under PERF's proposed structure, a single command over all districts will maintain explicit attention on district-level operations. Each district will have different problems and different approaches to addressing them, but all of the districts should use a common, rigorous problem-solving methodology to define and analyze their crime and disorder problems.

Recommendation: PERF recommends that each district have the same basic structure, although the number of people assigned will vary according to the nature of the district and the district's workload. Recommendations for staffing can be found in the "Staffing Analysis" report. The districts should each have components devoted to sector patrol, to staff services (certain administrative functions including clerks, permits, facility/vehicle maintenance, subpoenas, special events and two investigators to address local crimes that may not go to the Investigations Bureau), and a proposed Community Policing/CompStat section.

Recommendation: The proposed Community Policing/CompStat Section is designed to assemble the resources needed in the districts to help sector officers (with additional time to devote to community engagement)

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

identify and analyze problems, design responses, and assess district-level crime and quality-of-life problems. Headed by a lieutenant in each district, this section should have a crime analyst, school resource officers, problem-solving teams, housing and parks officers, and foot beat officers. Each of these elements, described in more detail below, plays an important part in the problem-solving process. The problem-solving teams should be flexible to supplement sector officers in specific operations that are part of problem response. They may work as a tactical team, work in plainclothes, or address traffic problems, for example.

Recommendation: FOB Administration Section: One lieutenant, reporting directly to the FOB deputy chief, should oversee FOB administrative staff as well as the Events Planning Team, Operation Outreach, and the Police Reserves and Patrol Specials. This lieutenant also should have responsibility for the Command Van. This matches the current organizational placement of these administrative activities.

Recommendation: Community Outreach Section: The second lieutenant should also report directly to the deputy chief and should head a proposed Community Outreach Section. This section groups aspects of Youth Services with crime prevention programs and includes the Police Activities League, Graffiti Abatement, and the Wilderness Program.

I. INVESTIGATIONS BUREAU

The Investigations Bureau should be restructured in line with best policing practices to better provide an investigative environment that can enhance its ability to meet high standards and improve accountability. The recommended new structure is also designed to encourage investigators to work in collaboration with others to address crime, violence, and quality-of-life issues. This involves engaging in problem-solving partnerships to solve crime, prevent future offenses, and provide services to victims and others impacted by crime. Investigative personnel, strategies and tactics must be committed to human values and driven by accurate, timely and reliable information.

Headed by a deputy chief, the Investigations Bureau should be organized into six Divisions under the command of five captains and a civilian forensic director. The proposed new alignment contains the following divisions: Crimes Against Persons, Crimes Against Property, Special Victims, Vice/Narcotics, Special Operations, and Forensic Services. Each division will be made up of sections that are under the command of a lieutenant or manager, with some further

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

subdivided into specialized units. Sections and units have been aligned based upon offense type, taking into account that investigative synergies may develop by the grouping of like units. Span of control was also considered. The recommendations for this more “specialist” approach will allow staff to increase expertise in their assignment, thereby improving effectiveness and case clearance rates.

J. ADMINISTRATION BUREAU

The Administration Bureau is under the command of a deputy chief and performs many of the agency’s personnel and business functions. Under the old configuration, the Bureau was made up of six operating divisions: Fiscal, Technology, Planning, Staff Services, Support Services, and Training and Education. In addition, Risk Management, Recruiting, and Behavioral Science reported directly to the deputy chief.

PERF recommends that after moving Risk Management and some elements of Planning to the Assistant Chief, the Administration Bureau should be composed of six divisions, plus Recruiting and Behavioral Science. The divisions should be Fiscal, Staff Services, Support Services, Training and Education, Information Services and Report Management.

Recommendation: Information Services Division: An enhanced Information Services Division, formerly referred to as the Technology Division, should be designed to bring together the key elements that will enable the department to implement the portion of the Vision that commits the SFPD to using strategies and tactics that “must be driven by accurate, timely and reliable information supplied by current and emerging technologies.” Such technology not only includes information technology for the CompStat process, but also other technologies such as radio and data communications, cameras, and “shot spotters.”

The division, commanded by the Chief Information Officer (CIO), should also have a Chief Technology Officer (CTO). The diverse responsibilities of this division require that the CIO focuses on ensuring that the department’s systems are responsive to the general question, “Who needs what information, when, to make what decisions?” as well as acting as a liaison with the City’s Department of Telecommunications and Information systems to coordinate networking issues for the shared systems, including records, HR management and mobile data terminals. The CTO’s responsibilities focus on more technical issues and day-to-day development and maintenance of the SFPD’s technology systems.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Recommendation: Training and Education Division: A key commitment the department has made in its Vision is to its workforce: “To make this vision a reality, the Police Department must reward the hard work, ingenuity, and resourcefulness demonstrated by its employees, and must offer state-of-the-art training, development and career opportunities for advancement and retention.” The proposed reorganization of the Training and Education division has three sections: Basic and Core Competencies, Field Training, and Career Development. PERF’s recommendation for the creation of a Career Development section is intended to strongly highlight and strategically focus the department’s commitment to its employees so they will see the Police Department as a lifelong career and strive to become the department’s next generation of leaders.

K. THE AIRPORT BUREAU

Although the current structure of the Airport Bureau matches the work that the Bureau performs, there needs to be increased clarity in the roles of the deputy chief and the commander. In some ways similar to the Chief of Police, the Airport Bureau Deputy Chief has both external and internal responsibilities. The deputy chief’s external duties include constant liaison with federal agencies, the airport authority, the airlines and San Mateo County (where the airport is located). Internal duties include giving strategic direction to the Bureau. The commander oversees the running of the day-to-day operations of the Bureau.

Internally, it is imperative that the Bureau provide a high level of safety and security for the entire airport community. Security inside the airport must meet and exceed TSA standards. Traffic on airport roadways must be managed and controlled to promote efficient movement of vehicles and pedestrians. And, security must be maintained in an era requiring constant vigilance to protect against terrorist threats and other criminal behavior.

L. SUMMARY OPTIMAL STAFFING

In addition to recommendations regarding organizational structure, this section of the report makes recommendations for the number and type of positions that should be assigned to every unit in the police department with the goal of creating an organization that is staffed appropriately to implement the vision for the organization.

The optimal staffing recommendations are the result of analysis of a number of data sources. Interviews were conducted with the heads of virtually every organizational component. Interviews and focus groups of San Francisco residents, public officials and other stakeholders compiled as part of the visioning process were taken into account. Assessments were made of available data sources, especially a database containing all recorded 2007 dispatch activity from the computer aided dispatch system and another database which included all 2007 crime incident

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

reports from the CABLE system. Reviews were conducted of other reports and studies of the department. And reports on the current staffing of the department were consulted.

This latter data source, current department staffing, is problematic. As in other large police departments, personnel assignments in the SFPD are in almost constant motion. People are moved for operational needs, as a result of injury and long term illness, to cope with unexpected vacancies, and because of disciplinary processes. Such changes are not always communicated on a timely basis and the primary source of personnel assignment information, the Human Resource Management System (HRMS), may not be a completely accurate record. Furthermore, the HRMS is not designed to track specific assignments within some units which may change. For example, although each of the ten police districts has a number of officers allocated through HRMS, their particular job duties are neither recorded in HRMS nor centrally in the department. Determining the number of district officers assigned to sector response, foot patrol, homeless outreach, park patrol, housing patrol or tactical activities requires a query of each district.

Staffing recommendations incorporate a number of factors described in more detail in the body of this report. For example, in the detailed discussion about sector patrol in the ten police districts, four different targets dealing with patrol officer time for community policing are discussed. The first target posits that, on average, 50% of sector patrol officers' time will be consumed by calls for service, the second target is 40%, the third target 35% and the fourth target 30%. Optimal staffing for patrol response, designed to best accomplish the vision which strives for ongoing engagement between community-based police officers and neighborhood residents, is essentially a policy decision that the police department needs to make. The level that is chosen will have an impact on the number of sector patrol officers needed in the department and the time that can be devoted to community policing and problem solving. The table below shows the range of personnel that should be assigned to the Field Operations Bureau depending on which target is selected.

Table 1: Field Operation Bureau Staffing By Target

	TARGET 1 (50% CFS)	TARGET 2 (40% CFS)	TARGET 3 (35% CFS)	TARGET 4 (30% CFS)
Deputy Chief	1	1	1	1
Commander	2	2	2	2
Captain	17	17	17	17
Lieutenant	61	61	61	61
Sergeant	167	178	189	204
Investigators	40	40	40	40
Officers	1056	1198	1318	1434
Civilians	83	83	83	83
Total Sworn	1344	1497	1628	1759
Total Civilian	83	83	83	83

Source: 2007 Computer-Aided Dispatch System (CAD)
and PERF Analysis

Another factor in determining optimal staffing is the use of appropriately trained civilians in positions that have been staffed with sworn officers. For example, thorough investigations require computer searches, paperwork completion and telephone calls. Case file preparation is often a laborious paperwork chore. These tasks can be performed by civilians rather than by

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

sworn personnel. The department should create a new civilian position of “police investigative aide” and staff these positions with appropriately trained civilians. This will allow investigators to spend more time on the street tracking down leads thus enhancing their productivity.

Another key area for civilianization is in the Crime Scene Investigation Section. By making a transition to all civilian positions, as is the case in many departments of the SFPD’s size, 37 investigator positions can be reallocated to direct crime investigations.

The next set of tables compares PERF’s staffing recommendations against current “full duty” staffing. Current SFPD staffing data came from the City’s Human Resources Management System (HRMS) as of August 12, 2008. Departmental data was used for that same time to adjust the HRMS data by subtracting sworn personnel that are in some form of “limited duty” status. “Limited duty” means a sworn employee is unable to perform all the tasks required of a sworn police officer. Limited duty was available from the department by Bureau only. The number of limited duty officers by rank for each unit was not available. Of the total of 2,277 sworn employees of the SFPD, 234 were in some form of limited duty status as of August 13, 2008. This accounts for 10.2% of the city’s sworn police staff.

Many agencies do not have such information readily available but PERF obtained “limited duty” percentages from several other large police departments as of October 2008. The rate for Los Angeles Police Department is 7.9%, for Boston 9.5%, for San Jose 7.8%, for Jacksonville FL 1.2% and for San Antonio 3.1%. If San Francisco were able to reduce the number of officers in limited duty status to 8% from 10.2% it would have about 50 additional officers at no additional cost to the city.

The tables below compared PERF’s recommend full duty staffing to equivalent SFPD staffing. Reserve officers and personnel assigned outside the SFPD are excluded from the tables. Each Bureau and each patrol staffing option is presented.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

**Table 2. Current (August 2008) Full Duty Staffing vs. Recommended Staffing
Chief's Office**

	Current	Recommended
Chief	1	1
Assistant Chief	1	1
Deputy Chief	0	
Commander	0	1
Captain	0	
Lieutenant	2	7
Sergeant	1	19
Investigator	1	
Officer	3	6
Civilian	3	41
Total Sworn	9	35
Total Civilian	3	41

Source: San Francisco Human Resource Management System (HRMS)
as of August 12, 2008 and PERF Analysis

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

**Table 3. Current (August 2008) Full Duty Staffing vs. Recommended Staffing
Field Operations Bureau**

	Field Operations Bureau (FOB) (Current)	FOB Target 1	FOB Target 2	FOB Target 3	FOB Target 4
Chief	0				
Assistant Chief	0				
Deputy Chief	1	1	1	1	1
Commander	3	2	2	2	2
Captain	14	17	17	17	17
Lieutenant	46	61	61	61	61
Sergeant	162	167	178	189	204
Investigator	12	40	40	40	40
Officer	1260	1056	1198	1318	1434
Civilian	63	83	83	83	83
Total Sworn	1498	1344	1497	1628	1759
Total Civilian	63	83	83	83	83

Source: San Francisco Human Resource Management System (HRMS)
as of August 12, 2008 and PERF Analysis

**Table 4. Current (August 2008) Full Duty Staffing vs. Recommended Staffing
Investigations Bureau**

	Current	Recommended
Chief	0	
Assistant Chief	0	
Deputy Chief	1	1
Commander	0	
Captain	3	5
Lieutenant	16	16
Sergeant	35	40
Investigator	176	332
Officer	58	
Civilian	62	166.5
Total Sworn	289	394
Total Civilian	62	166.5

Source: San Francisco Human Resource Management System (HRMS)
as of August 12, 2008 and PERF Analysis

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

**Table 5. Current (August 2008) Full Duty Staffing vs. Recommended Staffing
Administration Bureau**

	Current	Recommended
Chief	0	
Assistant Chief	0	
Deputy Chief	1	1
Commander	1	1
Captain	3	1
Lieutenant	9	4
Sergeant	27	15
Investigator	6	4
Officer	66	40
Civilian	120	176
Total Sworn	113	66
Total Civilian	120	176

Source: San Francisco Human Resource Management System (HRMS)
as of August 12, 2008 and PERF Analysis

**Table 6. Current (August 2008) Full Duty Staffing vs. Recommended Staffing
SFPD without Airport Bureau**

	Sub Total (Current)	Sub Total Target 1	Sub Total Target 2	Sub Total Target 3	Sub Total Target 4
Chief	1	1	1	1	1
Assistant Chief	1	1	1	1	1
Deputy Chief	3	3	3	3	3
Commander	4	4	4	4	4
Captain	20	23	23	23	23
Lieutenant	73	88	88	88	88
Sergeant	225	241	252	263	278
Investigator	195	376	376	376	376
Officer	*1387	1102	1244	1364	1480
Civilian	231	466.5	466.5	466.5	466.5
Total Sworn	**1909	1839	1992	2123	2254
Total Civilian	248	466.5	466.5	466.5	466.5

Source: San Francisco Human Resource Management System (HRMS)
as of August 12, 2008 and PERF Analysis

* This includes only full duty personnel. Limited duty personnel are not included. Although some limited duty personnel are at ranks other than officer, that information was not available when this report was prepared.

** Includes only full duty personnel.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

**Table 7. Current (August 2008) Full Duty Staffing vs. Recommended Staffing
Airport Bureau**

	Current	Recommended
Chief	0	
Assistant Chief	0	
Deputy Chief	1	1
Commander	1	1
Captain	3	3
Lieutenant	7	9
Sergeant	19	37
Investigator	1	
Officer	102	207
Civilian	126	141
Total Sworn	134	258
Total Civilian	126	141

Source: San Francisco Human Resource Management System (HRMS)
as of August 12, 2008 and PERF Analysis

**Table 8. Current (August 2008) Full Duty Staffing vs. Recommended Staffing
SFPD including Airport Bureau**

	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
	(as-is)	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4
Chief	1	1	1	1	1
Assistant Chief	1	1	1	1	1
Deputy Chief	4	4	4	4	4
Commander	5	5	5	5	5
Captain	23	26	26	26	26
Lieutenant	80	97	97	97	97
Sergeant	244	278	289	300	315
Investigator	196	376	376	376	376
Officer	1489	1309	1451	1571	1687
Civilian	374	607.5	607.5	607.5	607.5
Total Sworn	2043	2097	2250	2381	2512
Total Civilian	374	607.5	607.5	607.5	607.5

Source: San Francisco Human Resource Management System (HRMS)
as of August 12, 2008 and PERF Analysis

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

The staffing recommendations take into account two additional factors, violent crime rates and expected population change in San Francisco. The next table shows recent numbers for violent crime in San Francisco.

Table 9. Recent Violent Crime in San Francisco

UCR Part 1 Violent Crime in San Francisco, 2005- 2007			
	2005	2006	2007
Murder	96	86	98
Rape	172	154	125
Robbery	3078	3858	3771
Aggravated Assault	2639	2435	2418

Source: FBI UCR data 2005-2007

Fluctuation in crime is typical in large cities like San Francisco, and increases in crime almost always are a major concern to city residents. Recommended staffing in Investigations takes into account the time needed to perform thorough investigations in all crime categories. This level of staffing should improve investigative productivity and increase the number of crimes solved.

The recommended staffing recommendations are based on 2007 workload. Although police workload in cities with rapid population changes may fluctuate from year to year, in cities with stable population numbers these measures tend to be relatively stable. Population figures issued by the State of California's Department of Finance estimated a population of 798,680 in San Francisco in 2006. The same source projects the city's population at 787,500 in 2010, 765,965 in 2015 and at 755,800 by 2020. Population and workload demand can be expected to be relatively stable with a slight downward trend.

To provide a perspective on the recommended staffing for San Francisco, PERF examined other American cities of comparable size. Airport Bureau staffing for San Francisco is not included. The list below shows the cities, the size of their police departments, and the cities' populations. These figures are illustrative, but precise comparisons are problematic since land area, population density, economic factors, organizational differences (such as whether communications are part of the police agency), crime problems, and policing styles all have influence on the size of a police agency.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 10. Population and Size of Comparable Police Departments

Agency	Service population	Sworn personnel	Percent of total force	Civilian personnel	Percent of total force
San Francisco (target 1)	798,680	1,839	79.8%	466.5	20.2%
San Francisco (target 2)	798,680	1,992	81.0%	466.5	19.0%
San Francisco (target 3)	798,680	2,123	82.0%	466.5	18.0%
San Francisco (target 4)	798,680	2,254	82.9%	466.5	17.1%
Jacksonville, FL	797,350	1,639	57.1%	1,232	42.9%
Indianapolis	797,268	1,605	85.2%	278	14.8%
Charlotte-Mecklenburg, NC	733,291	1,515	75.1%	503	24.9%
Austin	716,817	1,418	71.1%	577	28.9%
Boston	591,855	2,170	77.2%	640	22.8%
Milwaukee	572,938	1,936	73.1%	713	26.9%
Baltimore	624,237	2,963	80.4%	721	19.6%
Oakland, CA	396,541	722	65.2%	386	34.8%
Portland, OR	538,133	989	78.6%	270	21.4%
San Diego	1,261,196	1,924	71.9%	751	28.1%
San Jose	934,553	1,396	78.3%	388	21.7%
Seattle	585,118	1,273	71.7%	502	28.3%

Source: State of California's Department of Finance; PERF survey/research

How San Francisco compares will depend on the sector patrol staffing level chosen by the department and the city. Civilian staffing recommendations for San Francisco, even with the suggested increases would place it third lowest in number of civilian employees.

The next sections of the report detail recommended staffing unit by unit, and recommended structural alterations.

ORGANIZING AND STAFFING THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF POLICE

M. ORGANIZING THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF POLICE


As the chief executive officer (CEO) of the San Francisco Police Department, the Chief of Police provides overall leadership and strategic direction to the department and the efforts to implement its Vision. The Chief is supported by the five members of the department's executive command staff. The Assistant Chief, who is the department's second highest-ranking member, reports directly to the Chief. This executive staff member serves at the discretion of the chief, and this position should be viewed as the equivalent of a Chief Operating Officer (COO) with a specific focus on the day-to-day internal operations within the agency. The other four members of the executive command staff are Deputy Chiefs, who also serve at the discretion of the Chief and report to the Assistant Chief, each commanding one of the agency's four Bureaus. The proposed organizational structure of the Office of the Chief provides a configuration that not only will increase communication and effectiveness but also will demonstrate a commitment to implement the San Francisco Police Department's Vision Statement.

Recently, the Assistant Chief's position was filled after being vacant from 2003 to 2007. The organizational structure of the Office of the Chief recommended by PERF includes specific responsibilities for the Assistant Chief. Under this model, the Assistant Chief oversees the day-to-day operations of the department, which enables the Chief to provide overall leadership and implement the department's Vision. The chief will provide strategic direction to the police agency as well as focusing on external relationships, protecting the agency's credibility, and preserving the community's trust.

Each of the Deputy Chiefs reports to the Assistant Chief and commands one of the department's four Bureaus: Field Operations, Investigations, Administration, and the Airport. A description of the organizational structure and commentary for each are provided in this report.

PERF recommends that two additional entities report directly to the Assistant Chief: a new Strategic Management Division, and the Risk Management Division. Many of the functions that make up these divisions were realigned from the Administration Bureau and play an integral role in the organization's ability to deliver high-quality service, preserve the rights of both the community and members of the department, and ensure that directives are up-to-date and in keeping with best practices.

**Organizational Structure and Staffing
Final Report December 2008**



**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

N. STAFFING THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF POLICE

The immediate Office of the Chief includes an Executive Secretary, a lieutenant executive officer, two front desk officers, and a five-member Public Affairs Unit. The front desk officers respond to telephone queries from the public and direct walk-ins to the area of the police department that can best deal with their issues. They also provide an additional level of security for the Office of the Chief, which is necessary since visitors can move freely through the Hall of Justice building after being screened upon entry.

Legal counsel in policing has evolved into a specialized field that continually changes with the external environment. Case law, legislation, policy and procedure modifications, emerging police practices, technology and other factors may impact legal issues and a police department's ability to deliver services. It is important for the San Francisco Police Chief to have a dedicated legal advisor who can provide expert counsel. The attorney may also perform legal research for the chief and executive staff on matters such as: the Fourth Amendment, self-incrimination, civil liability, homeland security legal issues, use-of-force law, pursuit liability, ethics, internal affairs investigations, electronic intercept law, and evidence. This attorney, part of the City Attorney's Office, should be housed in the police department and should maintain appropriate memberships and be active in police legal advisor associations.

Recommendation: A Legal Advisor should also be assigned to the Office of the Chief of Police, serving as an advisor on civil, criminal and organizational matters. This attorney, part of the City Attorney's Office, should be housed in the police department and should maintain appropriate memberships and be active in police legal advisor associations.

1. The Public Affairs Unit

The Public Affairs Unit is staffed by two sergeants, two civilians (a police services aide and a clerk/typist) and an officer who maintains the department's website.

With the addition of a legal advisor, the staffing of the Chief's Office is adequate and provides the clerical and administrative support necessary to conduct the daily business of the Chief of Police.

Recommendation: Maintaining the department's website does not require a sworn officer. This position should be replaced by an appropriately qualified civilian.

2. Assistant Chief

The Assistant Chief must have the support necessary to fulfill the significant responsibilities that come with the position. Since the Assistant Chief's position has recently been filled after a long period of being vacant, no support personnel exist. The Assistant Chief is currently using the services of the Chief's Office and other clerical

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

staff as available, which has placed an undue burden on personnel. The department has committed to the position of Assistant Chief, which PERF fully supports, and should move to provide a minimum number of staff so the Assistant Chief may effectively fulfill the responsibilities of the office.

Recommendation: The department should add two positions to the Assistant Chief's Office: an Executive Officer (lieutenant) and a secretary.

3. Strategic Management Division:

The Strategic Management Division recommended by PERF will have an integral role in developing the future of the San Francisco Police Department. This division should be tasked with exploring and implementing the recommendations of various studies and reports on the department and initiatives of the chief of police.

Recommendation: The new Strategic Management Division should be headed by a commander in order to ensure that the unit will carry the organizational weight necessary to drive the execution of these initiatives.

The important work to be completed by the Strategic Management Division can only be accomplished by a high-level unit comprised of full-time staff members, rather than by giving managers such work as a part-time or collateral duty. The Strategic Management Division should be composed of three sections – Implementation, CompStat and Crime Analysis Section and the Written Directives Section.

a) Implementation Section: This section should be tasked with institutionalizing the recommendations of the studies and reports on the San Francisco Police Department in order to improve its operational efficiency and effectiveness and to actualize the recently developed Vision Statement. Due to the time-critical and significant nature of the work performed, the section should be staffed with two full-time lieutenants, two full-time sergeants and a clerk/typist. Some or all of the sworn positions may become civilianized at some point in the future, but it is important that when the section is created, it is staffed with experienced personnel who can move forward immediately to begin accomplishing the section's mission.

b) CompStat and Crime Analysis Section: This section should provide the tools by which the department can increase organizational accountability through the timely identification of crime and disorder issues, development of effective responses that engage the community, and achieving long-term resolutions of persistent problems. The department is committed to creating, implementing and continuously improving its systems to provide timely and accurate data in a setting and format that support and encourage accountability at all levels of the organization. Accountability for crime and disorder control is an essential part of

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

the CompStat approach. The department must hold its managers accountable by ensuring that they act on crime and disorder data that is regularly collected, mapped and analyzed.

Recommendation: The CompStat and Crime Analysis Section should be led by a senior supervising analyst and should be staffed with five analysts and one Clerk/Typist. Each of the analysts should be responsible for analyzing and monitoring crime and disorder trends, hot spots, and the results of targeted operations in two police districts. This unit will provide the tools by which the department can increase organizational accountability through the timely identification of crime and disorder issues, development of effective responses that engage the community, and achieving long-term resolutions of persistent problems.

c) Written Directives Unit: PERF has recommended that the Written Directives Section be moved from the Planning Division in the Administration Bureau to the Strategic Management Division reporting to the Assistant Chief of Police. This unit is responsible for the writing, updating and distribution of general orders, department bulletins, and general order updates. Members of this section also produce revisions of department forms and manuals, and maintain compliance with the equal access guidelines by coordinating the translation of department forms and signage.

The use of bulletins to address and update changes in policy has resulted in a disparity, and in some cases contradiction, in policy and procedures. While this practice may bring about change in a quick timeline, it does not address the core issue of having conflicting policies. The members of the department should have a single reference point when it comes to policy and procedures for which they are accountable.

Recommendation: This Written Directives unit should be staffed by a Sergeant, two officers, three civilian analysts and a clerk/typist. Sworn status provides street level experience to help ensure that directives take into account operational realities. Much of the researching and writing directives can be performed by civilians. The unit should have immediate access to a Risk Management attorney who should be a specialist in police policy and directives. This attorney should be part of the review process of every directive, thus supporting and expediting the final review performed by the City Attorney's Office.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

As part of the repositioning and enhancement of the Written Directives Unit and process, the department should have discussions with the Police commission and the City Attorney's Office about re-creating the General Order system. Each General Order would be composed of a policy with procedures designed to implement the policy. Changes to the policy would still require Police Commission approval. The department would be able to amend procedures at a lower level of review in order to keep procedures more up-to-date and in keeping with best practices.

4. Risk Management Division

The department should move the Risk Management Division from the Administration Bureau to report directly to the Assistant Chief. The division is commanded by a civilian Director.

Recommendation: The duties of the director are complex and varied. With the expanded role of the division, a civilian assistant position should be assigned to the Director in order to address the increasing responsibilities of the division. The department should also add a clerk/typist to support the Director's work.

Risk Management should be comprised of four Sections: Professional Standards, Internal Affairs, Legal, and Equal Employment Opportunity. These sections are designed to maintain a professional staff while preserving fairness, human rights and justice. Some of the main responsibilities of these sections include:

- a) Professional Standards Section:** The current Professional Standards lieutenant will oversee Staff Inspections, while retaining responsibility for developing and implementing the department's Early Intervention System (EIS). Adequate staffing must be provided in order for the section to successfully fulfill its increased responsibilities and implement the Early Intervention System.
- **Early Intervention System Unit:** The department is committed to implementing an Early Intervention System and has dedicated a significant amount of resources to realize that goal. Although the system is approaching going fully on-line, there is important training and testing that must still be performed which is critical for the members of the department to have confidence in the system.

Recommendation: The department should add one sergeant to the EIS unit to help implement and oversee the system. Staffing should be reexamined once the unit is

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

fully operational. Specific immediate tasks should include completion of the procedural manual, training for management, supervisory personnel and line personnel, examination of performance reviews and recommendations, and follow-up on interventions.

Recommendation: The department should conduct a review of the General Orders and update where needed.

- **Staff Inspections Unit:** According to the standards of the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA), “A staff inspection ... is an in-depth review of all components of the agency. This management tool is used to assure the agency head that administrative procedures are being adhered to. The role of staff inspections is to promote an objective review of agency administrative and operational activities, facilities, property, equipment and personnel outside the normal supervisory and/or line inspections.”

The SFPD is undergoing significant change. It will be important for the agency to have the capability to monitor and inspect itself to ensure that the desired changes are being implemented and institutionalized. This is the role of staff inspections.

Recommendation: Two sergeants should be assigned to the Staff Inspections Unit to perform the function as outlined in the above CALEA standards.

Recommendation: All units within the police department should measure workload data on a monthly basis. This information will be helpful in tracking outcomes and maintaining accountability. It will also be instrumental for the department in making future staffing decisions.

b) Internal Affairs Section: Formerly the Management Control Section, Internal Affairs currently conducts the department’s administrative investigations into internal allegations of misconduct, officer-involved shootings and weapon discharges, and custodial deaths. The section commander is a lieutenant. Members of the section work in cooperation with the three attorneys who work out of the office and provide legal counsel. Additional staff includes eight sergeants and a clerk/typist.

The Internal Affairs Section is in the process of eliminating a backlog of investigations into Officer Involved Shootings and Officer Involved Discharges that dated back as far as 2000. This process has been helpful in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the department’s administrative investigation of such incidents.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Recommendation: PERF recommends the establishment of an *Office of Officer-Involved Shootings* under command of a lieutenant and staffed with two sergeants moved from Internal Affairs. It should be the responsibility of this office to respond and conduct the administrative investigations into all discharges of weapons (regardless of whether the intended target was hit) other than in the performance of training or disposing of an animal. The office should also conduct administrative investigations into in-custody deaths. The office can also provide assistance in other interval investigations when necessary. Further details of this office are included in PERF's Use of Force portion of this study.

Staffing for the Internal Affairs Section should then be one lieutenant, six sergeants and the civilian position. One attorney should specialize in internal investigations, a second in Equal Employment Opportunity compliance to work cooperatively with the City Attorney on training and to identify and address potentially discriminatory processes (although the City Attorney's Office has substantial expertise in equal employment opportunity, there should be a single source of such expertise related to police issues), and a third should become an expert in police policy and written directives as discussed in more detail elsewhere.

c) Legal Section and Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO Section): The legal section works closely with the City Attorney's Office and investigates civil claims and lawsuits that involve the department. Members of the Legal Section offer recommendations to the Chief regarding policy and procedure issues that increase operational efficiency and decrease liability by reducing the number of claims and lawsuits. This section also processes requests for documents, subpoenas for officers, and court motions.

The EEO Section is charged with ensuring that all employees are afforded equality in the workplace. Members of this section provide EEO training, which includes encouraging the reporting of violations supporting the Department of Human Resources in investigating potential discrimination and harassment violations.

The Legal and EEO sections are staffed by three sergeants, ten officers, and seven civilian positions.

Recommendation: Other than a core sworn complement of two sergeants who can provide sworn authority when needed, the Legal Section should be composed of all

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

civilian personnel. Staffing should be two sergeants, the seven civilian positions currently in place, four administrative analyst positions and four legal assistants.

Recommendation: The EEO Section should have a separate staffing complement of a sergeant, two officers and a clerk/typist. The sworn staffing is needed to provide peer-to-peer training. This section should also have ready access to one of the Risk Management attorneys who is a specialist in EEO matters.

* * *

**Table 11. Summary: Recommended Staffing
for the Office of the Chief of Police***

RANK	NUMBER
Chief	1
Assistant Chief	1
Commander	1
Lieutenant	7
Sergeant	19
Officer	6
Civilians (including one director and four attorneys)	41
Total Sworn	35
Total Civilian	41

Source: PERF Analysis

*Several positions that are budgeted in the SFPD do not appear in this tally because they work outside the department. These include two deputy chief positions assigned to other city agencies, a lieutenant detailed to the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice, and a lieutenant and a secretary used to provide staff support for the Police Commission.

ORGANIZING THE FIELD OPERATIONS BUREAU


PERF's recommend structure for the Field Operation Bureau (FOB) is to have the FOB Deputy Chief be supported by two commanders and two lieutenants. One commander should oversee Special Services, the other the Police Districts.

One lieutenant should be responsible for FOB administrative staff as well as the Events Planning Team, Operation Outreach, the Police Reserves and Patrol Specials, and responsibility for the Command Van. This matches the current organizational placement of these administrative activities.

PERF recommends that the second lieutenant report directly to the deputy chief and head a Community Outreach Section. This section groups aspects of Youth Services with crime prevention programs and includes the Police Activities League, Graffiti Abatement, and Wilderness Program.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

SFPD Field Operation Bureau
Proposed Structure November 2008



STAFFING THE FIELD OPERATIONS BUREAU

O. ADMINISTRATION

FOB Administration should be headed by a lieutenant and should include the Events Planning Team, Operation Outreach coordination, and the Police Reserves and Patrol Specials. The administration lieutenant should also be responsible for coordinating the assignment and use of the command van.

1. Events Planning Team

San Francisco has many events as diverse as the city itself. Some special events are citywide and occur annually. Others may be confined to a neighborhood or single street. Parades, sporting events and demonstrations and protests are almost a daily part of San Francisco. The function of this unit is to plan for these events and work with the police districts and the rest of the department to arrange for the needed police staffing for the events. The Events Planning Team has responsibility not only for planning but also for after-event review.

Recommendation: This unit should be headed by a sergeant who should oversee an officer and two Police Service Aides. Although the department has a long history of dealing with special events, it still needs to ensure that it maintains an institutional memory of how they were staffed and what adjustments are needed for the next time the event occurs. The sworn presence helps to maintain the police perspective needed for these events.

2. Operation Outreach

This operation coordinates the department's homeless outreach efforts. Each police district has an outreach coordinator tasked with brokering homeless services to the people in the district who need such assistance. The department also assists in the city's program which seeks to reunite homeless persons with out-of-city family members.

Recommendation: This unit should be staffed by a sergeant and a Police Service Aide. The sergeant is needed both to provide a uniformed presence at meetings of service providers and to coordinate the efforts of the district coordinators. The civilian position should be responsible for continually reviewing and updating the resources available to assist homeless people. Resources should be organized by police district when possible to assist the work of the district homeless officers.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

3. Police Reserves/Patrol Specials

The Police Reserve Officer Program is composed of volunteers who meet a set of qualifications including certification through a P.O.S.T. accredited institution. They supplement full-time officers and perform most of the same duties as full-time officers. Reserves, based on their training and experience, may be Level I, II or III. The level determines whether they may work alone or if they are required to work only with a full-time officer. A typical reserve officer works 20 hours a month. The department has 20 reserve officer positions.

Patrol Special Officers are essentially private security guards. Authorized under the City Charter, they are regulated by Police Commission. They receive their appointment from the Police Commission, which has oversight responsibility for the entire Patrol Special Program. The SFPD has a Patrol Special Liaison who examines applicants' paperwork and conducts background checks which are submitted with other documents for review by the Chief of Police. All applicant approvals are at the discretion of the Chief of Police. Patrol Special Officers are approved by the Police Commission.

Recommendation: A sergeant should coordinate the Reserve program with the assistance of one Police Service Aide. These two positions should also be responsible for preparing Patrol Special applicant packages for review by the chief of police.

* * *

Table 12. Summary of Recommended FOB Administration Staffing

Administration Staffing	
Lieutenant	1
Sergeant	3
Officers	1
Civilians	4
Total Sworn	5
Total Civilian	4

Source: PERF Analysis

P. SPECIAL SERVICES DIVISION

In order to allow the Police Districts Commander to focus on the ten police districts, the department should create the Special Services Division, headed by a commander. This division should be composed of the Homeland Security Section, the Traffic Section, and the Tactical Section. Each of these sections has citywide responsibility.

1. Organizing and Staffing the Homeland Security Section

The Homeland Security Section should be commanded by a captain and should remain as currently staffed and organized, with one exception. The Plans/Intelligence Unit should be expanded to house all of the department's intelligence operations. Such centralization should encourage cross-fertilization to provide a more complete picture of threats to the security of San Francisco. Many police agencies recognize that securing the homeland not only requires anti-terrorist information, planning and action but also requires addressing threats posed by gangs and other organized criminal enterprises. PERF recommends that the section take an all-crimes approach to intelligence sharing in order to have a greater impact on crime. Staffing recommendations are as follows:

a) Administration: This unit is composed of two administrative assistants, one sworn and one civilian. A civilian facilities coordinator completes the staffing for this group.

b) Finance Administration: There is a sergeant and a civilian assigned to this function. They monitor and track the various grants, grant requirements and spending for the Homeland Security Division because of the often complex state and federal tracking and justification requirements. These operations require a high degree of specialized knowledge. This unit has adequate staffing to perform the tasks required.

Recommendation: The Administration and Finance Administration groups should be merged. The Finance Administration sergeant should be in charge of the unit and the administrative assistant position staffed by a sworn officer should be civilianized.

c) Operations: Operations, headed by a sergeant, has two sub-units – Training (staffed by two officers, one designated as the Training Coordinator) and Exercise Planning (staffed by a sergeant who is designated as the Exercise Planner and one additional officer). The purpose of Operations is to provide training and to develop exercises and simulations for members of the department related to homeland security and anti-terrorism.

Recommendation: Although the number of personnel allocated to this unit meets current needs, under the current structure the sergeant who is the Exercise Planner reports to another sergeant. The department, after appropriate training and transition, should replace the Exercise Planner sergeant with an officer.

d) Plans/Information: This group is headed by an officer with another officer reporting to him who is designated as an Intelligence Analyst. An additional sub-group, also reporting to the officer in charge, is Plans/EOP/Policy which develops

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

directives and policies for the department regarding homeland security and anti-terrorism operations. This group includes a sergeant and two officers.

Recommendation: Although the number of personnel allocated to this unit meets current needs, the current structure should be changed. The group should be headed by a sergeant and all other staff should be officers. Neither officers nor a sergeant should report to someone of the same or lower rank.

e) **Logistics:** Two officers are assigned to Logistics, with one dealing with logistics communication. Federal Department of Homeland Security funding provides for local agencies to acquire a variety of equipment and special purpose vehicles to be used to enhance security and deal with potential terrorist attacks. The function of this group should be to manage and track homeland security equipment and vehicles. Current staffing is adequate to perform these tasks.

* * *

**Table 13. Summary of Recommended FOB Special Services Staffing
(and Homeland Security)**

Special Services Staffing	
Commander	1
Captain	1
Sergeant	3
Officers	10
Civilians	3
Total Sworn	15
Total Civilian	3

Source: PERF Analysis

2. Organizing and Staffing the Traffic Section

Structurally the Traffic Section should retain its current organization with the addition of the Hit and Run unit, to be moved from Investigations.

Recommendation: The department should move the responsibility for the investigation of hit-and-run crime from the Investigations Bureau to the Traffic Section of Special Services within the Field Operations Bureau. Hit and Run is comprised of specially trained personnel who investigate fatal traffic accidents and those that may result in a death, felony hit and run accidents in which a serious injury occurs, driving under the influence, CAL-OSHA

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

related and marine fatalities, and felony hazardous material incidents. This section also reviews all police pursuits and conducts further investigation when warranted. The duties of this unit are a good match to the expertise of the department's traffic specialists.

Recommendation: Traffic Section operations should be guided by problem-solving projects that come from the districts. Rather than independently targeting areas for operations, the Traffic Section should assign work guided by the needs of the districts, as defined through the problem-solving process. The locations where the Traffic Section operates and the tactics used should be the subject of negotiation among the district captains.

Recommendation: The Traffic Section should be a key reservoir of on-duty personnel for Special Events. Their scheduling should be flexible enough so that their work hours can be adjusted to meet the city's special events policing needs with the minimum use of overtime.

a) Staffing the Traffic Section: The Traffic Section, headed by a Captain and supported by one clerical position, is composed of four sections. Each section is headed by a lieutenant.

- One section is composed of two day-shift traffic enforcement-accident investigations squads and the STOP (Serious Traffic Offender Program) unit.
- A second section is composed of two additional day shift traffic enforcement-accident investigations squads and the Violence Reduction Squad.
- The third section is composed of two night watch traffic enforcement-accident investigations squads, the Traffic Support Section and the STOP Window.
- The fourth section contains two night watch traffic enforcement-accident investigations squads, the Commercial Vehicle Enforcement squad, and officers assigned to Traffic Court.

b) Traffic Enforcement – Accident Investigation Squads: There are four day squads and four night squads. The day squads typically work from 0600 – 1600 hours with some officers usually working each day of the week. Each day squad consists of a sergeant and six motorcycle officers (“solos”). They are assigned to work in the districts so that traffic enforcement and accident investigation capacity are spread over the city. They often work in neighborhoods where the residents have complained recently about vehicles not observing pedestrian laws or speed restrictions. They may work in conjunction with the two “solos” assigned to each district.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

The night watch squads also are spread across the city and work all days of the week. Their hours of operation are 1400 – 2400 Sunday through Thursday and 1700 – 0300 Friday and Saturday. The Friday and Saturday hours are designed to provide coverage at high accident times. These squads are composed of a sergeant and four motorcycle officers.

The traffic squads also work on-duty for special events policing and dignitary escorts. No data was available to determine what portion of their work is accounted for by this activity. Because they are considered a “special operation,” their shifts can be moved to accommodate the need to have a large police presence for special event policing.

In 2007, traffic enforcement units accounted for 436 calls for service and 16,118 self-initiated activities. Seventy-three percent (320) of the calls were traffic accident investigations. Another 238 accidents were investigated as self-initiated activities, for a combined total of 558 recorded accident investigations. For the 40 officers assigned to traffic enforcement-investigation, this equates to an average of 14 accident investigations annually.

The majority (66%, 10,642) of the self-initiated activities were traffic stops. Data was not available to determine how many traffic stops resulted in citations being issued or the extent to which citations may have been issued without a traffic stop being recorded.

These squads perform their everyday duties with little technological support. The motorcycles are not equipped with mobile data devices, so traffic stops and accident investigations require voice radio communication to check driver and vehicle registration information. Most accident investigations require manual measurements of distances; the department does not have advanced automated devices that would improve the accuracy and reduce the time needed for accident investigation. Motorcycle officers write citations by hand and do not have automated citation devices.

Recommendation: The allocated staffing of the enforcement – investigation squads is adequate for their current work load, but the department should ensure that all traffic stops are recorded through the dispatch system even during busy periods. Additionally, the department should install a systematic process to determine the amount of time that traffic enforcement officers spend on special events, escorts and dignitary protection.

Because of the seniority-based selection process that has been in place for many years, most of the traffic officers are older officers. The nature of police motorcycle work does result in officer injuries, and such injuries to older officers may result in longer recovery times. Consequently, the Traffic Division usually

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

has several officers on limited duty or on temporary disability. If the workload of the Traffic Division were driven fundamentally by external demand, it might make sense to overstaff traffic to take into account these almost predictable recurring injuries. But traffic enforcement, although subject to some external pressure, is fundamentally a discretionary activity. Temporary vacancies due to injuries may decrease work output, but the level of such injury absences is not so high as to interfere with the basic operations of the Traffic Division.

Recommendation: The department should acquire mobile data devices for motorcycles and accident investigation technology to expedite the enforcement process and the accident investigation process. These technologies will act as workforce multipliers and will improve the productivity of traffic officers.

c) Traffic Support Section: As of May 2008, the Traffic Support section had two sergeants and nine officers. Only limited-duty personnel are assigned to this section. They are unable to perform the full duties required of an SFPD officer. The section assists with the city's red light camera operations, the school crossing guards, the accident review team and other similar tasks. The staff assigned to this section varies according to the number of officers on limited duty who need to be accommodated. Because all personnel are on limited duty, the tasks they are performing could be done by civilian employees.

Recommendation: Rather than incurring the cost of hiring civilian personnel, the Traffic Support Section should continue to be staffed by limited duty officers, unless the number of such personnel falls consistently below the minimum needed to perform the necessary tasks.

d) Serious Traffic Offender Program (STOP): The mission of the STOP unit is to seek out serious traffic offenders, especially those without driver's licenses or with unregistered vehicles. Part of their effort is to look for specific individuals who are considered to be serious offenders because of multiple past traffic offenses. The STOP Unit operates citywide and can concentrate its efforts as part of campaigns to saturate neighborhoods with violent crime spikes. Members of the STOP unit work ten-hour shifts and are normally scheduled to work from 0600 to 1600. Their work is designed to be self-initiated rather than based on calls for service. 2007 workload data demonstrates that they were dispatched to only nine calls for service while recording 3,043 self-initiated activities. Of their self-initiated activity, 88% were traffic stops. This averages about three per shift per officer. Since almost all of their work is self-initiated rather than call- or complaint-driven and there is no suggestion that these violations are not sufficiently enforced, current staffing of a sergeant and five officers is adequate for the program's operations.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

e) Violence Reduction Squad: This squad of a sergeant and eight officers is designed to consistently add to the department's anti-violence efforts. The squad works in concentrated areas, under the command of the district where they are operating, to provide a high-visibility presence and enforce traffic laws in violence reduction zones. They are not assigned to calls for service. During 2007 members of the unit recorded 3,036 self-initiated activities, of which 85% (2,576) were traffic stops. No other activity type totaled more than 90 episodes. This data supports the desired discretionary nature of their work and hence their staffing is adequate to perform their function.

f) Commercial Vehicle Enforcement: This unit is composed of a sergeant and two officers. Its purpose is to enforce California laws and city ordinances pertaining to the weights, size and safety of commercial vehicles. The small size of this unit limits its effectiveness. During 2007, the unit responded to 42 calls for services arrayed over 9 different call types. In 2007 the unit accounted for 2,438 self-initiated activities including 1,254 passing calls, 580 traffic stops and 155 on view miscellaneous activities. These three activity types accounted for 82% of the recorded events. The unit's other actions were scattered over 27 event type categories. No data was available to show the citations the unit issued, the violations cited or the revenue collected.

Recommendation: This unit should be expanded by two officers to increase the department's capacity to enforce commercial vehicle codes. In addition, consideration should be given to having officers in this unit drive police vehicles rather than motorcycles. Commercial vehicles have restricted sightlines, and officers on motorcycles face a greater risk of injury than officers in standard police vehicles.

g) Traffic Courts:

Recommendation: The department currently has three officers assigned to act as bailiffs in the traffic courts. This practice should be ended. Court security should not be a function of the police. In many jurisdictions bailiffs are unarmed personnel, or if armed, are not sworn police officers.

h) The STOP Window: The division has four officers assigned to conduct appeal hearings from members of the public. These appeals may be of towing charges resulting from removal of illegally parked vehicles. In addition, violators who have had their vehicles impounded for failing to have registration or license can present proof of compliance, pay fines and have their vehicles released.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Recommendation: The hearing officers should be replaced by suitably trained civilians. In general, the department should aggressively seek to retire any permanently limited-duty personnel. They should be considered if they apply for civilian positions, but currently they occupy positions that should be filled by fully functional police officers.

i) Hit and Run Section: The Hit and Run Section should be moved from the Investigations Bureau to the Traffic Division. The section should be made up of specially trained personnel who investigate fatal traffic accidents and accidents that may result in a death, felony hit and run accidents in which a serious injury occurs, DUI cases, CAL-OSHA related and marine fatalities, and felony hazardous material incidents. This section also reviews all police pursuits and conducts further investigation when warranted. The duties of this unit are a good match to the expertise of the department's traffic specialists.

Recommendation: The same methodology used to determine the staffing requirements of the Hit and Run unit in the Investigations Bureau was used to determine the number of investigators who should be assigned to the Hit and Run Section in the FOB. This process categorizes incoming cases by solvability into "Contact Only," "More Complex," "Typical," and "Less Complex." Each category requires a different amount of time to perform a thorough investigation. Using 2007 case load data, the total number of hours required to investigate the cases to be assigned to the Hit and Run Section is 17,768 hours. Each investigator has 1,700 hours available annually (as described later in this report). Thus, the Hit and Run Section should be staffed by one sergeant and 10 investigators. Detailed information is shown below.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 14. Summary of Recommended Hit and Run Section Staffing

Contact Only	
# of Cases	155
Hours Per Case	1
Estimated Total Hours	155
More Complex	
# of Cases	19
Hours Per Case	32
Estimated Total Hours	608
Typical	
# of Cases	3215
Hours Per Case	5
Estimated Total Hours	16075
Less Complex	
# of Cases	465
Hours Per Case	2
Estimated Total Hours	930
Total Cases	3854
Total Hours	17768
Investigators Needed	10

2007 CABLE; Source: PERF Analysis

* * *

Table 15. Summary Recommended Traffic Division Staffing

Traffic Division Staffing	
Captain	1
Lieutenant	4
Sergeant	14
Investigator	10
Officers	66
Civilians	5
Total Sworn	95
Total Civilian	5

Source: PERF Analysis

3. Organizing and Staffing the Tactical Section

The Tactical Section should remain as currently organized but with the addition of the Fugitive Enforcement Recovery Team. Each Tactical Squad should be adequately staffed to provide adequate officer safety and operational flexibility. Ensuring that the squads

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

have an appropriate allocation should allow some expansion of operations while improving the margin of safety for their frequent high-risk operations. As with the Traffic Section, the operations of the Tactical Section should be guided by problem-solving projects that originate in the districts, especially when there is a need for proactive suppression operations. Their operations and activities should be the subject of targets established through the districts rather than independently derived.

The Tactical Division should be commanded by a captain, assisted by an officer and a civilian clerk. The division's four lieutenants answer to the captain. One is in charge of the two day-shift (0700-1700) Tactical Squads. A second supervises the night-shift Tactical Squads (1600-0200). The third lieutenant is responsible for the Honda Unit and the Mounted Unit. And the fourth lieutenant serves as a relief tactical lieutenant and provides oversight for the Marine Unit, the K-9 Unit, the Explosive Ordnance Disposal (Bomb Squad) Unit, and the Muni Response Team. The Fugitive Enforcement Recovery Team should be added to this division and report to the fourth lieutenant.

a) Tactical Squads (Days and Nights): There are two day-shift Tactical Squads and two night-shift squads. These units form the backbone of the department's Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) response. They perform high-risk entries, assist with crowd control, conduct high-visibility enforcement operations, and may work plainclothes assignments.

All of the tactical squads work ten-hour days. Their schedules are set up so that one squad works five days on, then two off followed by three days on and four straight days off. Both the schedules for the day and night squads are designed so that when one is working the other is off but both squads work on Wednesday. Wednesday can be used as a training day or to increase visibility and operations. The four straight days off are Thursday-Friday-Saturday-Sunday for one squad and Saturday-Sunday-Monday-Tuesday for the other. Each squad as of February 2008 was composed of a sergeant and six officers, although one of the four squads had a seventh officer assigned.

During 2007, tactical officers responded to 1,354 calls for service. The top six call types are shown in the table below.

Table 16. Leading Call Types: Tactical Squads CFS Responses 2007

Call Type	Number
Shots fired	256
Person with a gun	183
Suspicious person	124
Fight or dispute (no weapon)	99
Shooting	71
Robbery	62

Source: 2007 SF Computer Aided Dispatch System Data

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

These call types represent 59% of the tactical units' calls for service response. The danger inherent in their nature matches the training and expertise of the tactical squads. These squads also recorded 17,869 self-initiated activities. The top five such activities are shown in the next table.

Table 17. Top Five Self Initiated Activities: Tactical Squads 2007

Activity Type	Number
Passing calls	12163
Suspicious person	1373
Traffic stop	1204
Bus inspection	507
Suspicious person in a vehicle	392

Source: 2007 SF Computer Aided Dispatch System Data

The high number of passing calls represents focused efforts on the part of the tactical squads. Many of these indicate the activity of the tactical squads in the violence prevention zones.

Each Tactical Squad should be staffed to provide adequate officer safety and operational flexibility. Ensuring that the squads have an appropriate allocation should allow some expansion of operations while improving the margin of safety for their frequent high-risk operations.

Recommendation: Each Tactical Squad should be composed of a sergeant and eight officers rather than six officers. A major function of the tactical squads is to perform high-risk entries when information indicates that a dangerous suspect is likely to be present. A “stack” or “stick” of tactical officers performs the entry, then fans out in teams of two to check and secure different rooms. A team of eight tactical officers can clear and secure a location more quickly, thereby enhancing safety and reducing the risk to the officers, to suspects, and to others who might be present. Eight-officer teams will also allow increased high-profile visibility when needed and improve the operational capability of the teams.

b) Honda Unit: The Honda Unit provides a rapid response, by officers on dirt bikes, to areas that police cars cannot navigate. The unit is also part of the team that conducts high-visibility operations in Violence Reduction Zones. Honda Unit officers are also used to help police special events on an on-duty basis, including baseball games and critical-mass demonstrations. There are two Honda squads, each headed by a sergeant with eight officers. Both are scheduled to work from 0800-1800. All of the tactical squads work ten-hour days. Their schedules are set up so that one squad works five days on, then two off, followed by three

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

days on and four straight days off. Both squads work on Wednesday. Wednesday can be used as a training day or to increase visibility and operations. The four straight days off are Thursday-Friday-Saturday-Sunday for one squad and Saturday-Sunday-Monday-Tuesday for the other.

Members of the Honda Unit responded to only 228 calls for service, but since they are designed as a discretionary unit, this is not surprising. The single highest call type was suspicious person calls. They also accounted for 9,376 self-initiated activities. The top five are shown in the next table.

Table 18. Top Five Self Initiated Activities: Honda Unit 2007

Activity Type	Number
Bus inspection	3125
Passing calls	2630
Suspicious person	1836
Traffic stop	656
Interview a citizen	126

Source: 2007 SF Computer Aided Dispatch System Data

These five activities account for 89% of all Honda Unit activities. Data was not available to measure the frequency with which unit members were detailed to special events, escorts and other activities where their schedule flexibility allows them to work as a single large unit. Based on their current recorded workload, the total number of officers is adequate for the duties they perform.

c) Mounted Unit: The Mounted Unit is composed of two squads. One squad has a sergeant and two officers; the other a sergeant and three officers. In addition, the unit has four civilian stable attendants. The Mounted Unit is used at Golden Gate Park to patrol the trails. It is also used for community events such as parades, honor guards and color guards. It is also used to enhance the police presence during the holiday shopping season to deter theft and other crime. The current staffing is adequate for the operations of the unit.

d) K-9 Unit: K-9 teams may be used to search for suspects or narcotics, as well as to assist in explosive detection searches. The K-9 unit is composed of a sergeant and 10 officer/dog teams. They work a variety of ten-hour shifts including:

- 0800-1800
- 1300-2300
- 1600-0200
- 2000-0600

Each team works a days off sequence of five days on, two days off, three days on, four days off so that each officer has a four-day weekend off every two weeks. All K-9 teams are at work on Wednesdays and can conduct required training on

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

this overlap day. The schedules are staggered so that more teams are working during the peak calls-for-service times. According to February 2008 information, no K-9 team is scheduled from 0600 to 0800 daily, nor from 0900 to 1200 Monday and Tuesday, nor from 0900 to 1200 every other Saturday and Sunday. K-9 teams are available during these periods on a call-out basis.

In 2007, K-9 teams responded to 1,360 calls for service of which 40% were alarm calls. Their responses also included 143 “shots fired” calls. They also recorded 4,155 self-initiated activities. The top five activities are shown below.

Table 19. Top Five Self-Initiated Activities: K-9 Unit 2007

Activity Type	Number
Traffic stop	838
Passing calls	793
Bus inspection	690
Suspicious person in a vehicle	244
Suspicious person	226

Source: 2007 SF Computer Aided Dispatch System Data

These activities accounted for 67% of the self-generated workload of the K-9 units.

K-9 teams are a resource that should not be so heavily engaged in activity that units are not free to respond to episodes that need the specialized search, drugs or explosive detection capabilities of the officer/animal teams. The ten teams accounted for an average weekly total of 67.3 hours per week. Based on available data, the current allocation of K-9 teams matches the work required of the unit.

e) Explosive Ordnance Disposal (Bomb Unit): This unit responds to calls regarding suspected explosive devices and also conducts protective sweeps for dignitary visits and other events. Members of the unit are also the department’s specialists regarding weapons of mass destruction – chemical or biological. The Bomb Unit is composed of a sergeant and three officers.

Data from 2007 indicated that the Bomb Unit responded to 43 calls for service (24 of which were “shots fired”) and recorded 344 self-initiated activities. Most of the self-initiated activities were “passing calls.” The Bomb Unit is available when they are not on-duty, via call-out. They were called out 286 times in 2007. Available data indicates that staffing is adequate. However, the department should ensure that bomb unit members receive continuous update training and that it plans for replacement for members who may opt for reassignment. Planning and coordination with the E.O.D. unit in the Airport Bureau should also be maintained as an ongoing priority.

f) Marine Unit: This unit provides water-based patrol of the City’s waterways and docks, enforcing both boating safety and criminal laws. The Marine Unit

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

assists when needed with evidence recovery and with search, rescue and recovery operations. The unit has four boats and two personal watercraft. According to department information from February 2008, the Marine Unit is composed of a sergeant and four officers.

The unit is scheduled to work from 0800 – 1800 daily on a five-on, two-off, three-on, four-off schedule so that all four unit members are scheduled to work on Wednesdays. All personnel have four-day weekends scheduled every other week. In 2007, the Marine Unit responded to 42 calls for service, including 12 Coroner's Cases and 11 "person attempting suicide" calls. Of its 197 other recorded activities, 80 were passing calls. Much of the work of this unit is patrol by boat of the city's waterways rather than calls-for-service response. Opportunities for self-initiated activities are limited because of the nature of the operation. Under current operations, the unit cannot maintain continuous coverage if unit officers are on vacation, ill or otherwise absent.

Recommendation: Staffing for the Marine Unit should be increased by four officers. With four boats, equipment should be available to increase the presence of the Marine Unit and provide for enhanced coverage throughout the week.

g) Muni Response Team: The Muni Response Team focuses its efforts on public transportation in the city. Its purpose is to work with the district stations and Muni representatives so that the Muni system is a safe mode of transportation, both for the city's residents and visitors. The unit is supervised by a sergeant. Twelve officers are assigned to this unit, including three K-9 teams. Members of the Muni Team are scheduled to work the five-on, two-off, three-on, four-off schedule on a platoon system such that they each have a four-day weekend every two weeks.

Data from 2007 indicates that Muni team members recorded substantial amounts of their self-initiated work on Saturday and Sunday. Although the 2007 data shows that this unit responded to only 90 calls for service, they recorded 8,658 self-initiated activities. The most numerous included: "Bus inspections" – 5,215; "Passing calls" – 2,067; and "Traffic Stops" – 656. These types of activities are what should be expected of a proactive transit policing unit. The current staffing is adequate for their role.

h) Fugitive Recovery Enforcement Team (F.R.E.T.): The Fugitive Recovery Enforcement Team is intended to seek out and arrest serious high-risk offenders, especially those with multiple outstanding warrants. Their work includes liaison with other local, state and federal agencies.

Recommendation: F.R.E.T. should be composed of a sergeant and eight officers. The unit should report to the

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

day-shift tactical lieutenant and should work flexible hours. Concentration on wanted offenders will increase the number of repeat offenders who are apprehended. This can increase neighborhood safety and interfere with patterns of repeat offending.

* * *

Table 20. Summary Recommended Tactical Division Staffing

Tactical Division Staffing	
Captain	1
Lieutenant	4
Sergeant	12
Officers	95
Civilians	5
Total Sworn	112
Total Civilian	5

Source: PERF Analysis

Q. COMMUNITY OUTREACH DIVISION

This division should have a lieutenant in charge of Crime Prevention Programs, the Police Activities League, the Wilderness Program and Graffiti Abatement. Although this division focuses primarily on providing summer and after-school programming for youth, it should also add an effort to coordinate citywide crime prevention programs.

Recommendation: The Community Outreach lieutenant should explore private/public partnerships between the police department and city foundations and businesses to help with the department's outreach activities. This high level form of community engagement requires the management perspectives of a lieutenant's position.

1. Crime Prevention Programs

One outgrowth of the CompStat process should be better identification of areas that can be targeted for traditional crime prevention education. Part of the department's community outreach should include work to educate residents about measures they can take to reduce their potential to become crime victims.

Recommendation The department should create a new crime prevention unit staffed with a sergeant and two Police Service Aides. The sergeant's duties should include

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

liaison with the districts to focus crime prevention programs on issues developed in the districts.

2. Police Activities League (P.A.L.)

The mission of P.A.L. is to build community “by organizing youth sports and healthy activities that develop personal character and foster a positive relationship among police officers, youth and dedicated volunteers.” It provides supervised programs such as baseball, basketball, cheerleading, football, judo, soccer and law enforcement cadets. The Law Enforcement Cadet Program “offers young men and women an introductory education in law enforcement. Youth are exposed to law enforcement training, and they learn the importance of education to law enforcement officers.” The program includes an unpaid summer internship through which cadets are exposed to a variety of police operations and functions. P.A.L. staffing is composed primarily of community volunteers and the program is funded outside the police department.

Recommendation: The Community Outreach Lieutenant should act as a liaison to P.A.L. This program can be an important element to work with young people and help them see the SFPD as a sound career choice.

3. Wilderness Program

The Wilderness Program and the Fishing Program are designed to give youths experiences beyond what they normally encounter in the city. These adventures are designed to develop understanding and break down barriers among police, youth, and the community, as well as to build self-confidence, trust, and group support. The programs work with the school district, various community agencies, and volunteers in conjunction with police officers to operate the outings. The program is staffed by the department with one full-time officer.

4. Graffiti Abatement

The department’s graffiti abatement unit focuses on developing information that can help lead to apprehension of graffiti vandals and on providing access to resources to those who have been victimized. Two officers are assigned to this unit; one as the graffiti coordinator and an officer on limited duty. Staffing is adequate for the operations of the unit.

Recommendation: The limited duty officer assigned to the Graffiti Abatement Unit should be replaced with a civilian.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

5. Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT)

GREAT is a school-based, officer-instructed program to help deter young students from gang-related activity and violence, and to help them develop a positive relationship with law enforcement.

Recommendation: Responsibility for the G.R.E.A.T program (Gang Resistance Education and Training) should become part of the Community Outreach Division and fall under the command of the division's lieutenant.

* * *

Table 21. Summary Recommended Community Outreach Staffing

Community Outreach Division Staffing	
Lieutenant	1
Sergeant	1
Officers	3
Civilians	3
Total Sworn	5
Total Civilian	3

Source: PERF Analysis

R. THE POLICE DISTRICTS DIVISION

Recommendation: The Commander of the Police Districts Division should have oversight for the ten police districts, the Field Captains (formerly the night Captains), and the Community Policing/CompStat support unit. Although the commander's span of control will be wide, it is important that the department seek consistency and a common approach to fully implementing its enhanced community policing, problem-solving and CompStat approach. Dividing the districts into two groups and combining the commands with citywide units such as the Tactical and Traffic Sections would risk creating inconsistent expectations and diverted attention. The districts will have different problems and different approaches to addressing them, but they should use a common, rigorous problem-solving methodology to define and analyze their crime and disorder problems.

Some of PERF's target options for district staffing include increasing the time that sector officers have to engage community residents in problem identification. Each district is provided with

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

analytical capability, community policing/CompStat management and problem-solving resources. Additionally, traffic and tactical resources will serve as potential “force multipliers” for the district captains. Without a common approach and consistent monitoring, the department risks each district becoming overly independent in its approach to meeting the needs of its residents, workers and visitors. Clearly San Franciscans want policing tailored to the varying needs of the city’s diverse neighborhoods, but just as clearly they want consistent, dependable, effective and efficient police services.

1. Night Captains

Each district has four lieutenants, two on day shifts and two on an extended evening shift. They work ten-hour shifts to manage patrol, but their duty time results in coverage only 20 hours a day, leaving a gap in the early morning hours (typically from 2:00 a.m. until 6:00 a.m.). Two night captains, working opposing schedules with one common workday, provide oversight for this period. But their responsibility is citywide, and a problem in one district that requires their attention in the early morning hours results in no management coverage for the rest of the city.

Recommendation: The department should increase the number of night captains by two for a total of four. Each night captain, during his/her tour of duty, should be responsible for five districts. This will decrease the possibility that management coverage will be unable to cope with multiple crises. Although patrol workload is lowest during the 2:00 am to 6:00 am period, the risk of serious problems occurring during these hours merits the increased management presence.

2. Community Policing/CompStat Support Section

Recommendation: The police district’s commander should be supported by a new unit — the Community Policing/CompStat Support unit composed of a lieutenant and two analysts. One function of this unit is to help monitor and encourage an active and effective problem-solving process in the districts and to ensure that the CompStat process focuses on both district problems and on crime and disorder problems that may have citywide impact.

Recommendation: The Community Policing/CompStat Support unit should work with IT staff and the Department of Emergency Management (responsible for dispatching duties to the SFPD) to integrate a “community policing” call type into the incident code. This may be utilized to accurately capture and monitor the amount of time officers are spending on such activities as part of their normal work

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

day. The call type would include involvement in activities such as attending community meetings, conferring with businesses, participating in problem-solving actions and working with other public, private and non-profit partners to resolve long-term crime problems or address quality of life issues in the districts.

S. DISTRICT ORGANIZATION

Each of San Francisco's ten police districts, headed by a Captain, should have three major components: Sector Patrol, Community Policing/CompStat, and Staff Services.

1. Sector Patrol Section

Sector Patrol should be composed of three shifts of patrol officers – days, evenings and midnights. A detailed discussion of sector patrol appears later.

2. Community Policing/CompStat Section

The department should create a Community Policing/CompStat section in each district to be headed by a lieutenant. The unit should include a crime analyst, problem solving teams, school resource officers, housing and parks patrol officers, and the district's foot beat officers. Creation of this unit is a critical element in implementing the Vision of the San Francisco Police Department. The department has made a commitment to work with the city's communities to address "crime, violence, and quality-of-life issues by engaging ... in problem-solving partnerships ... Police strategies and tactics must be driven by accurate, timely and reliable information supplied by current and emerging technologies and supported by the Department's systematic engagement of all of San Francisco's diverse neighborhoods."

These units will enable each district to support the daily community policing activities of its sector officers with resources that can be focused on the diverse neighborhood problems discovered either through the department's recommended centralized CompStat process or through the "ground-up" problem identification process initiated by residents and sector officers. A process to document and prioritize these "from-the-ground-up" crime and disorder problems exists now via the department's 509 forms; however, the districts have lacked, at times, the concentrated and coordinated resources to effectively address these problems. The Community Policing/CompStat lieutenant is the central point in each district to ensure that community problems that need resources beyond those that the sector officers can provide are addressed. The focus should be on repeat calls for service and strategies to reduce crime through community engagement.

- a) Crime Analyst:** Each district should have a crime analyst. The functions of this position should include identifying crime patterns and trends that become the focus of the recommended centralized CompStat process, as well as providing in-

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

depth analysis of the community problems to be addressed through the problem-solving process.

The crime analysis position is critical because successful community problem-solving policing requires more in-depth analysis than is typically indicated on the department's current problem-solving form, SFPD Form 509. Therefore, the role of the district analysts should include dealing with each element of the SARA problem-solving model (**Scanning, Analysis, Response, Assessment**).

The **scanning process** involves examining groups of incidents to determine whether they are related by place, victim type, or offender type and therefore constitute a problem rather than just a collection of unrelated episodes. The collective harm done to victims and the community is one consideration in determining whether a particular problem will be addressed.

The **analysis process** requires that the problem be studied and understood as completely as possible. Places, victims and offenders each need careful analysis to fully understand why the problem exists and to provide clues for the response. Data collection may need to go beyond what may be available through the department's information system and may require some original research, such as examining planning and building codes, victim movements, or backgrounds of similar offenders if information about arrestees is not available. Information should be compiled on what is occurring, where it takes place, when the problem is most prevalent, who is involved, why it is taking place, and how the problem activity is carried out.

Designing a response most likely to reduce or eliminate the problem is dependent on the quality of the analysis. The response should be tailored to change one or more of the conditions that allow the problem to continue to exist. Therefore it is important that the analysis cover thoroughly the characteristics and interactions of the place, victims and offenders. The response should not only detail the specifics of the actions that are to be taken, but should also include the level of resources that need to be committed by each party to the response.

Assessing the results of the response also requires careful analysis. The analyst must assess the outcome of the response operation to determine whether the operation had a positive impact on the problem. This includes not only being able to attribute any measurable changes in the problem conditions to the operations, but also determining whether each party contributed the full scope of resources that were called for in the response.

b) Problem-Solving Teams: Each district should have one or more Problem-Solving Teams (PSTs). Currently the districts have various groups of officers who are devoted to such functions as tactical operations, plainclothes operations, or traffic. Each district also has solo motorcycle officers assigned to various traffic functions. These officers should be assembled into problem-solving teams to carry out the police side of the responses developed through the problem-solving process. The operations of these teams should be flexible so that they can play varying roles tied to specific problem-solving projects. Their focus will range from traffic operations to plainclothes assignments to uniformed tactical operations to engaging the community in problem-solving. The activities of the

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

PSTs should almost always be guided by a formal SARA problem-solving process.

c) School Resource Officers: SROs should be decentralized to the districts as part of the Community Police/CompStat team. This will encourage close communication between the SROs and the other officers who work in the district so that information on youth problems can be more readily shared.

d) Housing and Parks: Districts with substantial public housing communities and/or parks should have an allocation of patrol officers specifically dedicated to these areas. Because of the specialized safety and security needs of these places, the same officers should be consistently assigned to these locations. They should be part of the Community Policing/CompStat groups, because the locations they police may often be the subject of problem-solving projects. Officers policing these places should be directly supervised by a sergeant.

e) Foot Beats: Presently much of the SFPD's community policing has been carried out through foot patrol. The department is developing a plan to determine the areas best suited for foot patrol and the staffing requirements for each foot beat. Some of these areas may be the location of community problem-solving projects. Such projects will benefit from the knowledge of foot beat officers because they will be tasked with acquiring in-depth knowledge of the people and the conditions in their beats. One duty of foot patrol supervisors should be to monitor the activities of foot beat officers to ensure that the vast majority of their time is spent in their assigned foot beats.

3. Staff Services Unit


Recommendation: The department should create a Staff Services Unit in each district which should be headed by a sergeant who reports directly to the district captain. The unit should have three investigators to deal with crimes that are important to investigate within the district but which might not receive the same focus if sent to the centralized Investigations Bureau. The district clerks and automotive service technical employees should also report to the staff services sergeant.

- District support functions such as permits, facility maintenance, subpoenas and special event tracking should be performed by civilian employees. Each district should have Police Service Aides to provide these services. The staff services sergeant can provide sworn presence when needed.
- All Staff Services personnel should work the same schedule as the district captain, although the investigators should work a flexible schedule to best deal with their investigations.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

T. STAFFING THE DISTRICTS

San Francisco Police Department
Proposed District Staffing November 2008



1. Sector Patrol Calls-for-Service Response, Self-Initiated Activities, and Community Policing

At the basic level, the police officers in the districts respond to calls from the public for police service. These officers are assigned to sectors – geographic subdivisions – of each district.

Requests for sector officer service may be made through a call to 911, via a call to a non-emergency line, in person by flagging an officer down in the field, or by walking into a police facility. In San Francisco, most telephone requests for service are answered by the city’s Department of Emergency Management (DEM), an agency that is organizationally situated outside the police department. The calls are sorted geographically into one of the police districts by the address of the calling party or by the address of the incident called about. DEM then dispatches, by radio, sector units from the appropriate district to the incident, separating those that are emergencies that merit an immediate rapid response from those that require a less urgent response. Officers reacting to these “calls for

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

service” (CFS) will strive to deal with the problem, writing a report about the incident if necessary (usually when the circumstances indicate that a crime has been committed).

These sector officers not only react to public calls for service but also engage in proactive self-initiated (SI) activities. In San Francisco, self-initiated tasks occur when individual officers, on their own initiative, check on suspicious persons, make traffic stops (based on traffic violations, license violations, or suspicious circumstances), interview citizens, or otherwise initiate an encounter with a member of the public.

The term “self-initiated activity,” however, is used to describe limited types of proactive activities by officers. The term “community policing” refers to a higher level of proactive police work, in which officers attend community meetings to discuss crime and disorder problems, work with their police colleagues and other government agencies to analyze crime patterns and devise solutions, and involve residents and community leaders in the process of policing the neighborhoods.

Generally, self-initiated work is composed of episodes the officer starts. But some self-initiated activities may include tasks that officers perform to meet departmental directives—although the exact timing and/or location is left to officers to determine. In San Francisco there are two unusual categories of self-initiated activities – “Passing Calls” and “Bus Inspections.” At the start of the shift, officers may be directed to check on certain specific locations during their shift, i.e., pass by to check that everything is secure. These “passing call” locations may be places requested by residents or may be potential trouble spots that the police have identified. Usually, it is up to officers to decide when during their shift they will check on these locations. They may be pre-empted from a passing call to take a higher-priority assignment.

To conduct “Bus Inspections,” officers board a Muni vehicle and ride it for several blocks to provide an added level of security. Although bus inspections are required during an officer’s shift, their timing and location are generally left to the discretion of the officer.

Some of the time of district sector officers is consumed by administrative activities (ADM). In San Francisco, sector officer activities that the department categorizes as administrative are labeled as “administrative duty, meal, station, follow-up, investigation, gas/garage, training/traffic court, court, range/radio shop, senile person, and meeting.”

The next table shows the average amount of sector patrol officer time consumed in each district by calls for service, self-initiated activity and administrative activity. (The method used to calculate these figures is described later.)

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 22. Average Time Consumed by Activity Type by District 2007

District	Calls for Service	Self Initiated	Administrative	Total Time Consumed
Central	46.20%	13.2%	15.2%	74.6%
Southern	44.70%	15.9%	16.7%	77.3%
Bayview	48.30%	25.0%	18.2%	91.5%
Mission	50.70%	22.0%	19.9%	92.6%
Northern	40.50%	15.4%	26.4%	82.3%
Park	30.00%	20.3%	14.8%	65.1%
Richmond	33.60%	13.6%	10.8%	58.0%
Ingleside	43.00%	19.9%	19.2%	82.1%
Taraval	50.00%	12.7%	15.4%	78.1%
Tenderloin	37.70%	22.3%	14.7%	74.7%

Source: 2007 SF Computer Aided Dispatch Data

There is significant variation in the workload by district. In total time consumed Mission (92.6%) and Bayside (91.5%) are substantially busier than Park (65.1%) and Richmond (58.0%). This variation is especially evident with regard to calls for service. Such differences stem from the amount of work generated by the characteristics of the crime and disorder problems in each district and the number of officers assigned to sector patrol. Local policing priorities may also have an impact on work performed especially related to self-initiated and administrative activities. Each district also has police officers assigned to duties other than sector patrol. Officers who are not allocated to call response may be assigned to foot beat patrol, homeless outreach, park patrol, tactical operations, plainclothes/investigations, patrol in the district's public housing communities, traffic, prisoner transport wagon, motorcycle patrol, or to the Captain's staff. Typical duties performed by members of the Captain's staff include acting as the permit officer, coordinating vehicle and/or facility maintenance, managing subpoenas, and dealing with special events.

Based on extensive discussions with San Francisco community members, members of the Police Department, and elected and appointed local government officials, it is clear that the 10 police districts are expected to respond to calls for service promptly and effectively, and to work with the community to prevent and control crime, violence, and disorder. Officers assigned to the districts are expected to perform reactive policing tasks in response to calls for service but also to perform proactive tasks featuring substantial community engagement and partnership. The San Francisco Police Department's commitment to meeting these expectations is laid out in its Vision.

Although it is apparent that the community wants its police department to meet these twin expectations, it is less clear how much of the available district police officer time should be spent on each type of activity. How should each district be staffed to respond to calls for service, engage in self-initiated activities, and launch community policing initiatives?

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

To answer this question, PERF begins this analysis by establishing four options for time utilization targets, examines how time is currently being used, and then provides staffing options for each district that would allow the districts to meet the target that are chosen for the Field Operations Bureau.

a) Targets for Sector Patrol Officers: As described above, sector patrol officers perform the most basic police service expected of the police districts. They are charged with responding to calls for service and performing self-initiated work. A call for service begins when a citizen makes a request for service, usually with the expectation that the police will respond immediately to that request. Although it is possible to manage this workload somewhat—separating urgent calls for immediate priority from non-urgent calls for delayed response—the number of calls and the times when they originate cannot be controlled by the police. A police agency can have little impact on when calls for service take place, but it can influence the timing of self-initiated activity and administrative tasks.

Self-Initiated Activity: Self-initiated activity is, to a large extent, discretionary. Officers can initiate encounters when they have time to do so, and when there are suitable targets of opportunity. Much of this activity can be deferred to times when calls-for-service workload is lighter. However, self-initiated activity does depend on legitimate opportunities being available, and such times often coincide with high calls-for-service times. Car stops and checks of suspicious activities frequently occur during peak times of human movement and interaction.

Self-initiated activity is important if a department wants to work to solve the crime and disorder problems that are of greatest concern to its community and neighborhoods. In this scenario, self-initiated police work should involve not only car stops and pedestrian checks. Officers should be given time to work with residents and businesses to solve the problems underlying crime, violence, and disorder. When this self-initiated time is appropriately directed, a result can be a reduction in calls for service, as the conditions causing the problems that residents call about are improved.

Calls for Service: There are no universally accepted standards for how much patrol time should be consumed by calls for service. Some departments set an informal target for the amount of patrol officer time that is consumed by calls for service at 30 to 40 percent. Other departments may set targets at 50 or 60 percent. A common rule of thumb, established before community policing became prevalent, was that one-third of an officer's time should be spent on calls for service, one-third on self-initiated activity, and one-third on uncommitted patrol time.

Few jurisdictions track closely how patrol officer time is used, or set formal targets. PERF's staff work in other cities has shown variation in target utilizations for patrol officer calls for service time. Kansas City MO has a standard of 35 percent. Chandler AZ (a rapidly growing Phoenix suburb of 150,000) set a standard of 40 percent. Tallahassee FL, with an actual figure

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

of 67 percent, set a target to reduce call-for-service time to 50 percent. West Palm Beach FL set a target at 45 percent.

The target for patrol staffing should balance the work that needs to be performed against the resources a jurisdiction has available for patrol services. A target of 35 percent for CFS time may be desirable, but more officers will be required than if the target is 50 percent.

How a city wants its patrol officer time used is an important policy decision. Local demographics, crime and disorder problems, and policing style all have an impact on the demands on patrol officer time. Police and city leaders in one jurisdiction may regard the patrol function as primarily composed of response to citizen calls for service, self-initiated activities to deter and discover criminal activities (through traffic stops, pedestrian checks, and building checks), and a certain amount of administrative activity. Another jurisdiction may want its patrol officers to be heavily involved in community policing and problem-solving activities, such as getting to know the people and conditions in the district, attending community meetings to listen to neighborhood concerns, conducting analysis to develop plans to address community crime and disorder problems, and leveraging local government services to improve the quality of life in the city's neighborhoods.

Increasingly, cities want patrol officers to have time to address crime and disorder problems discovered through the CompStat process. Intelligence-led, or information-driven, policing approaches mean that prompt analysis of crime and disorder problems takes place and the problems are quickly addressed. Although special units may play a role in these efforts, patrol officer self-initiated time may also be directed to CompStat-identified "hot spots."

Some cities have their patrol officers spend some portion of their time conducting follow-up investigations of reported crimes. In this approach, patrol officers carry an investigative caseload. Thus, not all crime reports are sent to detectives for follow-up investigation.

San Francisco Calls-for-Service Time Targets: PERF's plan for determining a call-for-service time target in San Francisco is based on interviews with community members, city leaders and members of the police department, on the department's Vision for policing San Francisco, and on experience in other agencies.

PERF offers four different options for the department, with different targets for various types of workloads, based on the degree to which the city wants its patrol officers to be involved in community policing and problem-solving, in addition to the traditional goals of responding to calls for service and engaging in more limited self-initiated activities.

Each Target details the number of sector officers needed in each district. Staffing requirements gradually increase, with the lowest levels of staffing required for Target 1 and the highest levels of staffing required for Target 4.

Target 1 – Patrol time is devoted primarily to calls for service response and the traditional, limited types of self-initiated activity, with support for community policing activities conducted *almost exclusively* by officers not assigned to sector patrol.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- District sector officers should handle 85% of the calls for service workload in their assigned district. (Calls for service not handled by a district's patrol officers may be handled by specialty units either from the district or from centralized specialized units, by supervisors, or by patrol officers from adjacent districts.)
- District sector officers should average no more than 50% of their available time on calls for service.
- District sector officers should have sufficient time to average 30% of their time on self-initiated activities.
- District sector officers should average no more than 75% of their time on calls for service during peak CFS hours, and the 75% time commitment should be no longer than four hours in duration per shift.

Under Target 1, the primary use of sector officer time is for calls for service and self-initiated activity. Officers are expected to be busy with periods where they go from call to call, especially during peak periods. When they are not responding to calls, their time should be devoted to traffic stops, pedestrian and building checks, and other actions designed to discover and deter criminal activity. Non-obligated patrol time should be spent at locations that have been identified through a CompStat process as generators of frequent police activity. The time criteria set for this target considers officer fatigue factors (hence the four-hour straight limit for the peak CFS hours in which 75% of the officers' time is consumed on calls) and officer safety. The time committed to CFS should not be so high as to make it difficult to get prompt help to an officer who needs it.

Target 2 – Patrol time is used for calls-for-service response and self-initiated activity, and support for community policing activities is conducted *primarily* by officers not assigned to sector patrol.

- District sector officers should handle 90% of the calls for service workload in their assigned district.
- District sector officers should average no more than 40% of their available time on calls for service during off-peak times.
- District sector officers should have sufficient time to average 30% of their time on self-initiated activities.
- District sector officers should average no more than 75% of their time on calls for service during peak hours, and the 75% time commitment should be no longer than four hours in duration per shift.

Target 2 provides for time to be spent not only on CFS and SI but also in support of some community policing activities maintained primarily by other departmental personnel. In each district, foot beat officers are charged with community policing activities within the foot beat boundaries. Each district has at least one homeless outreach officer. Depending on the features of the district, officers may be assigned to patrol parks or public housing communities. Other officers may be assigned to tactical, plainclothes or traffic control depending on the nature of the

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

district. Sector patrol officers, under Target 2, would have time to make additional household or business contacts to get to know people in their sectors and to attend some community meetings. Consequently, this target recommends that more time be available for such activity by reducing the time spent on calls for service response. It also recommends that a target be set to have officers answer a larger majority (90 percent) of their district's calls for service so that they become increasingly familiar with the people and conditions in the areas they work.

Target 3 – Patrol time is used for CFS response and SI activity, with substantial involvement of sector officers in community policing and problem solving, especially during “prime time” community policing hours from 11:00 a.m. through 9:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday. These prime time hours allow officers to attend community meetings, work with community organizations, meet with business people, and contact other governmental agencies.

- District sector officers should handle 95% of the calls for service workload in their assigned district.
- District sector officers should average no more than 35% of their available time on calls for service, especially during community policing prime time.
- District sector officers should have sufficient time to average 40% of their time on self-initiated activities, which should include substantial time committed to community engagement.
- District sector officers should average no more than 70% of their time on calls for service during peak hours, and the 70% time commitment should be no longer than four hours in duration.

Target 4 – Patrol time is used for CFS response, SI activity, with heavy involvement of sector officers in community policing and problem solving, especially during “prime time” community policing hours from 11:00 a.m. through 9:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday. These prime time hours allow officers to attend community meetings, work with community organizations, meet with business people, and contact other governmental agencies.

- District sector officers should handle 95% of the calls for service workload in their assigned district.
- District sector officers should average no more than 30% of their available time on calls for service, especially during community policing prime time.
- District sector officers should have sufficient time to average 40% of their time on self-initiated activities, which should include substantial time committed to community engagement.
- District sector officers should average no more than 65% of their time on calls for service during peak hours, and the 65% time commitment should be no longer than four hours in duration.

Both the third and fourth targets envision that sector officers handle almost all of the work in their district so that they have as complete a picture as possible of their district's crime and

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

disorder problems. By working the same areas consistently, officers will become increasingly familiar with the conditions and the people in their area, and this “local” knowledge will increase their effectiveness.

The department’s Vision seeks to establish close relationships between officers and the area in which they work. This is a vital element of community policing. Sector officers should have time to discuss beat problems with other officers who work on other shifts, and should develop an extensive knowledge of the people, problems, and conditions in their districts.

The third and fourth targets also seek to limit the time officers spend on calls for service during prime community policing hours, so that they will have adequate time to work with the community, business, the schools, and other governmental agencies. Foot beat officers and other officers would still perform a significant amount of community policing activities, but under these targets, sector officers would have the time to become full partners in the department’s approach to community policing and problem solving.

Both the third and fourth targets increase the amount of sector officer self-initiated time. Such time can be used not only for community policing but also to address CompStat-identified problems.

Officer Visibility: Each of the four scenarios addresses both visibility and response time. Community residents, as expressed in their interviews, value police visibility. The department’s Vision statement implicitly recognizes the importance of enhancing citizens’ feeling of security by maintaining a visible presence in the community. Maintaining the right level of visibility is often a balancing act; at the extremes, some residents say they never see an officer in their neighborhood, while others say the police presence is heavy-handed.

Some patrol staffing formulas seek to have patrol officers travel by each block in their area a particular number of times per shift. “Best practice” recognizes that such structured patrol is neither efficient nor effective. Instead, visibility is achieved through a combination of calls-for-service response, self-initiated activity, patrol of locations that generate frequent police service calls (hot spots), and personal interactions between officers and neighborhood residents. This represents a strategy of focused visibility. Officers are encouraged to vary the locations of their meals and other breaks within their patrol areas. In some departments, such as San Francisco, foot patrol is used in areas of concentrated population to further enhance citizens’ feelings of safety and security. However, as demonstrated by the Public Safety Strategies Group’s study of foot patrol in San Francisco, establishing a causal link between increased visibility (such as foot patrol) and crime reduction is quite difficult.

Visibility, therefore, is a by-product of focused police activity in an area. More officers assigned to a district, especially when they are engaged in community policing activities, will improve residents’ feeling of safety and security as opposed to fewer officers engaging primarily in call response. Visibility is less of a quantitative concept that qualitative. It depends less on seeing a marked car pass than on having positive interactions with officers. Consequently, of the scenarios above, Target 1 will produce less visibility than will Target 4. Police research beginning in the 1970s with the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Project has consistently

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

demonstrated the efficacy of focusing the efforts of patrol officers, rather than using their time driving around, to increase visibility.

Response Time: Response time is important in two ways. First, when true emergencies exist, response time should be quick enough to have officers arrive soon enough to minimize personal injuries or property damage, to gather evidence, to contact witnesses, and to apprehend suspects. Secondly, officers need to respond quickly enough to meet citizen expectations.

In the first instance, there is no universal standard or benchmark for police response time. Some formulations have been based on fire response models, because fire response times are easier to understand. Such models establish locations of fire stations so that fire equipment can reach any location in the station's assigned area, taking into account topography, traffic, etc., within a set number of minutes. In a dense urban area the fire response time may be "four minutes or less, 90% of the time." In a rural area, fire response time may be set at eight or 12 minutes. In all cases, the goal is to arrive as quickly as possible to contain the already-burning fire. The fundamental difference between fire response time and police response time is that firefighters are responding to an ongoing, in-progress event, whereas police officers are almost always responding to an event that has already ended. Another critical difference is that firefighters usually begin their response from a fixed point, whereas police officers may need to travel from a wide range of locations in their district.

A low police response time depends on having a free police officer in close proximity to the event. But in practice, the closest police unit may already be occupied on another call, while an available free unit may be some distance away. Despite these vagaries, the police response time to an in-progress event should be as low as possible. The quicker the response to such events, the more likely it is that injuries can be contained, property damage can be limited, evidence can be preserved, witnesses can be identified, and suspects can be apprehended. But such police in-progress episodes are rare.

Police response time also depends on the dispatch center. People calling for police service do not usually initially talk with police officers. Their calls are answered by call-takers who take information from them. The call taker then forwards the information to a dispatcher. The priority of the call depends on the information the call taker is able to get from the person calling. The dispatcher then selects an appropriate police unit and contacts the unit by radio to relay the information so they can respond. The time that elapses from when the call is answered by a call taker until the patrol unit starts to travel to the location is "call holding time" or "queue time." It is not controlled by the police department unless the communications center is part of the police department.

In San Francisco, four call priorities are established.

- "A Priority" calls are defined as involving a "Life-threatening emergency."
- "B Priority" calls are defined as involving "Potential for harm to life and/or property."
- "C Priority" calls are defined as involving "Crime committed with no threat to life or property. Suspect left crime scene."

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- “I Priority: calls are “Information only broadcast, e.g. public disturbance. Caller wants to remain anonymous.”

In the SFPD’s “Performance Measures” set out as part of the City’s 2008-2009 budget, the department establishes the following target response times for 2008-2009:

- Priority A Calls – 4.4 minutes,
- Priority B Calls – 8.3 minutes, and
- Priority C Calls – 10.8 minutes.

Using 2007 data from the Computer Aided Dispatch System, PERF found the following average response times per district (measured from the time the call was dispatched until the unit arrived).

**Table 23. Average District Response Time 2007,
In Minutes**

Average District Response Time 2007			
District	Priority A	Priority B	Priority C
Central	3.8	11.6	11.5
Southern	4.8	15.7	15.5
Bayview	3.8	10.1	10.1
Mission	4.5	12.0	16.0
Northern	4.6	12.1	14.3
Park	1.8	4.7	6.0
Richmond	2.0	5.6	5.8
Ingleside	3.8	10.0	11.3
Taraval	3.4	11.1	10.6
Tenderloin	1.8	5.2	5.7

Source: 2007 SF Computer Aided Dispatch Data

In 2007, only Mission and Northern failed to meet the 2008-2009 the Priority A target. However, only three districts – Park, Richmond and the Tenderloin – met the Priority B target. Five districts – Bayview, Park, Richmond, Taraval and the Tenderloin – met the Priority C standard.

The second view of response time is whether the time it takes for the police to arrive meets the calling person’s expectations. These expectations are framed by what the call taker tells the caller. If the call taker says that “an officer will be there right away,” most people will assume a response in five minutes or less. A call taker may tell someone “our units are all tied up on emergency calls right now; an officer should be there in 30 minutes.” Departments that experimented with this approach discovered that most people would accept such a delayed response to a non-emergency call, as long as an officer showed up within the allotted time. Most

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

were also satisfied if they were called to establish a new time goal if it became apparent that the original one could not be met.

Response time, like visibility, is partially a function of the number of officers present and how busy they are. The more officers in the field, and the less their time is consumed by calls for service, the more likely it is that a lower response time will result. PERF's staffing Target 4 is therefore likely to generate lower response times than any of the other three targets, since more officers would be in the field and they might be able to be diverted from some community activities to respond to an emergency call.

Each of the four Target scenarios proposes how patrol officer time should be consumed. Each incorporates calls-for-service response, self-initiated activity, the role of patrol officers in community policing, and elements of visibility and response time. Staffing scenarios for each target for each district are presented below. The patrol staffing scenarios are then followed by recommendations for staffing the districts to perform other functions that complement patrol response.

2. Methodology Measuring the Current Patrol Response Work

PERF used the following guidelines to measure how much time is currently consumed for patrol response in each of the 10 San Francisco Police Department Districts:

Calls for service time consumed is measured beginning from the time that an officer receives direction from the communications center to travel to the specific location identified by a calling citizen.

For self-initiated work, time consumed begins when the officer notifies communications that s/he has initiated an event on the officer's own volition and ends when the officer lets the dispatch center know that s/he has cleared or completed the activity and is ready to handle another assignment, if needed.

To gain an accurate picture of the total time consumed, records were analyzed to take into account the total time consumed by all officers. If a car was staffed by two officers, the call time was doubled. The time consumed by officers responding as back-up cars or when multiple units were required was also measured.

Administrative time was also measured. An administrative task began when the officer notified the communication center that s/he had started the task and was concluded when the officer notified communication that the task was completed. Both times are recorded through the dispatch system.

PERF analyzed a database of San Francisco dispatch activity for a year's period from January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007. This database recorded over 1,000,000 separate calls for service for 2007.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

A complete analysis of patrol workload requires being able to measure the total amount of patrol officer time, and therefore requires records that show how much time each officer spent on each call. The total time consumed by an event includes not only the primary unit assigned, but also the time committed by backup units. The San Francisco database includes, at PERF's request, a separate record for each unit on each call so that a more accurate measurement could be made of the total time consumed on these events.

The average amount of time consumed for the average week in each of the city's ten police districts was calculated by examining the record for each unit on each event to calculate the time consumed from when the event began until it ended. For example, if a unit was dispatched on Monday at 16:10 and completed the activity at 16:55, 45 minutes were added to the Monday 16:00 to 17:00 time block. An activity that was assigned to a two-officer car on Thursday at 10:45 which was completed at 11:20 would result in 30 minutes being added to the Thursday 10:00 to 11:00 time block (15 minutes, from 10:45 until 11:00, for each of the two officers), and 40 minutes being added to the Thursday 11:00 to 12:00 time block (20 minutes, from 11:00 to 11:20, for each of the two officers).

The total time by each unit on each event was averaged for each district by day of the week and hour of the day to generate a matrix showing for each hour-long time block the average hours per week time consumed. Tables were developed for all activity, calls for service activity, self-initiated activity and administrative activity – for both sector car patrol response and for foot beats. The following table displays calls for service information.

**Table 24. Average Number of Calls for Service per Week
and Average Time Consumed by District**

District	Average Number CFS Week	Average Weekly Hours Consumed by CFS
Central	1,401	784.8
Southern	2,688	1,193.6
Bayview	2,900	1,086.7
Mission	2,449	1,227.3
Northern	2,838	971.1
Park	1,782	434.6
Richmond	1,201	481.2
Ingleside	2,229	1,011.2
Taraval	1,315	743.5
Tenderloin	1,331	489.9

Source: 2007 SF Computer Aided Dispatch Data

Differences from district to district are apparent in this table. Bayview averages 2,900 calls per week while Richmond has less than half that amount, 1,201. Park District

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

averages 434.6 hours per week on calls for service, while Southern's average is 1,193.6 hours. These figures demonstrate that the substantial differences between the districts (in square miles, population and demographics, land use, and crime and disorder problems) are reflected in the frequency of residents' requests for police service and how long it takes patrol officers to deal with those requests.

According to census figures reported by PSSG in its District Boundary Study, Taraval has a population of 147,806 while the Tenderloin has a population of 21,669. Yet both have approximately the same number of calls per service, with quite different amounts of time consumed. Each call in Taraval takes about 34 minutes of officer time to complete, while calls in the Tenderloin take about 22 minutes. However, Tenderloin patrol officers engage in substantially more self-initiated work because of the greater level of disorder in the Tenderloin.

The next table shows the number of patrol officers needed to meet the calls for service targets for each of the four target figures in each of the districts. The City and the Department have calculated that of the 2,080 work hours per year (40 hours times 52 weeks), each member of the department potentially has available 1,700 hours that are actually available for work. This takes into account vacation, illness, and other absences. This is an average 82% show-up rate and indicates that each employee averages 32.7 hour per week of the 40 hour work week. In PERF's work with other departments, the typical range of show-up rates is from 75% to 85%. San Francisco is near the high end of the range but is within it.

**Table 25. Number of Sector Officers Needed
Per District to Achieve Targets in Each Scenario**

	Average Weekly Hours Consumed By CFS	Target 1 50% of time spent on CFS; district officers handle 85% of all CFS	Target 2 40% of time spent on CFS; district officers handle 90% of all CFS	Target 3 35% of time spent on CFS; district officers handle 95% of all CFS	Target 4 30% of time spent on CFS; district officers handle 95% of all CFS
Central	784.8	41	54	65	76
Southern	1193.6	62	82	99	116
Bayview	1086.7	56	75	90	105
Mission	1227.3	64	84	102	119
Northern	971.1	50	67	81	94
Park	434.6	23	30	36	42
Richmond	481.2	25	33	40	47
Ingleside	1011.2	53	70	84	98
Taraval	743.5	39	51	62	72
Tenderloin	489.9	25	34	41	47

Source: 2007 SF Computer Aided Dispatch Data, PERF Analysis

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

To determine the impact of each of these scenarios on current patrol officer staffing, time sheet information from the City’s Human Resource Management System (HRMS) was used. Matrices by hour of the day and day of the week were created as a companion set of matrices for the workload data to reflect the average number of sector patrol officers per district for 2007. In addition, CAD data was used to construct matrices for each district to show how much of the calls-for-service time was consumed by these sector patrol officers. These figures are displayed in the next table.

Table 26. 2007 Sector Patrol Officers and Calls for Service

	CFS Hours per Week By Sector Patrol Officers	HRMS 2007 Number of Sector Patrol Officers	Average Weekly Sector Officer Time Consumed by CFS	% of All CFS Responded to by Sector Officers
Central	692	47.5	46.2%	88.2%
Southern	1065	74.0	44.7%	89.2%
Bayview	947	60.8	48.3%	87.1%
Mission	1086	67.6	50.7%	88.5%
Northern	852	66.1	40.5%	87.7%
Park	388	40.9	30.0%	89.3%
Richmond	446	42.3	33.6%	92.7%
Ingleside	941	68.3	43.0%	93.1%
Taraval	689	43.6	50.0%	92.7%
Tenderloin	425	36.6	37.7%	86.8%

Source: 2007 SF Computer Aided Dispatch Data, HRMS Data

Table 26 shows that the time consumed by calls for service in each district varies substantially. Mission, Taraval and Bayview have about 50% of their patrol time consumed by calls for service while Park and Richmond are at about 30%. The Park District currently meets the “time consumed by CFS” standard for Target 4 (30%), but it handles only about 89.3% of all calls for service work rather than the 95% target. The Richmond District also comes close to the Target 4 standards at 33.6% and 92.7%. Citywide, the average time consumed by calls for service is 42.5%, and sector cars average responding to 89.5% of the calls in their respective districts.

The percentages at which the district patrol officers handle the districts’ call for service work show less variation, ranging from a high of 93.1% in Ingleside to 86.8% in Tenderloin. The call for service response not handled by a district’s patrol officers may be handled by specialty units, supervisors, or patrol officers from adjacent districts.

The next table shows the changes in district sector patrol officers that would result from each scenario.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 27. Changes in District Sector Patrol Officers by Scenario

	HRMS 2007 Number of Sector Patrol Officers	Change in number of officers to reach Target 1: 50% of time to CFS & district officers handle 85% of CFS	Change in number of officers to reach Target 2: 40% of time to CFS & district officers handle 90% of CFS	Change in number of officers to reach Target 3: 35% of time to CFS & district officers handle 95% of CFS	Change in number of officers to reach Target 4: 30% of time to CFS & district officers handle 95% of CFS
Central	47.5	-7	7	18	29
Southern	74.0	-12	8	25	42
Bayview	60.8	-4	14	29	44
Mission	67.6	-4	17	34	51
Northern	66.1	-16	1	16	28
Park	40.9	-18	-11	-5	1
Richmond	42.3	-17	-9	-2	4
Ingleside	68.3	-16	1	16	30
Taraval	43.6	-5	8	18	28
Tenderloin	36.6	-11	-3	4	11
Net change In number of officers		-110	32	152	268

Source: 2007 HRMS, PERF Analysis

Currently, citywide, district officers average 42.5% of their time on calls for service and handle 89.5% of the calls for service work. The first target would increase the time spent on calls for service while decreasing the percentage of district CFS work performed by sector officers, thus requiring fewer officers, a net decrease of 110.

The second target would lower the overall CFS time consumed from 42.5% to 40% and increase slightly (from 89.5% to 90%) the percentage of CFS district work. Because the current averages vary from district to district, some districts, at this target, would require fewer officers – Park, Richmond and the Tenderloin. The other districts would need more officers to bring them to the target requirements.

Meeting the requirements of the third target would require more officers for all districts but Park and Richmond. Those two districts would still have more sector officers than needed to meet the parameters.

Meeting the requirements of Target 4 would require an increase in sector officers in all districts.

The next table shows the number of officers and first line supervisors (sergeants) required for each scenario for each district.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 28. Number of Recommended Officers and Sergeants by Scenario

	HRMS 2007	Target 1: 50% CFS		Target 2: 40% CFS		Target 3: 35% CFS		Target 4: 30% CFS	
	Patrol	Officers	Sgts	Officers	Sgts	Officers	Sgts	Officers	Sgts
Central	47.5	40.8	6	54.0	7	65.1	9	76.0	10
Southern	74.0	62.1	8	82.1	10	99.1	12	115.6	14
Bayview	60.8	56.5	8	74.8	9	90.2	12	105.2	14
Mission	67.6	63.8	8	84.4	10	101.9	12	118.9	15
Northern	66.1	50.5	7	66.8	9	80.6	10	94.0	12
Park	40.9	22.6	6	29.9	6	36.1	6	42.1	7
Richmond	42.3	25.0	6	33.1	6	39.9	6	46.6	7
Ingleside	68.3	52.6	7	69.6	9	83.9	10	97.9	12
Taraval	43.6	38.7	6	51.2	7	61.7	7	72.0	8
Tenderloin	36.6	25.5	6	33.7	6	40.7	6	47.4	6
TOTAL	547.7	437.9	68.0	579.6	79.0	699.2	90.0	815.8	105.0

Source: 2007 HRMS, PERF Analysis

3. The Impact of Scheduling on Matching Personnel to Workload

Schedules for patrol response officers should be developed by a combination of matching personnel to workload and considering officers' lives off duty. A further consideration is to remain within the standards of the federal Fair Labor Standards Act which specifies that police officers can work no more than 171 hours in a 28-day period without being paid for overtime.

a) There are a myriad of police patrol schedules. Most are based on shift lengths of 8, 10 or 12 hours. Eight-hour shifts require either staggered reporting times or overlap shifts to provide coverage at shift change and typically provide only two straight days off. Twelve-hour shifts usually do not match workload consistently over the course of the shift and may increase officer fatigue, but they usually provide officers with the most scheduled non-work days. Ten-hour shifts provide 30 hours of coverage for 24 hours in the day, providing six hours of overlap time for busy periods. Depending on the design, ten-hour shifts usually provide more off days than an eight-hour shift, and less than twelve-hour shifts.

Most agencies strive to place officers on fixed shifts, that is, officers work the same hours for three months or more to avoid the long-term health problems discovered by medical research on shifts that rotate frequently from day to midnight to evening, etc.

San Francisco patrol officers work ten-hour fixed shifts for six months in an unusual configuration. Officers are assigned to one of seven "watch off" groups, with about the same number of officers in each group. Each group starts on a different day of the week in the following sequence:

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Four days off, four days on,
- Four days off, four days on,
- Four days off, five days on,
- Three days off, five days on,
- Three days off, five days on,
- Three days off, five days on.

The cycle repeats every 49 days. Each of the four-day-off sequences provides the officers with a four-day weekend. This schedule with its ten-hour days provides daily overlaps for peak workload periods and provides officers with the unique benefit of frequent four-day weekends.

However, because the schedule requires approximately equal numbers of officers to be assigned to each “watch-off” group in order to have a consistent number of officers scheduled to work each day, it cannot take into account daily workload spikes, for example on Friday or Saturday nights. But in San Francisco there is little variation in workload by day of the week, as measured either by the number of calls-for-service per shift, or by the percentage of time spent on calls for service during a shift. This information is displayed in the next table.

**Table 29. Percent of Total Calls for Service and
Percent of Time Spent on Calls for Service
by Day of the Week and by District, in 2007**

District	Percent of Calls and Time	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Central	% of Calls	13.6%	13.4%	13.5%	14.6%	14.7%	14.7%	15.4%
	% of Time	14.4%	13.4%	13.9%	13.9%	15.2%	14.7%	14.6%
Southern	% of Calls	12.8%	14.3%	14.6%	15.2%	14.9%	14.9%	13.4%
	% of Time	14.0%	14.8%	14.0%	14.6%	13.7%	14.5%	14.4%
Bayview	% of Calls	13.4%	14.4%	14.5%	15.1%	14.7%	14.1%	13.9%
	% of Time	13.8%	14.4%	13.7%	13.8%	14.1%	14.6%	15.6%
Mission	% of Calls	13.2%	14.1%	14.2%	14.5%	15.1%	15.3%	13.6%
	% of Time	14.6%	14.0%	13.7%	14.2%	13.9%	14.5%	15.1%
Northern	% of Calls	13.0%	14.2%	14.4%	15.1%	15.4%	14.4%	13.6%
	% of Time	14.6%	13.8%	13.2%	13.4%	14.6%	14.7%	15.7%
Park	% of Calls	13.6%	14.2%	14.0%	14.5%	14.8%	14.6%	14.2%
	% of Time	13.9%	15.3%	13.8%	13.9%	13.4%	14.7%	15.1%
Richmond	% of Calls	14.2%	14.6%	13.9%	14.4%	14.2%	14.2%	14.5%
	% of Time	13.7%	13.3%	14.3%	14.3%	13.9%	15.1%	15.4%
Ingleside	% of Calls	13.3%	14.7%	14.4%	14.7%	15.7%	14.1%	13.0%
	% of Time	15.1%	15.0%	13.6%	13.8%	12.8%	14.8%	14.9%
Taraval	% of Calls	12.9%	14.1%	14.3%	15.4%	14.9%	14.6%	13.8%
	% of Time	14.1%	15.7%	14.8%	13.6%	13.2%	13.9%	14.8%
Tenderloin	% of Calls	13.7%	14.4%	15.1%	14.8%	14.6%	13.8%	13.6%
	% of Time	14.1%	13.9%	14.4%	14.9%	14.0%	14.6%	14.2%

Source: 2007 SF Computer Aided Dispatch System Data

Analysis was performed to determine the variation not only for the overall averages for each day for each district but also for each shift in each district. There were no average variations by shift,

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

by day for either the number of calls for service or the percentage of time consumed by calls for service, that were greater than 1%.

Thus, despite the general preference in policing for a schedule that can have more officers at work on busier days, the lack of workload variation in San Francisco makes this a moot point.

Another principle of patrol scheduling is squad integrity. Under this concept, the agency seeks to have a group of officers and their supervisor work the same days on/days off sequence to improve squad cohesion and to allow the sergeant to provide consistent standards, observe the work of each of her/his subordinates daily, and allow a more focused span of control. Most of the units in the Tactical Division achieve this with two squads with a sergeant assigned to each shift, each working a five day on, two days off, three days on, four days off schedule every two weeks. Pictorially the shift looks like this:

Table 30. Days Off Sequence for Tactical Unit Schedule

Day	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa	Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa	Su
Squad 1	off	off	on	on	on	on	on	off	off	on	on	on	off	off
Squad 2	on	on	on	off	off	off	off	on	on	on	off	off	on	on

Souce: PERF Analysis

Both squads work on Wednesday which allows one squad to train while the other engages in normal duties. Therefore each squad has two training days a month. This frequency of training is especially important for both the tactical squads and the K-9 squads which must maintain “perishable skills.” Other units of the tactical division can also benefit from built-in time for specialized training. The tactical division schedule essentially results in half of the personnel being at work each day and half unavailable due to a day off or a day in training.

Creating a similar squad-based schedule for sector patrol, while still providing frequent weekend off time, would involve all officers on a shift having a common day. Although training for sector officers is important, the amount of time available for training may exceed the time needed. In addition, the department lacks the capacity to effectively provide training for hundreds of officers every Wednesday.

Another issue with a squad-based schedule is that it decreases the available officers each day by about 7%. The squad-based schedule used in the Tactical Division has 50% of the officers unavailable each day, while the current Sector Patrol schedule has a days-off rate of 43% (of the seven “watch off” groups, three are off each day and four are working).

An alternative to a squad-based system in which the sergeant and his/her officers all work the same days-off sequence is to create a system in which the sergeants are virtually interchangeable and communicate continuously about the officers they supervise. For this approach to succeed, the department must establish a set of department-wide common and universal expectations about officer behavior and supervisory approaches. Each supervisor should have the same set of expectations about the officers they supervise, and these expectations should be communicated thoroughly. Working for one sergeant should be little different from working for any other

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

sergeant. Therefore, even if a sergeant does not directly supervise her/his subordinates every day, the sergeant who is present has the same expectations as the officer's assigned supervisor does. The two sergeants must talk frequently so that the assigned supervisor is fully aware of the behavior of one of his/her officers when they work different days. Although this is a sound theoretical approach, putting it into practice requires substantial effort and commitment. It requires discussion, development, planning and training about supervision that does not usually take place in police agencies.

A final consideration in scheduling is being able to vary the number of officers assigned to each shift to take into account the differences in workload by time of day. The next table shows for each district the workload by shift – by the number of calls and by the time consumed.

Table 31. Percent of Calls for Service and Percent of Time Spent on Calls for Service by District and Shift

District	Shift	Percent of District Calls for Service	Percent of Time Spent on District Calls for Service
Central	0000-0800	25.7%	32.6%
	0800-1600	38.0%	24.5%
	1600-0000	36.3%	42.9%
Southern	0000-0800	20.8%	27.2%
	0800-1600	39.4%	30.6%
	1600-0000	39.8%	42.3%
Bayview	0000-0800	15.2%	26.0%
	0800-1600	41.0%	30.5%
	1600-0000	43.8%	43.5%
Mission	0000-0800	22.3%	28.1%
	0800-1600	40.8%	27.9%
	1600-0000	37.0%	44.0%
Northern	0000-0800	21.6%	26.3%
	0800-1600	34.1%	30.6%
	1600-0000	44.3%	43.0%
Park	0000-0800	20.7%	27.2%
	0800-1600	35.2%	31.3%
	1600-0000	44.2%	41.4%
Richmond	0000-0800	20.7%	27.3%
	0800-1600	37.5%	28.4%
	1600-0000	41.8%	44.4%
Ingleside	0000-0800	18.6%	26.6%
	0800-1600	36.3%	30.8%
	1600-0000	45.1%	42.6%
Taraval	0000-0800	22.0%	29.3%
	0800-1600	34.5%	26.0%
	1600-0000	43.5%	44.7%
Tenderloin	0000-0800	22.8%	29.4%
	0800-1600	36.3%	30.7%
	1600-0000	40.8%	40.0%

Source: 2007 SF Computer Aided Dispatch System Data

While there was little difference by day of the week for patrol workload, there are substantial differences by shift. Ideally, the number of officers assigned to each shift should match the portion of the total workload on that shift. The overlap that comes with the ten-hour schedule

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

can be used to increase staffing during peak periods, which usually occur in the late evening and early morning, just after midnight.

4. Special Events

San Francisco hosts a wide variety of special events which require police presence. The Special Events Coordinator in the Field Operations Bureau maintains a list of the expected special events each year and the anticipated number of officers and hours that will be needed. The 2007-2008 list had some 115 events and projected about 50,000 hours of officer time (this did not include the 2007 baseball All-Star Game). This equates to about 30 full time equivalent officers.

The bulk of these events occur in just four of the ten police districts: Northern, Southern, Central and Mission. Special event policing is conducted by a combination of on-duty officers and officers on overtime, with the department's preference being for on-duty officers in order to keep costs down. Although most special events are planned, some are spontaneous. These latter events are frequently demonstrations and/or marches that occur with little or no advance warning to the department.

Although reports are filed for each event the department maintains mostly paper files. Event plans may describe planned staffing needs but "after-action" reports are not routinely filed so that staffing adjustments are not usually made in subsequent years. Additionally, although special event overtime records can be assessed through the HRMS system, there is no automated manner of tracking the amount of on-duty time spent on special events.

Traffic units, the Honda Squads, Tactical Units and sometime Narcotics and Gang officers are detailed to police special events on overtime. These specialty assignments carry with them flexible scheduling so that these officers can be allocated in large groups to special events that need a large police presence. Smaller planned events, large events that need personnel beyond those available from the special units and spontaneous events usually require the assignment of on-duty personnel. At times, sector officers are pulled from their patrol areas for special events.

The staffing analysis used above is based on the number of sector officers that are typically on-duty each day and each shift. With no systematic recording of the time on-duty sector officers are detailed to special events it is difficult to determine the impact special events have on officer availability. Special events in San Francisco are concentrated on weekends with on-duty officers from a variety of district stations being assigned to them.

Sample data was manually tabulated for two districts with high occurrence of special events: Southern and Central. They support the finding that the preponderance of on-duty special event staffing takes place on week ends, especially Saturday. The Southern District has an average time consumed by calls for service percent of 46.2% and Central

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

has an average of 44.7%. Although these averages increase slightly on weekends it is only be a few points.

The department's seven watch system, described above, requires that about the same number of officers be scheduled each day of the week. Therefore, attempting to increase staffing on only the weekends would create imbalances on other days. Even if such increases were implemented, imbalances still would occur because special events do not occur every weekend, instead, they are scattered through the year. Also, spontaneous special events may occur on any day, but again at scattered intervals. Still, using on-duty officers to police special events will, on occasion, result in degraded calls for service response.

Peak activity periods occur in normal calls for service response. On occasion a shift will be extremely busy with officers going from call to call to call. This may well be the result even at average call loads if there are fewer on-duty officers to respond to calls because some have been detailed to special events.

Although operating under a strain at times because of on-duty special events policing, the districts still perform well overall with regard to call for service response. If the department adopts any of the targets to increase community policing time, the four districts with the most special events will all gain personnel. Prime time for community policing, problem solving and community engagement is Monday through Thursday from 11 a.m. through 9 p.m. If the department continues its current seven watch schedule the recommended staffing increases will result in more weekend personnel which will mitigate the impact of special events policing.

5. Staff Services

Each district should have a Staff Services Unit headed by a sergeant who reports directly to the district captain. The district clerks and automotive service technical employees should report to the staff services sergeant.

Recommendation: Each district should have three investigators reporting to the Staff Services sergeants. They should work in cooperation with district personnel on minor crime problems that directly impact a neighborhood's quality of life. They will also serve as a liaison between the FOB and Investigations Bureau. Cases they should investigate include:

- Disturbing the peace
- Malicious mischief/vandalism
- Cruelty toward animals
- Public nuisance

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Begging
- Loitering
- Trespassing
- Refusal to identify
- Found/located property
- Acts against public transit
- Unusual/suspicious occurrences and persons
- Miscellaneous investigations

Recommendation: Other district support functions such as permits, facility maintenance, subpoenas and special event tracking should be performed by civilian employees. Each district should have Police Service Aides to provide these services. The staff services sergeant can provide sworn presence when needed. Each district should have the following number of staff services personnel:

- 1 Sergeant
- 3 Investigators
- 1 Clerk
- 3 Police Service Aides for Permits, Facility Maintenance, Subpoenas, Special Events
- 1 Automotive Service Attendant

6. Community Policing/CompStat Section

PERF recommends that the department create a Community Policing/CompStat section in each district to be headed by a lieutenant. The unit should include a crime analyst, problem-solving teams, school resource officers, housing and parks patrol officers, and the district's foot beat officers. Creation of this unit is a critical element in implementing the Vision of the San Francisco Police Department. The department has made a commitment to work with the city's communities to address "crime, violence, and quality-of-life issues by engaging ... in problem-solving partnerships ... Police strategies and tactics must be driven by accurate, timely and reliable information supplied by current and emerging technologies and supported by the Department's systematic engagement of all of San Francisco's diverse neighborhoods."

These units will enable each district to support the daily community policing activities of its sector officers with resources that can be focused on the diverse neighborhood problems discovered either through the department's recommended centralized CompStat process, or through the "ground-up" problem identification process initiated by residents and sector officers. A process to document and prioritize these localized crime and

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

disorder problems exists now via the department's 509 forms; however, the districts have lacked, at times, the concentrated and coordinated resources to effectively address these identified problems. The Community Policing/CompStat lieutenant is the central point in each district to ensure that community problems that need resources beyond those that the sector officers can provide are addressed. The focus should be on repeat calls for service and strategies to reduce crime through community engagement.

- a) **Crime Analyst:** Each district should have a crime analyst. The functions of this position should include identifying crime patterns and trends that become the focus of the recommended centralized CompStat process, as well as providing in-depth analysis of the community problems to be addressed through the problem-solving process.
- The crime analysis position is critical because successful community problem-solving policing requires more in-depth analysis than is typically indicated on the department's current problem-solving form, SFPD Form 509. Therefore, the role of the district analysts should include dealing with each element of the SARA model (**S**canning, **A**nalysis, **R**esponse, and **A**ssessment).

b) **Problem-Solving Teams:** Each district should have one or more Problem-Solving Teams (PSTs). Currently the districts have various groups of officers who are devoted to such functions as tactical operations, plainclothes operations, or traffic. Each district also has solo motorcycle officers assigned to various traffic functions. These officers should be assembled into problem-solving teams to carry out the police side of the responses developed through the problem-solving process. The operations of these teams should be flexible so that they can play varying roles tied to specific problem-solving projects. Their focus will range from traffic operations to other roles, such as plainclothes assignments, uniformed tactical operations, and engaging the community in problem-solving. The activities of the PSTs should almost always be guided by a formal SARA problem-solving process. Each problem-solving team should be composed of a sergeant and eight officers. An important consideration in staffing the problem solving teams should be the inclusion of officers with skill in languages other than English, especially in districts with concentrations of non-English speakers.

Recommendation: Each district should have the number of problem-solving teams as shown in the following table.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 32. Recommended Problem Solving Teams By District

District	Number
Central	2
Southern	4
Bayview	4
Mission	4
Northern	3
Park	2
Richmond	2
Ingleside	4
Taraval	2
Tenderloin	3

Source: PERF Analysis

c) School Resource Officers: SROs should be decentralized to the districts as part of the Community Police/CompStat team. This will encourage close communication between the SROs and the other officers who work in the district so that information on youth problems can be more readily shared. Currently all 29 SROs work four ten-hour days each week with either Friday-Saturday-Sunday or Saturday-Sunday-Monday off. Their schedule should be changed so they work eight-hour days Monday through Friday to match the school week. They should also be present at night and weekend school events since their knowledge of the students would add to the safety and security at such events.

- In exchange for this schedule alteration, the department should seek to have school resource officers awarded with a combination of compensatory time earned at a mixture of straight time and overtime rates. The amount of this time should equal the additional time they attend school events. The expectation should be that SROs can take comp time when school is not open during holidays, breaks and other times during the school year. During the summer they should schedule SRO update training, in-service time and their vacation time. Any other on-duty time available during the summer should be allocated to their district's problem-solving team or to supplementing sector patrol.
- Based on the current schedule, the following is a district-by-district allocation:

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 33. SRO Allocation by District

	SROs	Sergeants
Central	1	-
Southern	0	-
Bayview	5	1
Mission	6	1
Northern	5	1
Park	3	-
Richmond	1	-
Ingleside	6	1
Taraval	2	-
Tenderloin	0	-

Source: PERF Analysis, SFPD Roster Data

- In Bayview, Mission, Northern and Ingleside the SROs should report to a district-based SRO sergeant. In Central, Park, Richmond, and Taraval the SROs should receive direct supervision from the dayshift foot beat sergeant since the span of control in those districts is not large enough to justify a sergeant.

d) Housing and Parks: Districts with substantial public housing communities and/or parks should have an allocation of patrol officers specifically assigned to these areas. Because of the specialized safety and security needs of these places, the same officers should be consistently assigned to these locations. They should be part of the Community Policing/CompStat groups, because the locations they police may often be the subject of problem-solving projects. Officers policing these places should be directly supervised by a sergeant when they number more than five. Otherwise they should be supervised by a foot patrol sergeant.

Recommendation: Housing and Parks officers represent discretionary staffing and are designed to improve the safety and security of the specific areas that are patrolled. The number established for each district is based on the past experiences in the districts combined with the number and size of the places that need this specialized attention. The following table provides staffing recommendations for each district.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 34. Recommended Staffing for Housing and Parks Patrol

	Housing	Parks	Sergeants
Central	0	2	0
Southern	0	0	0
Bayview	16	2	2
Mission	0	2	0
Northern	4	2	1
Park	0	2	0
Richmond	0	2	0
Ingleside	8	2	1
Taraval	0	2	0
Tenderloin	0	2	0

Source: PERF Analysis, SFPD Roster Data

e) **Foot Beats:** A key component in the San Francisco Police Department’s delivery of services through its ten districts is foot patrol. The objective of this analysis is to determine the appropriate level of foot patrol staffing for each of the districts, pending the department’s development of its comprehensive plan for foot beat identification and staffing that is a result of the legislatively mandated assessment of foot patrol in the city.

The Public Safety Strategies Group completed its extensive evaluation of the SFPD’s foot patrol program in April 2008 (“Foot Patrol Program Evaluation Report”). Among its key findings were:

- SFPD and the community widely accept foot patrol.
- SFPD committed significant resources to foot beat staffing.
- Foot patrols in the city have increased the community’s perceptions of safety.

District-based foot patrol is also an important element that will help the SFPD realize its vision. Foot patrol officers can be a vital element in forming problem-solving partnerships so that the police and the community can address crime, violence, and quality-of-life issues, as required under the department’s Vision statement. Foot patrol can also help the department ensure its systematic engagement of all of San Francisco’s diverse neighborhoods.

Even before the legislation mandating foot patrol, foot patrol has been an ongoing operation in the districts. The table below shows the hours per year that each district assigned officers to dedicated foot patrol.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 35. Foot Patrol Officers, Hours per Year

	2002*	2003*	2004*	2005*	2006*	2007** Actual	2007*** Extrapolated
Central	10,002	11,219	11,580	9,882	10,878	15,772	14,176
Southern	4,384	3,766	4,755	9,599	11,874	31,028	20,012
Bayview	3,112	3,090	963	3,267	10,054	23,384	15,436
Mission	5,491	3,092	8,692	8,582	9,966	24,996	16,734
Northern	5,851	5,497	9,373	16,806	24,871	34,694	30,860
Park	3,618	1,221	3,337	6,157	15,031	28,194	20,844
Richmond	1,747	3,033	3,180	3,414	4,011	8,050	7,502
Ingleside	1,769	1,555	1,717	188	1,184	12,542	12,694
Taraval	2,888	2,590	1,933	2,228	2,200	11,794	8,362
Tenderloin	3,860	8,648	8,921	7,493	11,090	32,209	20,330

Source:

* PSSG: Attachment G from "Foot Patrol Program Evaluation Report"

** PERF Analysis of 2007 HRMS data

*** PSSG: Extrapolation of all of 2007 from January through June 2007 data

The 2007 data clearly show that the department and the districts have continued to increase the time spent on foot patrol. The time committed to foot patrol assignments more than doubled from 2006 to 2007 in seven of the ten districts and was substantially higher in 2007 in the other three districts (Central, Northern and Park).

Southern, Bayview, Mission, Park and the Tenderloin each substantially accelerated their foot patrol programs during the last six months of 2007 compared to the first six months. This is demonstrated by the difference between the 2007 actual figures compared to the 2007 extrapolated figures derived from doubling the time spent during the first six months of 2007. Significant increases during the second half of the year are not unusual historically, as is demonstrated by data in Attachment G of the "Foot Patrol Program Evaluation Report." Increased street activity in the warmer months of the year and enhanced foot patrol in shopping areas during the end of the year holiday season may account for some of the July through December increase. The focus on foot patrol throughout the city and the police department during the analysis and preparation of the PSSG report may also account for some of the increase during the last six months of 2007.

The next table shows the average hours per week that each district had assigned foot patrol officers. Both regular and overtime hours are shown.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 36. Average 2007 Hours per Week for Foot Patrol Assignments

2007 Beat Hours	Regular Time Hours per Week	Overtime Hours per Week	Total Foot Beat Hours per Week	Percent of Total FB Hours Accounted for by Overtime
Central	287.7	15.6	303.3	5.1%
Southern	475.3	121.4	596.7	20.3%
Bayview	326.2	123.5	449.7	27.5%
Mission	378.8	101.9	480.7	21.2%
Northern	558.5	108.7	667.2	16.3%
Park	480	62.2	542.2	11.5%
Richmond	140.2	14.6	154.8	9.4%
Ingleside	218.2	23	241.2	9.5%
Taraval	193.7	33.1	226.8	14.6%
Tenderloin	587.9	31.5	619.4	5.1%

Source: 2007 SF Computer Aided Dispatch System Data

Northern and Tenderloin Districts averaged the most foot beat time per week. Richmond, Taraval and Ingleside were the lowest users of foot beat time. The department's focus on crime problems in Bayview likely accounts for the high amount of foot beat assignments that were charged to overtime as the department sought to supplement the resources normally available in that district.

The information above came from 2007 HRMS data. This describes the allocation of officers' time to dedicated foot patrol. The following data comes from DEM's computer aided dispatch (CAD) system which records the work performed by foot beat officers. This data was analyzed separately from the work performed by sector officers. The analytical methodology used to examine the workload of foot beat officers was the same as used for sector officers.

Table 37 shows the average time consumed per week by calls for service and by self-initiated activities by officers assigned to foot beats during 2007.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

**Table 37. Foot Beat Officer Average Weekly Time Consumed
by Calls for Service (CFS) and Self-Initiated activity (SI)**

	Total FB Assignment Hours per Week (HRMS)	Average Hours CFS (CAD) per Week	Average Hours SI (CAD) per Week	Average Hours CFS + SI per Week
Central	303.3	39.7	60.2	99.9
Southern	596.7	58.9	127.9	186.8
Bayview	449.7	56.1	178.2	234.3
Mission	480.7	42.1	144.6	186.7
Northern	667.2	65.9	144.2	210.1
Park	542.2	79.6	127.9	207.5
Richmond	154.8	19.8	26.3	46.1
Ingleside	241.2	42.9	61.6	104.5
Taraval	226.8	30.8	30.2	61
Tenderloin	619.4	96.8	152.7	249.5

Source: 2007 SF Computer Aided System Dispatch Data, 2007 HRMS Data

The Tenderloin had substantially more foot beat officer time per week consumed by calls for service in 2007 than did any of the other districts. The Tenderloin is a small and dense police district. Many of the services provided for the homeless are centered in the area. There are frequently a substantial number of people on the street, especially at night. Because of these conditions, the district has been an extensive user of foot patrol, which puts officers in close contact with people in the area. A foot beat officer may be closer to the location of problems called about and may be more readily able to access them than a sector car.

The most frequent problems that the public called for a police officer in the Tenderloin included the following types of CFS: Suspicious Person, Suspicious Homeless Person, Interview a Citizen, Suspicious Person in a Vehicle, and Fight or Dispute (no weapon). In some of these instances, foot beat officers may act as a back-up to a sector officer. In addition, some responses may be by a foot beat officer when they are traveling in a patrol car moving in the district. Increasingly during 2007, foot beat officers became available to respond to calls for service in their foot beats as the department worked with the communications centers to revise protocols.

Bayview and the Tenderloin had the highest amount of foot beat officer time consumed by self-initiated activity. Bayview foot beat officers frequently performed the following self-initiated activities: Passing Calls, Suspicious Person, Bus Inspection, Traffic Stop, and Suspicious Person in a Vehicle. The most frequent self-initiated activities in the Tenderloin were: Suspicious Person, Passing Calls, Suspicious Homeless Person, Meet with a City/Public Service Employee, and Interview a Citizen.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

The Bayview list includes Passing Calls, Bus Inspections and Traffic Stops. The Tenderloin list also includes Passing Calls. The locations of Passing Calls may be within the boundaries of a foot beat and these calls may be recorded by foot beat officers walking past the location. Bus Inspections may also be conducted when a foot beat officer boards a bus from his/her walking assignment and gets off the bus in the foot beat to continue walking. Both Passing Calls and Bus Inspections are frequent sector car self-initiated activities. Traffic Stops are typically initiated by an officer in a patrol car and are also typical sector car self-initiated activities. Traffic Stops are not only recorded by Bayview foot beat officers but also are recorded by foot beat officers in other districts. These observations indicate some data limitations. Currently, records for CFS and SI activities by foot beat officers do not indicate whether they are on foot or in a vehicle when they receive a call or initiate an activity. In addition, although the officer performing an activity can be identified as being assigned to foot patrol because of the officer's radio code number, whether the activity is actually in the foot beat is not currently recorded.

Despite these idiosyncrasies, foot patrol is a critical component of police service delivery in San Francisco. Through 2007, the average number of officers per district assigned to foot patrol was as follows. The table includes a recommendation for foot beat sergeants based on a span of control of not more than one to ten. One duty of foot patrol supervisors should be to monitor the activities of foot beat officers to ensure that the vast majority of their time is spent in their assigned foot beats.

**Table 38. Average Number of Officers
Assigned to Foot Patrol**

Foot Patrol	Officers	Sergeants Recommended
Central	9	1
Southern	18	2
Bayview	13	2
Mission	14	2
Northern	20	3
Park	16	2
Richmond	5	1
Ingleside	7	1
Taraval	7	1
Tenderloin	19	3

Source: PERF Analysis, SFPD Roster Data

These figures, which include both regular time and overtime assignments, represent the department's effort to comply with the Board of Supervisors' legislative requirements and to meet local district needs. Because the department is developing a comprehensive foot patrol staffing plan, this study will project district staffing using these figures in the interim.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

7. Summary Staffing the Districts

The following tables represent recommendations for staffing the police districts. There is a table for each district which includes staffing recommendations for each of the four calls for service targets discussed earlier, listed under the heading “Sector Patrol.” Target 1 represents the sector officers needed for an average time used for calls for service of 50%, Target 2 is at 40%, Target 3 is at 35% and Target 4 is at 30%.

The “Staff” column includes the district Captain, the Staff Services sergeant, the district-based investigators, and the civilian clerk, police service aides and automotive attendant.

Columns under the “Community Policing/CompStat” heading include “Mgmt,” which includes the lieutenant heading the section and the crime analyst. “PST” represents personnel assigned to the problem-solving teams and varies according to the size of the district and the activity. The district motorcycle officers are included in the PST allocation. “SRO” represents the allocation of School Resource Officers assigned to each district. When necessary, a supervisor is included in the recommended allocation.

An allocation is recommended for each district for Housing and Parks officers as well as for Foot Beats. Summaries are provided for each district for each target.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 39. Staffing Per District by Target

CENTRAL	SECTOR PATROL				SUPPORT STAFF	COMMUNITY POLICING/COMPSTAT					TOTAL			
	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4		Mgmt	PST	SRO	Housing & Parks	Foot Beats	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4
Captain					1						1	1	1	1
Lieutenant	4	4	4	4		1					5	5	5	5
Sergeant	6	7	9	10	1		2			1	10	11	13	14
Investigator					3						3	3	3	3
Officers	41	54	65	76			16	1	2	9	69	82	93	104
Civilians					5	1					6	6	6	6
									Total Sworn		88	102	115	127
									Total Civilian		6	6	6	6

Source: 2007 HRMS, PERF Analysis

SOUTHERN	SECTOR PATROL				SUPPORT STAFF	COMMUNITY POLICING/COMPSTAT					TOTAL			
	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4		Mgmt	PST	SRO	Housing & Parks	Foot Beats	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4
Captain					1						1	1	1	1
Lieutenant	4	4	4	4		1					5	5	5	5
Sergeant	8	10	12	14	1		4	0		2	15	17	19	21
Investigator					3						3	3	3	3
Officers	62	82	99	116			32	0	0	18	112	132	149	166
Civilians					5	1					6	6	6	6
									Total Sworn		136	158	177	196
									Total Civilian		6	6	6	6

Source: 2007 HRMS, PERF Analysis

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

BAYVIEW	SECTOR PATROL				SUPPORT STAFF	COMMUNITY POLICING/COMPSTAT					TOTAL			
	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4		Mgmt	PST	SRO	Housing & Parks	Foot Beats	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4
Captain					1						1	1	1	1
Lieutenant	4	4	4	4		1					5	5	5	5
Sergeant	8	9	12	14	1		4	1	2	2	18	19	22	24
Investigator					3						3	3	3	3
Officers	56	75	90	105			32	5	18	13	124	143	158	173
Civilians					5	1					6	6	6	6
									Total Sworn		151	171	189	206
									Total Civilian		6	6	6	6

Source: 2007 HRMS, PERF Analysis

MISSION	SECTOR PATROL				SUPPORT STAFF	COMMUNITY POLICING/COMPSTAT					TOTAL			
	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4		Mgmt	PST	SRO	Housing & Parks	Foot Beats	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4
Captain					1						1	1	1	1
Lieutenant	4	4	4	4		1					5	5	5	5
Sergeant	8	10	12	15	1		4	1	0	2	16	18	20	23
Investigator					3						3	3	3	3
Officers	64	84	102	119			32	6	2	14	118	138	156	173
Civilians					5	1					6	6	6	6
									Total Sworn		143	165	185	205
									Total Civilian		6	6	6	6

Source: 2007 HRMS, PERF Analysis

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

NORTHERN	SECTOR PATROL				SUPPORT STAFF	COMMUNITY POLICING/COMPSTAT					TOTAL			
	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4		Mgmt	PST	SRO	Housing & Parks	Foot Beats	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4
Captain					1						1	1	1	1
Lieutenant	4	4	4	4		1					5	5	5	5
Sergeant	7	9	10	12	1		3	1	1	3	16	18	19	21
Investigator					3						3	3	3	3
Officers	50	67	81	94			24	5	6	20	105	122	136	149
Civilians					5	1					6	6	6	6
									Total Sworn		130	149	164	179
									Total Civilian		6	6	6	6

Source: 2007 HRMS, PERF Analysis

PARK	SECTOR PATROL				SUPPORT STAFF	COMMUNITY POLICING/COMPSTAT					TOTAL			
	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4		Mgmt	PST	SRO	Housing & Parks	Foot Beats	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4
Captain					1						1	1	1	1
Lieutenant	4	4	4	4		1					5	5	5	5
Sergeant	6	6	6	7	1		2	0	0	2	11	11	11	12
Investigator					3						3	3	3	3
Officers	23	30	36	42			16	3	2	16	60	67	73	79
Civilians					5	1					6	6	6	6
									Total Sworn		80	87	93	100
									Total Civilian		6	6	6	6

Source: 2007 HRMS, PERF Analysis

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

RICHMOND	SECTOR PATROL				SUPPORT STAFF	COMMUNITY POLICING/COMPSTAT					TOTAL			
	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4		Mgmt	PST	SRO	Housing & Parks	Foot Beats	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4
Captain					1						1	1	1	1
Lieutenant	4	4	4	4		1					5	5	5	5
Sergeant	6	6	6	7	1		2		0	1	10	10	10	11
Investigator					3						3	3	3	3
Officers	25	33	40	47			16	1	2	5	49	57	64	71
Civilians					5	1					6	6	6	6
									Total Sworn		68	76	83	91
									Total Civilian		6	6	6	6

Source: 2007 HRMS, PERF Analysis

INGLESIDE	SECTOR PATROL				SUPPORT STAFF	COMMUNITY POLICING/COMPSTAT					TOTAL			
	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4		Mgmt	PST	SRO	Housing & Parks	Foot Beats	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4
Captain					1						1	1	1	1
Lieutenant	4	4	4	4		1					5	5	5	5
Sergeant	7	9	10	12	1		4	1	1	1	15	17	18	20
Investigator					3						3	3	3	3
Officers	53	70	84	98			32	6	10	7	108	125	139	153
Civilians					5	1					6	6	6	6
									Total Sworn		132	151	166	182
									Total Civilian		6	6	6	6

Source: 2007 HRMS, PERF Analysis

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

TARAVAL	SECTOR PATROL				SUPPORT STAFF	COMMUNITY POLICING/COMPSTAT					TOTAL			
	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4		Mgmt	PST	SRO	Housing & Parks	Foot Beats	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4
Captain					1						1	1	1	1
Lieutenant	4	4	4	4		1					5	5	5	5
Sergeant	6	7	7	8	1		2		0	1	10	11	11	12
Investigator					3						3	3	3	3
Officers	39	51	62	72			16	2	2	7	66	78	89	99
Civilians					5	1					6	6	6	6
									Total Sworn		85	98	109	120
									Total Civilian		6	6	6	6

Source: 2007 HRMS, PERF Analysis

TENDERLOIN	SECTOR PATROL				SUPPORT STAFF	COMMUNITY POLICING/COMPSTAT					TOTAL			
	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4		Mgmt	PST	SRO	Housing & Parks	Foot Beats	Target 1	Target 2	Target 3	Target 4
Captain					1						1	1	1	1
Lieutenant	4	4	4	4		1					5	5	5	5
Sergeant	6	6	6	6	1		3		0	3	13	13	13	13
Investigator					3						3	3	3	3
Officers	25	34	41	47			24	0	2	19	70	79	86	92
Civilians					5	1					6	6	6	6
									Total Sworn		92	101	108	114
									Total Civilian		6	6	6	6

Source: 2007 HRMS, PERF Analysis

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 40. Citywide Summary of Recommended Police District Staffing

	Total Target 1	Total Target 2	Total Target 3	Total Target 4
Captain	10	10	10	10
Lieutenant	50	50	50	50
Sergeant	134	145	156	171
Investigator	30	30	30	30
Officers	881	1023	1143	1259
Civilians	60	60	60	60
Total Sworn	1105	1258	1389	1520
Total Civilian	60	60	60	60

Source: PERF Analysis

Table 41. FOB Summary of Recommended Staffing

TARGET 1	Management	Admin	Homeland Security	Traffic	Tactical	Community Outreach	Office of the Districts	Districts	TOTAL
Deputy Chief	1								1
Commander			1				1		2
Captain			1	1	1		4	10	17
Lieutenant		1		4	4	1	1	50	61
Sergeant		3	3	14	12	1		134	167
Investigators				10				30	40
Officers		1	10	66	95	3		881	1056
Civilians	1	4	3	5	5	3	2	60	83
Total Sworn	1	5	15	95	112	5	6	1105	1344
Total Civilian	1	4	3	5	5	3	2	60	83

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

TARGET 2									
	Management	Admin	Homeland Security	Traffic	Tactical	Community Outreach	Office of the Districts	Districts	TOTAL
Deputy Chief	1								1
Commander			1				1		2
Captain			1	1	1		4	10	17
Lieutenant		1		4	4	1	1	50	61
Sergeant		3	3	14	12	1		145	178
Investigators				10				30	40
Officers		1	10	66	95	3		1023	1198
Civilians	1	4	3	5	5	3	2	60	83
Total Sworn	1	5	15	95	112	5	6	1258	1497
Total Civilian	1	4	3	5	5	3	2	60	83

TARGET 3									
	Management	Admin	Homeland Security	Traffic	Tactical	Community Outreach	Office of the Districts	Districts	TOTAL
Deputy Chief	1								1
Commander			1				1		2
Captain			1	1	1		4	10	17
Lieutenant		1		4	4	1	1	50	61
Sergeant		3	3	14	12	1		156	189
Investigators				10				30	40
Officers		1	10	66	95	3		1143	1318
Civilians	1	4	3	5	5	3	2	60	83
Total Sworn	1	5	15	95	112	5	6	1389	1628
Total Civilian	1	4	3	5	5	3	2	60	83

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

TARGET 4									
	Management	Admin	Homeland Security	Traffic	Tactical	Community Outreach	Office of the Districts	Districts	TOTAL
Deputy Chief	1								1
Commander			1				1		2
Captain			1	1	1		4	10	17
Lieutenant		1		4	4	1	1	50	61
Sergeant		3	3	14	12	1		171	204
Investigators				10				30	40
Officers		1	10	66	95	3		1259	1434
Civilians	1	4	3	5	5	3	2	60	83
Total Sworn	1	5	15	95	112	5	6	1520	1759
Total Civilian	1	4	3	5	5	3	2	60	83

Source: 2007 HRMS; PERF Analysis

ORGANIZING THE INVESTIGATIONS BUREAU

The Police Executive Research Forum recommends modifications to the San Francisco Police Department's Investigations Bureau to increase the efficiency of operations as well as support the department's Vision. This section addresses the proposed structure of the Bureau. Staffing for each of the divisions will be addressed in the upcoming Staffing Analysis component of the PERF study and will incorporate personnel levels to match workload.


PERF's recommended restructuring of the Bureau represents best practices in policing and provides an investigative environment to enhance high standards and accountability. It also encourages working in collaboration with others to address crime, violence, and quality-of-life issues, and engaging in problem-solving partnerships to solve crimes, prevent future offenses, and provide services to victims and others impacted by crime. Investigative personnel, strategies and tactics must be committed to human values and driven by accurate, timely and reliable information.

Headed by a Deputy Chief, the Investigations Bureau is organized into six Divisions under the command of five Captains and a Civilian Forensic Manager. PERF recommends that the divisions be realigned into: Crimes Against Persons, Crimes Against Property, Special Victims, Vice/Narcotics, Special Operations, and Forensic Services. Each division should be made up of sections that are under the command of a lieutenant or manager with some further sub-divided into specialized units. Sections and units have been aligned based upon offense type with an ancillary consideration of association and span of control whenever possible. A more "specialist" approach has been implemented to allow staff members to increase their expertise in their assignment, thereby improving effectiveness and case clearance. Two Crime Analyst positions have been integrated into the Investigations Bureau to provide support for the timely identification and response to crime trends, repeat offenders and victimization.

The newly aligned Bureau is diagrammed in the following organization chart followed by a brief narrative description of each of the Investigations Bureau's Divisions, their associated sections and units and a sample of the types of cases that should be investigated by each section.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

SFPD Investigations Bureau
Proposed Structure November 2008



**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

U. CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS DIVISION

PERF recommends that the Crimes Against Persons Division investigate offenses in which a person is the victim of a criminal act that does not involve domestic violence or a sexual offense, and the victim is not under the age of 14 years. (PERF recommends that those sexual offenses be investigated by the newly-created Special Victims Division described later.) The new Crimes Against Persons Division should be made up of the following three investigative sections: Homicide, Aggravated Assaults and Robbery.

1. Homicide Section:

In addition to investigating murders, officer-involved shootings, and suspicious and in-custody deaths, PERF recommends that the Homicide Section take on the additional responsibility of reviewing suspicious death reports, the investigation of non-vehicular accidental deaths, and aggravated assaults in which there is a strong possibility that death may occur. This latter change will help to ensure that critical investigative steps will not be lost because of an eventual homicide's initial categorization as something else. PERF also recommends that the section should incorporate a full-time Homicide Cold Case Unit working in close partnership with Forensic Services and the District Attorney's Office to bring old homicide cases to a conclusion.

Partial listing of case responsibilities:

- All homicides
- Suicides and attempted suicides
- Accidental deaths
- Non-vehicular manslaughter deaths
- Officer-involved shootings
- In-custody deaths
- "Cold" homicide cases

2. Aggravated Assault Section:

PERF recommends the creation of an Aggravated Assault Section that will incorporate many of the investigations previously performed by members of the General Work Unit. Criminal investigations conducted by the section should include: felonious assaults (except those handled by Homicide in which death is a strong possibility), kidnappings, non-fatal shootings, stalking incidents, extortion, prisoner escapes, firearms violations, harassing phone calls, restraining order violations, and hostage/barricaded suspects.

Partial listing of case responsibilities:

- Aggravated assaults with weapons and bodily force
- Attempted homicides
- Assaults with chemicals and poisoning
- Mayhem and attempted mayhem

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Aggravated assault on a police officer
- Kidnappings, attempt kidnappings and false imprisonment
- Possession of a deadly weapon with intent to assault
- Battery
- Accidental burns and lacerations

3. Robbery Section:

The Robbery Section is responsible for the follow-up investigation of all commercial, residential and person robberies. Members of the section work in cooperation with the FBI's Violent Crime Unit to coordinate the investigation of bank robberies. As most street robberies are committed by persons who live in or frequent the area in which the act is committed, robbery investigators should maintain a close working relationship with the FOB to gather timely information on active suspects in the community. To facilitate the investigation of robbery cases as well as provide support for the SFPD's Vision, PERF recommends that the staff of the Robbery Section be assigned cases geographically, based upon the existing police district boundaries. This will further advance the section's existing practice of working in close partnership with members of patrol.

Partial listing of case responsibilities:

- Robberies (person, commercial and residential)
- Theft from person
- Carjacking
- Attempted robbery
- Grand theft purse snatch

V. CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY DIVISION

The Crimes Against Property Division recommended by PERF deals with offenses that generally target property rather than persons. The division should be made up of the following four investigative sections: Economic Crimes Section, Burglary Section, Auto Section, and Theft Section.

It should be noted that while the vast majority of these cases do not receive a great deal of news media attention, they are important for the confidence of the community in the police department. Most crime victims are victims of a property crime, so their opinion of the police will be based upon the department's handling of this type of case. Secondly and equally as important, the high-volume property offenses have the greatest impact on Uniform Crime Report statistics. For this reason, it is beneficial for the department to put significant effort into the investigation of these crimes and the arrest of offenders responsible for committing a disproportionate amount of crime.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

1. Economic Crimes Section:

PERF recommends the creation of an Economic Crimes Section to investigate financial crimes including check and access card fraud, theft by false pretenses, forgery, identity theft involving financial loss, Internet fraud, counterfeit trademark merchandise, counterfeit money, real estate and notary fraud, embezzlement by employees, and financial elder crimes. Within the Economic Crime Section should be the Fraud Unit, which will handle cases such as counterfeiting, felony cases of thefts by false pretenses, and thefts by trick and device. A designated member of the Fraud Unit should continue to participate in the San Francisco County Fiduciary Abuse Specialist Team (FAST), which consists of representatives from the Adult Protective Services, Public Guardian, City and District Attorney, and the police to address criminal issues related to elder financial abuse.

Partial listing of case responsibilities:

- Checks (forgery, fictitious, NSF)
- Forgery
- Credit card crimes
- Embezzlement
- Counterfeiting
- Thefts by trick and device
- Thefts by false pretenses
- Short change grand and petty thefts
- Putting slugs in a telephone box
- Changing the face amount of money

2. Burglary Section:

The Burglary Section is responsible for investigating residential and commercial burglaries, retail store thefts and other thefts from “structures” as defined in the California Penal Code. Investigators should be assigned cases geographically so they may work closely with district personnel to identify crime patterns and apprehend those responsible in a timely manner.

Partial listing of case responsibilities:

- Burglaries of residences, businesses, storage facilities and construction sites
- Burglary of a safe
- Possession of burglary tools

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

A sub-unit of the Burglary Section is the Fencing Unit that regulates pawn shops, secondhand dealers and e-commerce. An examination of over 250,000 pawn slips is conducted every year to recognize and recover stolen property along with identifying criminal suspects. Using automated technology, the Fencing Unit now has the ability to review all pawn slips with greater efficiency and scrutiny. The Unit also investigates related criminal offenses including persons and locations suspected of receiving and selling stolen property.

3. Auto Section:

The Auto Section recommended by PERF will conduct investigations of all felony arrest cases involving, but not limited to, the theft of all types of vehicles as defined in the California Vehicle Code, recovered stolen vehicles and auto burglaries. The Auto Section investigates the sale of vehicles and auto parts on the Internet and continues to work in partnership with the CHP and San Francisco DA's Office in the San Francisco Auto Theft Task Force. Members of the detail also work with the DMV and their counterparts in the existing nine Bay Area Auto Theft Task Forces to curtail the theft of autos, the operations of chop shops, and the import and export of stolen vehicles. The Auto Section is also responsible for the storage and release of over 4,000 vehicles annually with a police hold as well as the inspection of auto repair and body shops for permit, licensing and other violations.

Partial listing of case responsibilities:

- All automobile thefts (cars, trucks, motorcycles, trailer, etc.)
- Petty theft from vehicles, auto stripping
- Embezzled vehicles
- Impounded vehicles
- Recovered stolen vehicles
- Proactive unit

PERF recommends that the Auto Section support the department's Vision by expanding its duties to include proactive efforts to reduce auto thefts through such measures as analyzing the location of auto thefts and recoveries, a study of repeat offenders, the use of a bait vehicle, and an education campaign in the community.

4. Theft Section:

PERF recommends that a newly created Theft Section conduct investigations of all thefts not investigated by other sections within the Bureau. Their case work should include grand and petty theft and attempted thefts, shoplifting, grand theft person, and pick pocketing. Within the section should be the Retail Theft Unit, a group of investigators

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

responsible for tracking, analyzing and identifying habitual retail thieves as well as serving as the department's liaison with corporate and merchant association groups.

Partial listing of case responsibilities:

- Petty theft
- Grand theft
- Attempted thefts
- Shoplifting
- Grand theft person
- Pickpocketing

W. SPECIAL VICTIMS DIVISION

Hate crimes are particularly offensive to the public and at times they can incense communities. Because of the nature and sensitivity of these investigations, PERF recommends that the Hate Crime Unit report directly to the captain of the Special Victims Division. The unit is responsible for the investigation of all hate crimes and bias-motivated incidents reported to the department as defined in Section 422.6 of the California Penal Code⁴. Members of the Hate Crime Unit may also provide training and liaison for the department and community groups.

The problems of child and sexual abuse, domestic violence, and child abduction have historically been handled as separate entities requiring unique specialization and training. Research now shows an undeniable cause and effect between these problems, which stem from violence in the home. These issues cannot be treated in isolation from one another, nor can incarceration be regarded as the only method to stop them. Part of the rationale for PERF's recommended realignment of this division is based on emerging research indicating that 50 to 75 percent of male batterers also abuse their children and that spousal abuse also strongly correlates to sexual abuse of young girls. One study found that girls whose fathers abuse their mothers are 6.5 times more likely to be sexually assaulted than girls from nonviolent homes. In addition, nearly 70

⁴ CPC 422.6. (a) No person, whether or not acting under color of law, shall by force or threat of force, willfully injure, intimidate, interfere with, oppress, or threaten any other person in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him or her by the Constitution or laws of this state or by the Constitution or laws of the United States because of the other person's race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, gender, or sexual orientation, or because he or she perceives that the other person has one or more of those characteristics.

(b) No person, whether or not acting under color of law, shall knowingly deface, damage, or destroy the real or personal property of any other person for the purpose of intimidating or interfering with the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to the other person by the Constitution or laws of this state or by the Constitution or laws of the United States, because of the other person's race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, gender, or sexual orientation, or because he or she perceives that the other person has one or more of those characteristics.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

percent of children in battered women's shelters have been found to be victims of physical abuse or neglect.

Recommendation: Based upon this information and other similar research, PERF recommends that the Special Victims Division be organized in such a manner to address the macro problem of abuse and family dysfunction rather than continue to treat them as isolated offenses. The Special Victims Division under PERF's plan has three sections:

1. Sex Crimes Section

This new section will investigate all felony and misdemeanor sexual assaults on victims over the age of 14. Investigators should respond to all reported sex crimes under their purview. The section should work closely with outside agencies such as the Rape Treatment Center for adults and the Child and Adolescent Support Advocacy and Resource Center for minors for medical treatment and forensic exams. In order to be as effective as possible, members of the section should routinely work with external partners including medical staff, advocacy groups and the DA's Office as well as internal cohorts such as crime scene investigations and the crime lab.

Partial listing of case responsibilities:

- Suspicious act toward a female/male with sexual connotations
- Incest
- Oral copulation
- Sodomy
- Sexual battery
- Peeping Tom
- Possession of obscene matter for sale
- Obscene phone calls
- Abortion

Within the Sex Crime Section are two units. The Sexual Offender Unit is a group of investigators who manage and monitor registered sex offenders in San Francisco County. They should work proactively to ensure that registered offenders comply with court and legislative directives, and they should take appropriate action when offenders are discovered to be out of compliance. The Sexual Assault Cold Case Unit should investigate old sexual assault cases using DNA and other advances in technology.

2. Juvenile Crimes Section

This section, carried over from the existing structure, is made up of four investigative entities: the Child Abuse Unit, the Internet Crimes Against Children Unit, the Juvenile Offenders Unit, and the Missing Persons Unit. The Child Abuse Unit investigates cases

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

of sexual assault and/or molestation against victims under the age of 14. This unit also is responsible for investigating other crimes against children including child abuse and neglect, incest and stranger abductions. Due to the nature of their work, investigators work closely with outside agencies including Child Protective Services, the Child Adolescent Sexual Advocacy and Resource Center, and the Child Abuse Prevention Center. As its name suggests, the Internet Crimes Against Children Unit investigates crimes against children involving the use of the Internet. The Juvenile Offenders Unit investigates assaults, vandalism, threats and similar crimes committed by juveniles and works in close cooperation with the School Resource Officers and outside entities including the Community Assessment Referral Center and Youth Guidance Center. The Missing Persons Unit investigates all missing person cases, both juvenile and adult.

Partial listing of case responsibilities:

- Child sexual abuse
- Willful cruelty toward a child
- Suspicious acts toward a child
- Possession of weapons by juveniles
- Specific crimes committed by juveniles
- Selling restricted glue to juveniles
- Threats to school teachers
- Disruption of school activities
- Missing persons

3. Domestic Violence Section

This section will conduct investigations of all domestic violence, elder abuse and stalking cases presented to the department and provides domestic violence training to field officers. This unit also works in close collaboration with the Assistant District Attorneys who prosecute domestic violence cases. The unit maintains a strong relationship with numerous shelters and advocacy groups to provide resources to victims of abuse and their families. Organized under the Domestic Violence Section to assist those caught in the “cycle of violence,” PERF recommends that the Psych Liaison Officer be placed under the command of the domestic violence lieutenant, but this officer may be utilized as a resource for any member of the Investigations Bureau as needed.

Partial listing of case responsibilities:

- All domestic violence
- Elder abuse

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Stalking cases
- Emergency restraining orders
- All missing persons cases

X. VICE/NARCOTICS DIVISION

This division has purposefully been assigned only two sections in order to provide an environment for the commanding officer to intimately manage these high-risk assignments. The captain must be personally familiar with the personnel and investigations in this sensitive area to guard against potential scandal and corruption. Members of the division are also tasked with the secondary responsibility of acting as first responders to special events, protests and other activities in which crowd control is needed.

1. Narcotics Section

This section investigates all drug complaints and initiates narcotic investigations on mid-to upper-level drug traffickers. Investigators use “buy/bust” operations to curtail street drug sales. They also initiate search warrants based upon informant and investigative information. The section is responsible for all asset forfeiture responsibilities and works in partnership with other local, state and federal agencies on investigations of mutual interest.

Primarily self-initiated investigations

2. Vice Section

This section conducts investigations into pimping, pandering, prostitution, human trafficking, State of California Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) regulations, tobacco enforcement, gambling, and felony crimes related to prostitution. Members of the section have administrative responsibilities including background investigations of massage applicants and the inspection of tobacco and ABC permitted businesses. Investigators also provide human trafficking training for members of SFPD and other police agencies as well as other city employees and the public.

Partial listing of case responsibilities:

- Self-initiated cases
- Pimping, pandering and prostitution
- Human trafficking
- Alcoholic Beverage Control regulations
- Tobacco enforcement
- Gambling
- Felony crimes related to prostitution.

Y. SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION

1. Gang Task Force Section

This section works to make San Francisco neighborhoods safe through enforcement activities and partnerships with local and federal agencies. The section has recently changed from an undercover capacity to working in uniform, saturating gang hot spots. The section meets every two weeks with station officers and representatives of the District Attorney's office, probation, parole, federal agencies, and Assistant U.S. Attorneys to exchange information and strategize on enforcement activities.

Case Responsibilities

- Primarily self-initiated investigations

2. Special Investigations Section

The Special Operations Section, recommended by PERF, houses highly specialized units made up of a cadre of investigators trained and equipped for their unit of expertise. The Fugitive Unit is responsible for handling all felony warrant extraditions to include preparation of court paperwork, appearance in Superior Court, and coordination of transportation arrangements to return wanted persons. Finally, the Multi-Agency Task Force Unit has functional supervision of all members of the SFPD working off-site on task forces, and it acts as liaison between the department and those groups. This centralized supervision of personnel will enable better oversight of personnel and assurance there is continued value to the department to contribute resources to these endeavors.

Partial listing of case responsibilities:

- Outside multi-agency task force personnel
- Triggerlock II Task Force (2)
- DEA (3)
- Mayor's Human Trafficking Task Force/Bay Area Human Trafficking Task Force (1)
- JTTF (2)
- Electronic Crimes Task Force (1)

3. Tactical Investigations Section

Within the Tactical Investigations Section is a team of investigators assigned to work cases requiring technical skills to conduct surveillance activities. They may perform their services for any member of the Investigations and Field Operations Bureaus. Other members of the unit perform dignitary protection services and consulate liaison while others conduct confidential and sensitive investigations and routinely work in partnership with the FBI, Secret Service, U.S. State Department, U.S. Marshals Service, and the

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

District Attorney Office's Special Prosecutions Unit. The section also contains the Arson and Weapons and Explosives Units, which perform investigative functions and have close interaction with the department's federal partners.

Partial listing of case responsibilities:

- All incendiary offenses
- Explosives
- Bombing incidents

Z. FORENSIC SERVICES DIVISION

The Forensic Services Division provides human identification, physical evidence and expert testimony to support the SFPD's efforts to identify and prosecute offenders. The division is made up of three sections: the Crime Lab, Identification section, and Crime Scene Investigation.

1. Crime Lab Section

This section supports the department and criminal justice system through the "efficient and reliable evaluation, analysis and comparison of physical evidence." The goal of the section is to provide clear, objective interpretations and findings. The division's Forensic Biology unit is certified under the DNA Advisory Board Quality Assurance Guidelines and the lab has received full accreditation from the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors. Services performed by the lab include: narcotic and chemical analyses; firearms identification; operability and legality; forensic ballistics; serial number restoration; gunshot residue detection; document examination; and body fluid identification and DNA typing.

Partial listing of responsibilities:

- Narcotic and chemical analyses
- Firearms identification, operability and legality
- Forensic ballistics
- Serial number restoration
- Gunshot residue detection
- Document examination
- Body fluid identification and DNA typing

2. Identification Section

This section processes, maintains and disseminates criminal offender and applicant photograph and fingerprint records. Services provided by the ID Section include: processing misdemeanor suspects cited to appear in court; building the AFIS database; identifying "John Doe" arrestees and Medical Examiner's Office cases; data entry for the DA's Office's Court Management System; criminal history checks and identity verification of all arrestees; sealing records in compliance with court orders; data entry

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

into CABLE, CLETS and CJIS; and providing rap sheet and mug shot information to SFPD and other law enforcement personnel.

Partial listing of responsibilities:

- Process misdemeanor suspects cited to appear in court
- Build AFIS database
- Identify “John Doe” arrestees and Medical Examiner’s Office cases
- Data entry for DA Office’s Court Management System
- Criminal history checks and identity verification of all arrestees
- Data entry into CABLE, CLETS and CJIS
- Provide rapsheet and mug shot information

3. Crime Scene Investigation (CSI) Section

This section includes CSI, forensic photography, and computer forensics, including recovery and documentation from cellular phones. This section performs diverse services, including: crime scene preservation; collection and documentation of evidence and reconstruction; photographic evidence at major crime scenes; photography services including Crime Bulletins and mugshots; latent print processing, enhancement, photography and comparison; Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) searching; computer forensics analysis; forensic video analysis; and composite sketch services.

Partial listing of responsibilities:

- Crime scene preservation, collection and documentation
- Photographic evidence at major crime scenes
- Photography services
- Latent print processing, enhancement, photography and comparison
- Fingerprint searching
- Computer forensics analysis
- Forensic video analysis
- Composite sketch services

STAFFING THE INVESTIGATIONS BUREAU

No matter how much investigative effort is put forth by either the initial responding officer or by the follow-up inspector, not all crimes can be solved. The volume of crime in most cities in America is beyond the investigative resources of police departments. Large urban police departments in the United States, such as San Francisco's, find the best use of their limited investigative resources is to assign cases based upon the seriousness of the incident and the potential to solve the case, the latter sometimes referred to as "solvability factors."

Typically, the series of crimes that make up the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Report's Part 1 offenses (homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson) constitute the crimes that are often assigned for follow-up investigation. This is largely due to the perceived severity of these crimes, injuries caused to victims, a danger of continuing violence associated with the crime, threats to the community at large, and a higher potential for solving the case and arresting criminals. Significant property loss may also be justification for an offense to receive immediate follow-up investigation.

Solvability factors include leads, clues and pieces of information present at a crime that may to be useful in bringing a case to a successful disposition. The success of a follow-up investigation, if one is initiated, depends heavily on how the preliminary investigation was conducted by the first responder, along with the information uncovered as investigators search for and assess evidence.

Useful solvability factors include:

- Witnesses to the crime – individuals or "electronic witnesses" in the form of video/audio recordings
- Knowledge of the suspect's name
- Knowledge of where the suspect may be located
- Description of the suspect
- Description of the suspect's vehicle
- Traceable property
- Specific method of operation (MO)
- Presence of usable physical evidence
- Assistance of public and/or news media

Currently, the number of personnel assigned to the San Francisco Police Department's Investigations Bureau is dependent on a number of variables, including: the desired level of completed investigations as established by the department; management's expectation of the desired levels of case assignment and closure; the types and complexity of cases followed up on by investigators; and the availability of time to investigate cases.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

When considering staffing levels, it is important to understand that the actual availability of employees' time to address casework is quite different from the hours they are assigned to work. Members of police departments have 2,080 hours available to work per year (an average of 40 hours per week). However, not all these hours will be available to apply to an investigative workload. From the 2,080 annual hours, one must deduct holidays, various categories of leave (annual, military, family, etc.), training time, and court time to determine the amount of time available to investigate cases. The SFPD has calculated that its sworn employees average 1,700 hours per year, or a show-up rate of 81.7 percent per year. This equates to an average of 32.7 hours of work per investigator per week. Though the department formally estimates this is the maximum number of hours per week that each investigator is available to work, some number of additional hours may be lost to business and administrative tasks, fielding general telephone inquiries, and the like.

Table 42 shows the current staffing in the Investigations Bureau. The Hit and Run Unit is not included in the staffing data for the Investigations Bureau because PERF is recommending that the unit be transferred to the Traffic Division in the Field Operations Bureau. (Refer to that section for PERF's staffing recommendations for the Traffic Section.) In this manner, PERF's staffing recommendations can be compared to the current personnel figures below.

Table 42. Investigations Bureau Current Sworn Investigator Staffing*

Investigative Unit	Sworn
Auto	11
Burglary	18
Fencing	4
Fraud	9
General Works	26
Psych Liaison	1
Sex Assault	13
Gang Task Force	43
Homicide	19
Robbery	23
Special Investigations	23
Domestic Violence	18
Juvenile Section	26
Narcotics Section	41
Vice Section	13
Total	290

Source: 2007 HRMS

* Excluding the Hit and Run Unit, which PERF recommends for transfer to the Traffic Division

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

AA. INVESTIGATIVE STAFFING AND METHODOLOGY

PERF used 2007 CABLE data to measure investigative workload. Using this data, crimes were categorized into offense groups that reflect PERF's recommended reorganization of the Investigations Bureau. The actual number of offenses reported to the department in each category was then calculated to determine the total number of cases to be investigated. Mirroring the current practice of the Bureau, the percentage of cases assigned for follow-up investigation varied based upon the classification of the offense and solvability factors of individual cases. The percentages of cases assigned for investigation ranged from 100 percent in homicide, missing persons, and sexual offenses to less than 25 percent for auto thefts and fraud cases. Focus should be placed on cases with the highest solvability factors along with those that have a particular impact on the community and department, as there are diminishing returns on working investigations with less leads. However, as investigators become more productive, additional time should be available to examine some cases that are currently unassigned in an effort to increase their solvability. As previously noted, solvability factors are used to assign cases for investigation. Often, the more complex the case, the more time is needed to thoroughly investigate it. The investigative database was analyzed to identify a solvability rating for crimes in each category and then to determine the time it takes to investigate different crimes.

Individual crime types were collapsed into groups of cases that would be assigned to each of the new investigative units recommended by PERF. Solvability scales were created for each crime group using logistic regression analysis to identify variables that had a positive relationship to the best conclusion of an investigation: an arrest being made. For example, the variables most strongly associated with a homicide arrest included a witness, an identified suspect, a vehicle description, knowledge of the suspect's race, knowledge of the suspect's weight, and a distinctive modus operandi (MO). The greater the number of these factors that are present, the higher the likelihood that an arrest will be made in the type of cases to be assigned to the homicide unit. For the case types assigned to the newly recommended burglary unit, the variables most strongly associated with arrest included an identified suspect, knowledge of the suspect's race, knowledge of the suspect's gender, knowledge of the suspect's weight and a distinctive MO.

For each crime category, the variables having a positive influence on likelihood of arrest were weighted using regression analysis. A solvability scale for each crime category was created by adding all the weighted variables. A case's value on the solvability scales was used to place the case in one of the four solvability categories: "contact the victim only" (lowest solvability); more complex; typical; and less complex (highest solvability). From this, the percentage of crimes falling into each solvability category was determined for each crime category. For example, in the aggravated assault category, 10 percent of the cases were "contact only"; 30 percent were "less complex."; 59 percent were "typical"; and 1 percent were "more complex".

An estimation of the time it takes to investigate a crime in each solvability category was established. This estimation includes the time that should be spent conducting a thorough investigation, either to determine that no crime was committed, to exhaust all leads, or to submit the case to the District Attorney's Office for filing criminal charges. These are average times for

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

all cases in the category; some investigations will take more time, while others will take less. The times used in each category were based upon survey information from the SFPD Investigations Bureau and PERF's work with other investigative units throughout the country.

For example, of the cases to be assigned to the new homicide unit, it is highly unlikely that any murder investigation will fall into the "contact only" group. However, some accidental death cases will demand far less investigation and may be resolved completely within the two hours allocated for homicide unit "contact only" cases.

Another factor that was taken into account in establishing the time needed for each category are activities to support the prosecution of a case to a successful conclusion within the judicial system. As in other investigative entities throughout the nation, personnel within the San Francisco Police Department's Investigations Bureau provide additional information requested by the prosecuting attorney, prepare case files for trial, and provide logistical support for evidence or witnesses as necessary. With information provided by the department, PERF was able to determine the amount of time members of the Bureau should spend performing services in support of prosecution. With a goal under the Bureau's reorganization of a thorough investigation leading to an arrest in all cases, associated time was allotted to enhance the investigation prosecution of cases. As described above, time not used for the prosecution of cases may be dedicated to the investigation of cases currently not assigned, with the hope of improving the Bureau's solvability rate, prosecution and conviction.

Table 43. Required Investigative Time (in hours)

Investigative Section/Unit	Contact Only	Less Complex	Typical	More Complex
Homicide Section*	2	40	80	220
Aggravated Assault Section	1	6	20	54
Weapons/Explosives Unit	1	6	8	16
Robbery Section	1	10	30	48
Theft Section	1	3.5	8	16
Economic Crimes Section	2	12.5	24	166
Burglary Section	0.5	32	40	78
Auto Section	0.5	12	16	200
Sex Crimes Section	0.5	8	12	40
Juvenile Section	1	16	20	64
Domestic Violence	1	5	8	32
Missing Persons Section	0.5	2	3	16
Arson Unit	1	12	23	70

* "Contact only" category for homicide represents review of accidental deaths.

Source: PERF Analysis; SFPD Investigative Bureau Survey 2008

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

To reiterate, the hours or portions of hours allocated for investigative time for each of the Bureau's sections or units is the **average** time consumed for the investigation of **all cases** in each category. As an example, an average "more complex" homicide is allotted 220 hours, or 5.5 weeks. Some complex murder investigations will take more than 220 hours while others may consume less than the average time. In the instance of the Aggravated Assault Section, a complex aggravated assault case may take more or less than the 54 hour average. Other complex cases investigated by the Aggravated Assault Section will include kidnappings and hate crimes, not just aggravated assault cases. Finally, investigations handled by the Auto Section average 30 minutes for those cases in which detectives' only action is contacting the victim. Auto Section time may be spent on a range of auto-related cases, ranging from impounded cars and thefts from vehicles to stolen vehicles. Even though auto theft cases may not often involve investigations at the level or priority of sexual assaults and armed robberies, complex cases do sometimes call for surveillance and painstaking record searches that can consume a great many hours.

The percentage of cases in each of the four categories was calculated for all crime categories and is included in Table 44 below.

Table 44. Cases by Category and Solvability Ratings

Crime Category	Contact Only		Less Complex		Typical		More Complex		Total # of Cases
	# of Cases	% of Cases	# of Cases	% of Cases	# of Cases	% of Cases	# of Cases	% of Cases	
Homicide Section*	839	47	821	46	107	6	18	1	1785
Aggravated Assault Section	391	10	1174	30	2308	59	39	1	3912
Robbery Section	65	4	196	12	1356	83	8	1	1625
Economic Crimes Section	241	23	356	34	440	42	10	1	1047
Burglary Section	769	45	137	8	718	42	85	5	1709
Auto Section**	1347	90	30	2	120	8	7	1	1504
Theft Section	1629	46	673	19	1204	34	18	1	3524
Sex Crimes Section	3415	54	190	3	2656	42	63	1	6324
Juvenile Section	302	12	1283	51	855	34	75	3	2515
Domestic Violence Section	468	10	1403	30	2758	59	47	1	4676
Missing Persons Section	2101	60	525	15	700	20	175	5	3501
Total	11567	36	6787	21	13224	41	547	2	32125
*Contact only cases for homicide represents cases such as accidental deaths and review of death reports									
**The solvability scale was relaxed for the Theft of/from an Auto and Theft categories in order to reduce the number of cases falling into the "More Complex" category.									

Source: PERF Analysis; SFPD Investigative Bureau Survey 2008, 2007 CABLE Data

A multi-step process was used to calculate the number of cases investigated in each of the newly configured investigative sections. First, 2007 CABLE data was used to determine the number of reports for each offense code. This data was grouped into the proposed crime categories that would make up the cases assigned to each of the proposed new investigative sections. Then, 2007 case data supplied by the Investigations Bureau was used to determine the ratio of cases received to cases assigned. The remaining cases, based on the regression analysis, were

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

dispersed among the four categories of “Contact Only,” “Less Complex,” “Typical,” and “More Complex.”

As expected, Table 45 shows that the most complex cases made up the smallest portion of cases. The least amount of investigative time per case is for those cases that fall into the “Contact Only” category. These investigations, with the exception of the Homicide detail, are primarily done over the telephone, and continuing the investigation is likely dependent on the ability of the victim or witness to provide additional information or further leads, which experience suggests is unlikely in most cases. The amount of time allocated for these contacts is 30 minutes to two hours, depending on the offense type. In the Homicide section, cases such as accidental deaths are included in the “Contact Only” category, and two hours are allotted for each investigation, as the inspectors’ responsibility is only to determine if any suspicious circumstances are present that would require additional investigation.

Table 45 combines information from Table 43 and Table 44 to show the time needed per investigation type and the number of investigators needed in each proposed investigative unit. These staffing levels will enable the department to conduct thorough investigations and to deal with the work demands from the District Attorney’s Office.

Recommendation: The recommended staffing for the Investigations Bureau is shown in Table 45.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 45. Time per Investigation Type and Investigators Needed

	Contact Only		Less Complex		Typical		More Complex		Total		Optimal Invest.
	# of Cases	Estimated Hours	# of Cases	Estimated Hours	# of Cases	Estimated Hours	# of Cases	Estimated Hours	# of Cases	Estimated Hours	
Homicide Section*	839	1678	821	32844	107	8568	18	3927	1785	47017	28
Aggravated Assault Section	391	391	1174	7042	2308	46166	39	2113	3912	55712	33
Robbery Section	65	65	196	2353	1356	40687	8	392	1625	43497	26
Gang Task Force Section **											43
Economic Crimes Section	241	482	356	4456	440	10568	10	1740	1047	17246	10
Burglary Section	769	384	137	4374	718	28702	85	6663	1709	40124	24
Auto Section	1347	2694	30	359	120	1916	7	1497	1504	6465	10
Theft Section	1629	1629	673	2355	1204	9632	18	280	3524	13896	20
Sex Crimes Section	3415	1708	190	1518	2656	31873	63	2530	6324	37628	22
Juvenile Section	302	302	1283	20525	855	17104	75	4829	2515	42760	25
Domestic Violence Section	468	468	1403	7013	2758	22066	47	1496	4676	31042	18
Missing Persons Unit	2101	1051	525	1051	700	2101	175	2802	3501	7004	4
Narcotic Section**											44
Vice Section**											16
Tactical Investigations Section**											14
Special Operations Section**											9
Arson Unit	106	106	145	1735	99	2271	2	123	351	4235	2
Total	11567	10851	6787	83888	13224	219383	547	28268	32125	342390	348

* "Contact only" category for homicide represents accidental deaths

** Staffing based upon department priority rather than caseload level

Source: PERF Analysis; SFPD Investigative Bureau Survey 2008, 2007 CABLE Data

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

To determine the number of investigators needed for each section, the total number of hours was divided by the number of hours available per investigator (1,700 per year). Based upon this calculation, the Bureau needs 426 detectives to conduct follow-up investigations.

Ideal staffing of self-initiated investigative sections such as Narcotics, Vice and the Gang Task Force is always difficult to quantify because their workload is not associated with quantifiable reports of crime. Rather, workload is dependent on intelligence and tips from informants, changes in illegal drug markets, changes in gang membership and competition, effectiveness of neighboring jurisdictions, and innumerable other factors that are hard to link to long-term staffing needs. Frequently, the greater the staffing, the greater the impact that can be made, but unlike investigative teams that address workload based on measurable crime, staffing of these units relies more on the department's recognition of narcotics, vice and gang conditions and the desired enforcement levels established by the department. Based upon interviews with members of the San Francisco Police Department who manage these functions and the officers who conduct street-level operations, the current staffing of these components is adequate, and no change is recommended by PERF.

It is estimated that members of the Investigations Bureau devote over 127,000 employee-hours per year preparing and participating in the prosecution of cases in which the defendant was arrested by the San Francisco Police Department. These activities include prisoner bond/suppression hearings, consultation with the State Attorney, case file preparation for trial and grand jury, court appearances and depositions and travel to and from court. The following table lists the estimated number of annual hours consumed by members of the Investigations Bureau to assist in the criminal prosecution of defendants arrested by SFPD. Calculations are categorized by activity.

**Table 46. Projected Time Devoted to Preparing for Prosecution
by Members of the Investigation Bureau**

Crime Category	Hours Consumed: Bond Suppression Hearing	Hours Consumed: State Attorney Consultation	Hours Consumed: Case File Trial Preparation	Hours Consumed: Grand Jury or Court Appearance	Hours Consumed: Court Travel Time	Hours Consumed: Total
Homicide Section	1633	1166	6997	17726	233	27755
Aggravated Assault Section	5307	3185	3185	6370	531	18578
Robbery Section	5294	1764	1764	5294	1765	15881
Economic Crimes Section	329	329	1971	985	657	4271
Burglary Section	709	354	2126	5668	354	9211
Theft Section	182	182	910	728	182	2184
Sex Crimes Section	1785	1785	1785	8925	892	15172
Juvenile Section	1897	0	2845	1897	948	7587
Domestic Violence Section	8651	2595	8651	5190	1730	26817
Estimated Annual Hours	25787	11360	30234	52783	7292	127456

Source: PERF Analysis; SFPD Investigative Bureau Survey 2008

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Utilizing the average of 1,700 hours per year provided by each member of the Bureau, the total amount of time consumed in this manner is equivalent to 75 positions or 22.6 percent of the reconfigured sworn investigator positions. The amount of work performed in this regard varies by crime type. More complex investigations usually involve more work with the District Attorney's Office to enhance the presentation of the case in court and achieve a successful prosecution of the case. The table below shows the estimated time devoted to assisting in the prosecution of cases by investigative personnel. That data is then converted to calculate the number of staff required to fulfill this important duty requirement.

Table 47. Investigative Time Preparing for and Assisting in Prosecution

Crime Category	Total Number of Cases	Total Estimated Investigative Hours	Estimated Investigative Hours Assisting in Prosecution	Estimated Staff Required for Prosecution
Homicide Section	1785	47017	27756	16
Aggravated Assault Section	3912	55712	18577	11
Robbery Section	1634	43497	15881	9
Economic Crimes Section	1048	17246	4271	3
Burglary Section	1708	40124	9211	5
Theft Section	3541	13899	2184	1
Sex Crimes Section	6324	37628	15172	9
Juvenile Section	2515	42760	7587	4
Domestic Violence Section	4675	88135	26816	16
Total	37131	403806	127456	75

Source: PERF Analysis; SFPD Investigative Bureau Survey 2008, 2007 CABLE Data

Recommendation: The successful reorganization of the Investigations Bureau recommended by PERF is much more than the reassignment of personnel. It is intended to change the way the Bureau operates in order to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of its responsibilities. With the addition of investigative sergeants to supervise the cases and personnel of those under their command, the Bureau should update and revise protocols, policies and procedures, based upon best practices from around the country. Work schedules should be re-evaluated to determine if the current schedule optimizes performance. (In the same manner, the department may wish to evaluate the work schedules of all non-patrol functions to determine if a different schedule would enhance service, improve contact and availability with the community and other elements of the criminal justice system and reduce overtime). A changed schedule may have an impact on solving more crimes, thus increasing clearance rates and reducing crime.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

BB. INVESTIGATIONS BUREAU SUPPORT STAFF

A police department's Investigations Bureau should be staffed with sufficient support personnel in order for detectives to maximize their efficiency and productivity. Support personnel are civilian members of the department who perform duties not requiring the training, expertise, or weapons skill of a sworn member of the department. In some cases, support personnel perform duties specialized to their position. Traditional duties include answering telephones, receptionist activities, providing information to the public, transcribing detectives' reports and victim/witness statements, suspect interviews and filing duties. When staffed correctly within an investigative environment, these employees provide detectives with the time they need to conduct interviews, follow up on leads, arrest suspects, and prepare cases for the successful prosecution of defendants. In some progressive departments, civilian investigative aides or civilian investigators assist detectives with case follow-up, including computer and telephone research, contacting complainants and witnesses, and any other "office-based" duties not requiring sworn status. Strategically integrated into the workforce, such positions may also present the opportunity to decrease the number of sworn personnel necessary to perform the same level of work, or to increase the percentage of cases that are successfully closed.

In general, the SFPD Investigations Bureau currently uses civilians to perform the functions of clerk-typist and receptionist. Each section within the Bureau has a minimum of one such employee.

Recommendation: All sections should retain their clerk-typist and that some units should be provided with an increase in civilian staffing based on workloads, as indicated in "PERF Recommended Staffing for Investigations Bureau", the chart below. The new staffing level provides one clerk-typist for every 15 detectives.

Recommendation: In order to support the newly adopted vision statement and increase efficiency through the CompStat process, two crime analysts should be assigned to the Investigations Bureau: one for the Crimes Against Persons Division and the Special Operations Division, and the other for the Crimes Against Property, Special Victims and the Vice/Narcotics Divisions. The responsibilities of the crime analysts should include:

- Studying crime and profiling suspects.
- Analyzing crime data to forecast the day, time, and place a crime is likely to occur and make appropriate notifications.
- Communicating crime patterns to detectives to produce efficient law enforcement.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Coordinating with the other analysts throughout the department.
- Contributing to the Strategic Management Division's department-wide CompStat activities.

Recommendation: PERF also recommends that the department establish a new Police Investigative Aide (PIA) position within the Investigations Bureau. This position will be used to perform the administrative and routine work of detectives. The purpose of this highly specialized and trained position is to do the initial workup of the case and coordinate with the assigned detective throughout the investigation. In this manner, detectives may spend their time following leads, interviewing witnesses, canvassing neighborhoods and serving warrants rather than performing administrative and clerical activities. The department may consider making the PIA an upgrade of the current Police Service Aide (PSA) position. This will enable the department to draw upon the expertise of the PSAs as an entry-level position to advance to a PIA, thereby creating a new career path for civilians.

Tasks performed by PIAs should include:

- Obtaining copies of all original and supplemental reports for follow-up investigation.
- Preparing case files.
- Running data inquiries, including driver's license/identity cards, arrest and criminal history records, probation/parole information, etc.
- Conducting phone interviews.
- Scheduling interviews for detectives.
- Coordinating crime lab requests and results.
- Researching offenses and criminal codes.
- Completing supplemental reports as necessary.
- Preparing photo line-ups.
- Coordinating with the division's crime analyst.
- Maintaining accurate clearance files.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Recommendation: Using the PERF staffing recommendations, 23 detective positions should be converted to the new Police Investigative Aides. Detectives now filling these positions can be transferred to fill some of the additional positions PERF recommends for investigative staffing.

One of the potential issues that arise from including civilians in the Investigative Bureau is their ability to testify at a preliminary hearing. In 1990, California passed Proposition 115, the Crime Victims Justice Reform Act. The initiative implemented a broad range of statutory and constitutional changes relating to California's criminal justice system

The finding of probable cause as outlined in Section 1200 of the California Evidence Code⁵ may be based, in whole or in part, upon the sworn testimony of a law enforcement officer or honorably retired law enforcement officer relating the statements of declarants made out of court offered for the truth of the matter asserted. Any law enforcement officer testifying as to hearsay statements shall either have five years of law enforcement experience or have completed a training course certified by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) that includes training in the investigation and reporting of cases and testifying at preliminary hearings. (Amended by Stats. 2005, AB 557, Ch. 18, Sec. 1. Effective January 1, 2006.)

It should be noted Proposition 115 does not include the language of “peace officer,” “police officer,” or “sworn officer;”, rather, it uses the term “law enforcement officer.” The Orange County District Attorney’s Office in Southern California has interpreted a “law enforcement officer” to include civilian investigative specialists. After completing the POST training described above, civilian investigative specialists are considered qualified by the OCDA’s office to testify at preliminary hearings, including felonies. The California Courts have placed some limits on the ability of civilians to testify in court.⁶ However, civilian investigative aides can perform a variety of functions that can enhance the productivity of sworn police investigators.

Recommendation: Using the PERF staffing recommendations, 23 new Police Investigative Aide positions should be added to the Investigations Bureau. The sworn investigative positions that these positions additions replace should be reallocated throughout the Bureau according to PERF’s recommendations for increased investigative staff.

⁵ Section 1200 of the California Evidence Code defines Hearsay Evidence

(a) "Hearsay evidence" is evidence of a statement that was made other than by a witness while testifying at the hearing and that is offered to prove the truth of the matter stated.

(b) Except as provided by law, hearsay evidence is inadmissible.

(c) This section shall be known and may be cited as the hearsay rule.

⁶ *Sims v. Superior Court, supra*, 19 Cal.All. 4th 463

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Recommendation: The department should look for opportunities to expand the Police Investigative Aide position to perform specific functions now done by sworn officers. For example, in the Economic Crimes Section, a civilian with expertise in accounting could conduct an initial investigation into complex fraud cases to determine whether a crime has been committed and if so, how. The case could then be turned over to a detective for further action. Another example: The Auto Section is responsible for coordinating all vehicles towed by the department. This function could be performed by a PIA. Finally, in the Vice Section, a PIA could perform administrative duties such as Alcohol Beverage Control licensing and issuing permits.

As the department becomes familiar and comfortable with this new position of Police Investigative Aide, other opportunities may become apparent that will provide the same or improved level of service to the community while providing cost savings to the department.

CC. OPERATIONS CENTER (OC)

The Operations Center reports directly to the Crimes Against Property Captain in the PERF organizational scheme and serves as the department's "nerve center," seven days per week, 24 hours per day. The OC receives internal and external information regarding significant police activity occurring in San Francisco and is responsible for making appropriate notifications as established protocol dictates. The OC also handles press inquiries during non-business hours and is responsible for writing and distributing the "Big 19 Report," a compilation of the most noteworthy events that occur each day.

The center is staffed with 14 officers and is supervised by a sergeant. Officers work a 4/10 schedule with four officers assigned to the day shift, six to swings, and four to midnights. Minimum staffing levels are set at two officers per shift, and overtime is used as necessary to maintain these minimums. The schedule's overlap day off is Wednesday, and personnel have either Monday/Tuesday or Thursday/Friday and every other weekend as normal days off. (This is the same schedule as used in the Tactical Division.)

All Operations Center staff, including the sergeant, are made up of limited duty personnel not available for street duty. Staffing using limited duty personnel presents challenges of continuity within the operations of the center. Often, just as an officer becomes familiar with the operations and responsibilities of the center, he or she is returned to full-duty and is replaced with a new limited-duty officer, who begins the training process.

Recommendation: The Operations Center performs an important function for the San Francisco Police Department and its law enforcement partners. However, there is no

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

reason the center cannot be staffed by permanent, well-trained civilians. As sworn officers rotate out of the center, they should be replaced by civilians to allow for a smooth transition of the civilianization of the Operations Center. It is also recommended that the OC remain under the supervision of a sergeant, which should be full-duty, to maintain institutional knowledge and provide support for frequent contacts with other members of the department and outside agencies.

DD. FORENSIC SERVICES DIVISION

The Forensic Services Division provides human identification, physical evidence and expert testimony to support the SFPD's efforts to identify and prosecute offenders. The division is made up of three sections: the Crime Lab, Identification, and Crime Scene Investigation. The Crime Lab Section supports the department and the criminal justice system through the efficient and reliable evaluation, analysis and comparison of physical evidence. The Identification Section processes, maintains and disseminates criminal offender and applicant photograph and fingerprint records. The Crime Scene Investigation (CSI) Section performs diverse services including: crime scene preservation, collection and documentation of evidence and reconstruction; photographic evidence at major crime scenes; photography services including Crime Bulletins and mugshots; latent print processing, enhancement, photography and comparison; Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) searching; computer forensics analysis; forensic video analysis; and composite sketch services.

The Forensics Services Division can anticipate significant changes in the future. The physical location of the lab will be moving from its current location to a new 94,000-square-foot facility shared with the Medical Examiner's Office in 2011.

Recommendation: The San Francisco Police Department should civilianize the Forensic Services Division. This may be accomplished over a period of time in order to allow for a smooth transition to well-trained civilian specialists. Such a plan will also offset some of the fiscal impact of increasing the Forensic Services staff to maintain an anticipated increase in service levels. These increases are based upon factors such as the impact of California's Proposition 69; the DNA Fingerprint, Unsolved Crime and Innocence Protection Act passed in November 2004; advancements in biological and trace evidence; the increasing reliance on physical evidence in court; and crime trends.

Recommendation: The department should retain staffing levels that will maintain accreditation of its forensic services operations.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 48. Recommended Staffing of the Forensic Services Division

	Sworn Staff		Civilian Staff	
	Current	Recommend	Current	Recommend
Administration				
Director			1	1
Lieutenant	2	0		
Manager			1	3
Evidence Control				
Crime Lab Section				
Questioned Documents			1	1
Controlled Substances			4.5	6.5
Breath Alcohol			0.5	0.5
Trace Evidence			0	2
Fire Debris			0	0.5
Firearm Analysis	2	0	4	7
Gun Shot Residue			1	1
Forensic Biology/DNA			11	12
Quality Assurance			1	1
Identification Section				
Fingerprint Technicians			17	18
Clerk/Data Entry			8	12
Officers	6	0		6
Crime Scene Investigation				
Crime Gun Tracking	1	0		1
Crime Scene Investigator	17	0		26
Forensic Imaging	4	0		7
Latent Print			5	5
Digital Evidence	4	0		7
Composite Artist	1.5	0		1
Total	37.5	0	55	118.5

Source: 2007 HRMS; Perf Analysis, SFPD Forensic Services Report

Recommendation: Recommended staffing level is a total of 118.5 positions, a net gain of 26 positions over the 92.5 current positions (37.5 sworn plus 55 civilian). It is understood that while all of the 118.5 recommended positions are listed in the civilian column, it will take time for the department to completely civilianize the division. During that transition, the number of recommended positions assigned to each function, regardless of whether they are in fact civilian or sworn at any given time, should be maintained to provide the personnel necessary for high quality forensic services.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

* * *

EE. SUMMARY: INVESTIGATIVE BUREAU STAFFING

Table 49. Recommended Staffing for Investigations Bureau

Investigations Bureau					
	Sergeants	Investigators	PIA	Analyst	Clerk/Typist
Crimes Against Persons Division				0.5	
Homicide Section	3	26	2		2
Aggravated Assault Section	4	31	2		2
Robbery Section	3	24	2		2
Crimes Against Property Division				0.33	
Economic Crimes Section	1	9	1		1
Burglary Section	3	22	2		2
Auto Section	1	9	1		1
Theft Section	2	18	2		1
Special Victims Division				0.33	
Sex Crimes Section	2	20	2		2
Juvenile Section	3	27	2		2
Domestic Violence Section	2	18	2		1
Vice/Narcotics Division				0.33	
Narcotics Section	5	44	1		1
Vice Section	2	16	1		1
Special Operations Division				0.5	
Gang Task Force Section	5	43	2		2
Tactical Investigations Section	2	14	1		1
Special Investigations Section	2	11	1		1

Source: PERF Analysis

Recommendation: The Department should assign sergeants to supervise investigators within the Bureau. (The role of sergeant/inspector positions is addressed in the Human Resources component of PERF's study of the SFPD.) PERF is recommending a reorganization of the Investigations Bureau to advance the efficiency and effectiveness of its operations. An expected outcome should be an increase in the solvability of cases. However, personnel and structure alone cannot increase the performance of the Bureau; strong supervision is also required.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Sergeants should be assigned to the Bureau for direct supervision of investigators and oversight of investigative cases. The span of control has been set at one sergeant for every ten investigators. Generally, the more experienced personnel assigned to investigations do not require the same level of supervision as in the FOB, where the ration is 1:8. The ratio of 1:10 allows for the supervision of personnel at a level that is fiscally responsible while providing adequate resources to fulfill the supervisory responsibilities of the Bureau's personnel and casework. Sergeants should be expected to perform oversight functions including: critically reviewing reports submitted to the Bureau; assigning and actively managing investigations; coordinating with internal and external partners; working in close cooperation with crime analyst and Forensics Services; and developing and mentoring those under their command and addressing personnel issues.

Recommendation: PERF's recommended staffing for the Investigations Bureau is a compilation of Forensics Services and the other five divisions in the Bureau. Based upon an analysis of workload and time consumed by the members of the San Francisco Police Department's Investigations Bureau, in order for the department to successfully conduct thorough investigations, the Bureau should have the following staff:

Table 50. Investigations Bureau Staffing

Investigations Bureau Staffing	
Rank	Recommended
Deputy Chief	1
Captain	5
Lieutenant	16
Sergeant	40
Investigator	332
Civilian	166.5
Total Sworn	394
Total Civilian	166.5

Source: PERF Analysis

ORGANIZING THE ADMINISTRATION BUREAU

The San Francisco Police Department's Administration Bureau is under the command of a deputy chief and performs many of the agency's personnel and business functions. Under the old configuration, the Bureau was made up of six operating divisions: Fiscal, Technology, Planning, Staff Services, Support Services, and Training and Education. It also oversaw the ancillary duties of Risk Management, Recruiting, and Behavioral Science.


Like most other police agencies across the country, the San Francisco Police Department must carefully balance the staffing of administrative assignments and having sufficient uniformed personnel to work the streets. The Administration Bureau has many critical initiatives to support the department and drive needed organizational change. There is a major hiring plan under way to fill much-needed officer positions. The department is dedicating itself to improving technology and advancing a CompStat approach in order to increase the efficiency, effectiveness and accountability of the department. The staffing of the Administration Bureau must be adequate to provide the resources, information and support necessary for the department to achieve these and other significant goals. Other than in the Training Division, almost all positions in the Bureau should be civilianized in order to best provide the professional services required through skilled workers and achieve a stability of institutional knowledge while offering fiscal benefits to the department.

In order to study the staffing of the Administrative Bureau, PERF collected and examined available data from various sources including the police department as well as the Controller's Office. Where no data exists, we relied on interviews of managers, supervisors and line-level employees, our personal observations, and in some instances a review of work products to lend insight into the workload of various units. Using all this information, along with the expertise of PERF staff, we were able to draw outcome conclusions and make staffing recommendations.

Recommendation: The department should move many of the sections within the Planning Division along with the Risk Management Division to the Assistant Chief of Police, leaving the remaining five divisions along with Recruiting and Behavior Science under the Administration Bureau. Those Planning Division components not aligned with the Assistant Chief have been distributed to new divisions within the Administration Bureau based upon their function and purpose.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

SFPD Administration Bureau
Proposed Structure November 2008



**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Following is a description of the roles and responsibilities of elements under PERF's recommendations for a newly aligned Administration Bureau.

FF. THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMANDER

The Administrative Commander should report to the Bureau's Deputy Chief. This position not only provides general management of the Administration Bureau assisting the Deputy Chief, but also specifically oversees the Behavioral Science and Recruitment Units.

1. Behavioral Science Unit (BSU)

The Behavioral Science Unit is designed to provide services for all members of the department and their families, from academy training to retirement. The unit aims to "take care of the people that take care of the public." The BSU provides service to employees and is independent of the department's disciplinary process. The unit operates from an office space separate from the department's other facilities, in order to maintain the confidentiality of those served. The BSU oversees the department's Employee Assistance and Peer Support Programs through a cadre of 300 trained volunteers—members of the department who perform counseling functions as an ancillary duty to their primary assignment in the police department. The unit is responsible for conducting all training regarding assistance and peer-support and post-critical incident debriefings of members. The unit also provides all training for assistance and support volunteers. The BSU manages the Critical Incident Response Team (CIRT), which conducts post-critical incident debriefings of employees involved in major incidents, such as officer-involved shootings and major traffic collisions, to help employees deal with the stresses involved in a law enforcement career. The BSU supervises the Stress Unit and the Catastrophic Illness Program and coordinates with the department's chaplains to provide needed support to sworn and civilian members of the department, along with their families and significant others.

The BSU is staffed by a sergeant who oversees the unit's operations, two officers, and one office worker for clerical support.

Recommendation: One additional civilian position should be added to the Behavioral Science Unit to help coordinate counseling and to work with the Written Directives Section of the Risk Management Division to review policies and procedures regarding employee support services offered by the department. It should be noted that PERF identified the San Francisco Police Department's Behavioral Science Unit as a national policing model and best practice for law enforcement.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

2. Recruiting Unit

The San Francisco Police Department is currently hiring approximately 250 officers to achieve its goal of filling three academy classes during the calendar year. To underscore the importance and priority the city is placing on attracting the best candidates available, the Recruiting Unit is overseen by a commander. This unit has met all hiring goals and objectives. Current staffing consists of one sergeant and two officers.

Recommendation: As the department's sworn staffing level stabilizes through its current aggressive recruitment strategies, the Recruiting Unit should begin focusing on recruiting to fill the significant number of civilian positions currently vacant as well as new positions created by the department's civilianization plans. These positions are critical to providing the support and expertise necessary for the department to maintain a high level of service. Furthermore, as organizational strategies change and the department nears its authorized staffing of sworn officers, consideration should be given to reassigning the unit's commander to another assignment where high-ranking authority is needed. At that time, the department should also consider whether downsizing the Recruiting Unit is appropriate.

Table 51. Behavioral Science and Recruitment Unit Staffing

Behavioral Science & Recruitment Units	
Rank	Recommended
Commander	1
Sergeant	2
Officer	4
Civilian	2
Total Sworn	7
Total Civilian	2

Source: PERF Analysis

GG. THE FISCAL DIVISION

The Fiscal Division is commanded by a civilian director who has primary responsibility for developing and administering the department's \$400-million annual budget. Members of the division provide processing and accountant services, perform most of the

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

financial duties for the department, and respond to audits from federal, state and local authorities.

1. Accounting Section

The Accounting Section manages all financial transactions other than payroll. The section also processes payment for work orders, contracts, and lease payments, and oversees the purchase of supplies for the department. The section is allocated five civilian staff but is currently carrying two vacancies.

Recommendation: PERF recommends that two positions be added to the Accounting Section, for a total staff of seven. This will provide the necessary staffing for the section to assume organizational responsibility for developing and overseeing all contracts for service the department enters into. Centralizing these roles will streamline and coordinate these two interrelated functions to improve the department's efficiency in authorizing contracts and payments.

2. Budget/Grant Section

The PERF-recommended *Budget/Grant Section* (a combining of formerly separate sections) will be responsible for developing and managing the San Francisco Police Department's annual budget. The grant component will research and write all state and federal grant applications submitted by the department. As part of the grant process, members of the section work in cooperation with the City and County and the Police Commission to gain necessary approvals in a timely manner. Under the PERF plan, the consolidated budgeting and grants components will work together—for example, by identifying and aggressively pursuing grant possibilities that can fill budgetary gaps to help the department achieve operational priorities that have been identified in the budget process.

Currently, the Budget Section has a staff of two civilian workers. The Grant Section is allocated three positions that are now filled with two sworn and one civilian position. However, one of the sworn positions is being converted to civilian.

Recommendation: Staffing has been increased by one position for a total staff of six in the combined sections. This will allow for sufficient staffing so that the new Budget/Grant Section may assume the additional responsibility of managing the administrative duties of all grants awarded to the department. This will provide a single point for

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

researching, writing, submitting, managing, and tracking all police department grants. PERF also recommends that all positions in this section be civilianized.

3. Supplies Section

The Supplies Section maintains supplies for most “consumables” throughout the department. The three civilian Supply Officers work with personnel throughout the department who have supply responsibilities for their individual division, section or unit. All current transactions are paper-based. Staffing in this section is adequate.

4. Print Shop

The Print Shop is a one-person operation responsible for the majority of printing for the department. Even though it is a small operation, the Print Shop has been described as the SFPD’s “backbone” in terms of disseminating information. The City’s printing services can supplement the Print Shop as needed. Staffing in this section is adequate.

Table 52. Fiscal Division Staffing

Fiscal Division	
Rank	Recommended
Officer	0
Civilian	18
Total Sworn	0
Total Civilian	18

Source: PERF Analysis

HH. INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION

The Information Services Division, formerly referred as the Technology Division, is responsible for developing the department’s use of technology, maintaining technological equipment, entering data into information systems, and serving as the repository of information in those systems. The division is commanded by the agency’s Chief Information Officer (CIO), a civilian who is responsible for the selection, design, and implementation of computer database systems for current use and future needs of the department. The CIO also acts as liaison with the City’s Department of Telecommunications and Information Services to coordinate networking issues for the shared systems including records, HR management and mobile data terminals.

Recommendation: PERF recommends adding a Chief Technology Officer (CTO), a civilian manager who will report directly to the CIO and will oversee the sections that make up the division.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

One of the primary duties of the CTO will be to evaluate new technology and devices to determine their usability for the agency.

1. Information Technology Section

The Information Technology Section provides computer support services and maintains the Police Department's webpage, e-mail, and Intranet, as well as programs and computer hardware used by the Department. The IT Section is now staffed with one lieutenant, two sergeants, eight officers (one on temporary medical light-duty and one on permanent medical light-duty) and six civilians.

Recommendation: Based upon an assessment of the IT needs of the SFPD, the agency's commitment to improve information systems, and a review of the Gartner IT Study completed in 2007, PERF recommends increasing the staff of the IT Section by six positions. This will provide personnel who are needed to support the various needs of the department, including the Help Desk, Desktop LAN UNIX Server, Mainframe Server, and Application support for the department. These functions, especially the application support of CABLE, HRMS and crime mapping, will become increasingly important as the department moves to a CompStat environment.

Recommendation: PERF supports the Gartner Study's recommendation that the department move to civilianize the Information Technology Section and only use sworn personnel on a temporary basis as required for "project-specific tasks." All 23 members of the section should be civilianized, including the manager (currently a lieutenant) and supervisors (currently sergeants).

2. Telecommunications Section

As the name suggests, the Telecommunications Section provides support for all communication devices, including cellular and landline telephones, pagers, and fax machines. The section is staffed with one sworn officer who is on permanent medical light-duty.

Recommendation: This position should be civilianized, and sworn personnel should be used only on a temporary basis for project-specific tasks.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 53. Information Services Division Staffing

Information Services Division	
Rank	Recommended
Lieutenant	0
Sergeant	0
Officer	0
Civilian	26
Total Sworn	0
Total Civilian	26

Source: PERF Analysis

II. REPORT MANAGEMENT DIVISION

The Report Management Division is composed of Report Management Day and Report Management Night Sections. The unit completes various tasks related to report processing and retrieval and data storage. Members of these sections copy reports and distribute them to the appropriate unit or agency. The unit processes up to 400 daily requests and is responsible for generating statistical reports for the department. Units within the sections include the On-Line Reporting Service and Teleserve, which provide differential police response to the needs of the community while keeping officers available in the field.

A significant amount of staffing of the Report Management Section is filled by medically limited or “light-duty” sworn personnel as well as some awaiting potential disciplinary action. The Report Management Day Section is made up of one sergeant, six officers (four on permanent medical light-duty and two on limited duty awaiting disposition of a disciplinary matter), and 25 civilians. The Report Management Night Section is staffed with one lieutenant (on limited duty awaiting disposition of a disciplinary matter), one sergeant (on temporary medical light-duty), six officers (three on permanent medical light-duty and three on limited duty awaiting disposition of disciplinary matters), along with 18 civilian clerks. Staffing with sworn, non-fieldable personnel creates avoidable issues regarding training, supervision and morale. It is also not in the best interest of the department to allow personnel facing potential disciplinary action access to such a wide range of information, some of it confidential. Also, when higher paid but generally less-productive sworn personnel are assigned to perform the same duties as well-trained civilian staff, often the result is resentment, presenting a myriad of problems for supervisors and managers.

Recommendation: PERF recommends that the Report Management Sections be staffed with permanent civilian employees. Light-duty officers should not be temporarily assigned to this section. The Division should be headed by a civilian director

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

and each section should be headed by a civilian manager.

Recommendation: The department should conduct a business practice review of the entire report management process after a new Records Management System is implemented. Part of this process should be a careful consideration of the roles and responsibilities of the current Report Management Division. Staffing needs will change with the new system and changes should be anticipated. Careful thought should be given to whether vacancies should be filled with permanent positions or with temporary/part time personnel.

Though light-duty personnel represent a sometimes less flexible, yet valuable, resource to the department, no specific unit should be expected to address its workload with an uneven workforce. These officers should be utilized – to the degree practical – by their district or division commands. Whether in the precinct facility assisting with administrative or telephone follow-up duties, or vehicle transport, crime prevention, community engagement/meeting attendance, or other external tasks in line with their abilities and limitations, light-duty officers could be better utilized as directed by their commanders.

Table 54. Report Management Division

Report Management Division	
Rank	Recommended
Lieutenant	0
Sergeant	0
Officer	0
Civilian	58
Total Sworn	0
Total Civilian	58

Source: PERF Analysis

JJ. STAFF SERVICES DIVISION

PERF recommends reorganizing the Staff Services Division into nine sections that serve the administrative and personnel needs of the department. The division is led by a civilian director, who, with the assistance of a lieutenant staff services manager, oversees the operations of: ADA, Background Investigations, Claims Validation, Payroll, Personnel, Personnel Distribution, Medical Liaison, Illness/Injury Protection Program, and the Police Physician. PERF recommends that the sworn lieutenant position remain in

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

the division to oversee other sworn personnel, as well as to have the formal authority to address personnel issues such as arming officers, potentially false IOD claims, and other matters that could potentially lead to criminal action.

1. Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) Coordinator

The ADA Coordinator is responsible for the department's compliance with all provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. In cooperation with the City Attorney's Office and State of California, the coordinator ensures that the department provides appropriate accommodations under the requirements of ADA for individuals with disabilities. This includes meeting with injured/disabled employees to ensure that their needs are met. The coordinator is also the department's liaison to the disabled community.

Recommendation: The current ADA Coordinator is a sergeant that is planning on retiring in 2009. This position plays a critical role in the department's compliance with various ADA laws and associated issues. The ADA Coordinator's position should be filled when vacant. This position should be civilianized to maintain the expertise and continuity of the function. The department should consider filling the position before the current coordinator leaves to provide a transition period for these responsibilities.

2. Backgrounds Investigation Section

The Backgrounds Investigation Section is responsible for the investigation of all applications for employment by the police department. This section works closely with physicians, psychologists, polygraph technicians, and other outside agencies to determine the suitability of an applicant to become a member of the SFPD. As the department is currently conducting a major hiring initiative, the Backgrounds Investigation Section use the services of 28 contracted, part-time background investigators who are law enforcement retirees, supervised by a sergeant, to supplement the section's eight sworn full-time positions and one clerical position. This strategy is effective in providing the level of staff needed by the department to complete background investigations while maximizing the section's flexibility to match resources to changing workload. The department assesses the work of each contract employee on an annual basis to ensure that their quality of work complies with standards. In fiscal year 2006/2007, the section completed 1,453 background investigations to hire 250 sworn officers, approximately 8% of those persons that submitted a job applications.

Recommendation: The practice of using police retirees on a contract basis to conduct background

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

investigations is a sound strategy and should be continued. In order to achieve the timely hiring of support personnel and not risk losing talented workers to other employers, one additional sergeant should be assigned to the section to oversee the team of contract employees dedicated to the task of completing background investigations of civilian candidates. Should the current hiring phase decrease and the use of contract employees lessen, the second sergeant position in the Background Investigations Section may be eliminated.

3. Claims Validation Section

The Claims Validation Section is a two-member unit of inspectors who investigate the validity of disability claims initiated by members of the department. Working in an undercover capacity, the investigators observe and in some cases videotape employees on disability to assist in the determination of whether their actions are consistent with the asserted injury. The members of the section do not review medical records prior to their investigation and do not make any findings. They complete their reports and forward them to medical or other professionals to establish medical conclusions.

There is a significant number of worker's compensation claims made by members of the department. Each inspector has an open case file of approximately 8 cases and completes about 32 cases per year. Many cases are worked simultaneously, and in most cases inspectors work in the field alone. The section also assists other members of the division when it has been directed that officers need to be relieved of their firearms at their home and when assistance is needed in the recruitment and background processes.

Recommendation: The department should add two additional positions to this section to restore its previous staffing level of four. This will provide staffing for additional investigations and help to better control workers compensation costs. Increasing the size of the section may serve as a deterrent to false claims, and could assist in returning officers to duty as soon as they are able.

4. Payroll Section

Twelve civilian employees make up the Payroll Section, which processes the payroll for the entire police department in cooperation with the Office of the Controller. There is duplication of work in this section. Payroll clerks in each precinct key data into the "PeopleSoft" HRMS system, then print the report,

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

which is forwarded to the Payroll Section. Payroll clerks must then re-enter the information into the City's payroll system, and they are not able to produce reports showing the cost of overtime by category. Although the system is in need of enhancement, staffing in this section is adequate, aside from the need for a manager. Should the payroll process be integrated into a single system in the future, the department may be able to reduce staffing either in the precincts or within the Payroll Section.

Recommendation: A civilian manager should be added to Payroll to more closely monitor the day-to-day work of the section. It is suggested that one manager oversee the Payroll and Personnel Sections, resulting in an increase in each section by 0.5 managers.

5. Personnel Section

The Personnel Section is responsible for processing and maintaining personnel files for sworn and civilian employees. The section is made up of a staff of eleven, including three positions added to the FY 2008/09 budget, which oversees and administers all human resources tasks related to new hires, promotions, and separations. As the department aggressively hires more than 250 new employees a year while managing the normal attrition rate, the workload of the Personnel Section has increased. Thus the department has added three positions to the section. This should be sufficient to maintain the workload of the section.

Recommendation: One-half of a civilian manager position, as described in the Payroll Section above, should be added to the Personnel Section.

6. Personnel Distribution Section

Personnel Distribution is responsible for the complex task of tracking assignments throughout the department by using updates to the HRMS data. A permanent medical light duty officer has been assigned to this task until the permanent full-time civilian employee in this position returns from an extended medical leave of absence.

Maintaining an accurate accounting of personnel throughout the San Francisco Police Department is an important and complex procedure. The significant personnel changes going on throughout the department, along with regular attrition, creates a challenging environment to accurately identify the work location of all employees, but this must be achieved for organizational accountability. As PERF was collecting data for this study, it was apparent that the department could not easily and accurately report where all members of the department were assigned.

Recommendation: PERF concurs with the department's strategy of hiring a full-time temporary civilian until the full-time employee is able return to work.

7. Medical Liaison Section

In liaison with the City's Worker's Compensation Department, the Medical Liaison Section oversees all claims of industrial injury and illness claimed by members of the department. The sergeant and two officers who make up the section are responsible for ensuring that medical benefits and appropriate confidentiality are provided to all injured or ill employees. The section also oversees leaves of absence, processes identification cards for active and retired members, and investigates fraudulent claims. The section assists in the physical agility testing of applicants and has recently been tasked with overseeing the drug testing policy of the department.

Recommendation: Due to the nature of work in the Medical Liaison Section, it is prudent to maintain a sergeant as the section supervisor. However, the other two positions should be civilianized. The vacant clerk/typist position should be filled to provide necessary support to the section.

8. Illness/Injury Protection Program (IIPP) Unit

The IIPP Unit reports to the Medical Liaison Section and is the department's connection with Cal OSHA. The unit also assists with the department's flu shot program and contributes to the avian flu threat workgroup. The IIPP Unit is staffed with one permanent medically light-duty officer.

Recommendation: This position has been identified to be civilianized in the future. PERF concurs with this recommendation.

9. Police Physician

The department is mandated by City Charter to have a Police Physician. This position has been vacant for over two years, during which time the duties have been performed on a contractual basis by staff of the University of San Francisco or San Francisco General Hospital. Duties include coordinating formal responses from private physicians as they relate to employees' industrial and non-industrial injuries and illnesses. The Police Physician also reviews medical restrictions of officers returning to work in a modified-duty capacity and provides a medical

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

opinion on potential hires as necessary. When staffed full-time, the physician also provides input on departmental policies and procedures.

Table 55. Staff Services Division Staffing

Staff Services Division	
Rank	Recommended
Lieutenant	1
Sergeant	3
Investigator	4
Officer	8
Civilian	33
Total Sworn	16
Total Civilian	33

Source: PERF Analysis

KK. SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION

The Support Services Division is currently commanded by a Captain. PERF recommends that the division be organized into two sections, Permits and Property/Facility. Each of the sections is now managed by a lieutenant. PERF recommends that the division commander (captain) position be civilianized, along with the Permit and Property/Facility Section commanders (lieutenants). The Taxi Unit within the Permit Section should remain under the supervision of a sergeant due to the enforcement aspects and collaborative nature of the position. Over 62 percent of the staff, or 62 positions within this division, are sworn. Most of the services provided may be performed by trained civilian specialists. The department should move to civilianize all non-enforcement positions in this division as a better deployment of sworn resources. Such a strategy will maintain the division's services at a reduced fiscal impact to the department.

1. Permit Section

The Permit Section is divided into the Taxi, Permits, and California Community Dispute Services Units.

- a) **The Permits Unit** processes fees, issues and maintains 55 distinct types of permits for nearly 1,000 separate venues, and posts notice signs. The Noise Abatement/Ordinance Amendment Detail conducts noise tests for permit applicants and makes recommendations for the hearing officer of the Entertainment Commission on matters of permit applications, disciplinary and enforcement issues. The unit is managed by the half lieutenant's position shared with the Taxi Unit, one sergeant, half a full-duty officer's position, an officer on permanent medical limited-duty, and

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

two civilian positions. The unit generates revenue of nearly \$500,000 annually.

b) The Taxi Unit enforces codes and laws specifically directed toward the regulation of commercial vehicles for hire. Members of the unit (which is comprised of half a lieutenant's position that is shared with the Permits Unit, one sergeant, three officers, and one civilian) conduct enforcement operations, investigate violations and complaints, and audit permit holders and companies. According to the department, the unit is responsible for overseeing 7,000 taxi drivers, 1,450 medallions, and more than 30 companies, and it responds to 20 to 40 telephone inquiries per day. The results of complaint investigations are referred to the Taxi Commission for determination of findings and discipline.

Recommendation: Non-enforcement personnel should be civilianized to redeploy sworn resources and maintain services at a reduced fiscal impact. Therefore the unit should be staffed by one sergeant, one officer and two civilians.

Recommendation: There is adequate staffing in the Permits Unit, which should be fully civilianized to redeploy sworn resources and maintain services at a reduced fiscal impact.

c) The California Community Dispute Services Unit works with a court-appointed referee. Cases referred by the District Attorney's Office are researched by staff, who prepare the cases as appropriate for presentation and recommendation to the referee. The staffing of half a full-time officer's position is adequate.

Recommendation: The section should be staffed with one full-time civilian.

2. Property/Facility Section:

The Property/Facility Section is made up of the Evidence and Property, Narcotics, Facilities, Fleet Management, and Uniform and Equipment Units. As in other sections, the department should move to civilianize all positions to better deploy sworn resources. Such a strategy will maintain the division's services at a reduced fiscal impact to the department.

a) The Evidence and Property Unit receives, stores, and maintains all evidence and found property in a secure facility. The unit is staffed with one lieutenant, two sergeants (one of whom is limited-duty pending disciplinary disposition), four officers (including two on permanent

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

medical light-duty), and four civilians. It is not a good practice to have a member of the department, sworn or civilian, awaiting the disposition of a disciplinary matter to be assigned to the Evidence and Property Unit.

Recommendation: There unit is adequately staffed. The department should move to civilianize the Evidence and Property Unit. Limited duty personnel, whether sworn or civilian, should not be assigned to the Evidence and Property Unit.

b) The Narcotics Unit is a subunit of the Evidence and Property Unit, including shared staff. The unit receives, stores and maintains all narcotics evidence and property in a secure facility. The unit also coordinates the disposal of narcotics evidence no longer needed for court.

Recommendation: There is adequate staffing in the unit, which can be fully civilianized. It is not a good practice for members of the Narcotics Unit, as in Evidence and Property, to be staffed by a member of the department, sworn or civilian, awaiting the disposition of a disciplinary matter.

c) The Facilities Unit provides a single point of contact for repairs at all 19 SFPD facilities (11 owned and 8 leased) and is available to respond for emergency repairs 24/7. The unit is staffed with two officers (one on permanent medical light-duty). It provides assistance for any facility design, relocation, and infrastructure development proposed by the department. Members of the Facilities Unit work with facilities coordinators at each satellite location to identify needs and make repairs. The unit averages about 50 repair orders per month.

Recommendation: PERF recommends adding one clerk position to the Facilities Unit to handle workload and to provide logistical support for the future housing of the Crime Lab and Tactical Units moving from their current facility. PERF further recommends that the unit be civilianized and that it only use sworn personnel on a temporary basis for project-specific tasks.

d) The Fleet Maintenance Unit works with each satellite location and the City's fleet maintenance staff to coordinate and provide efficient, timely and responsive maintenance and repairs to protect the department's fleet investment. The unit assists in devising the specifications for vehicles and uses the expertise of members of the department for specialty

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

vehicles such as tactical command and Explosive Ordnance Devices (EOD) vehicles. The unit is staffed by one officer and three civilians.

Recommendation: As in the other units in this section, while staffing is adequate, it may be completely civilianized, and sworn personnel should only be used on a temporary basis for project-specific tasks.

e) **The Uniform and Equipment Unit** is staffed by one supply clerk who distributes new and replacement uniforms and equipment to both sworn and civilian members of the agency. The department has a liberal uniform replacement policy which, while creating work for the unit, helps produce a professional image to the public. The staffing of the unit is adequate.

Table 56. Support Services Division Staffing

Rank	Recommended
Captain	0
Lieutenant	0
Sergeant	1
Officer	1
Civilian	26
Total Sworn	2
Total Civilian	26

Source: PERF Analysis

LL. TRAINING AND EDUCATION DIVISION

PERF recommends that the Training and Education Division be realigned into three areas of expertise: the Field Training Officers program, Career Development, and Basic and Core Competencies. The re-engineering of the division was initiated to support the component of the department's Vision which calls for: "[providing] state-of-the-art training, development and career opportunities for advancement and retention. This will ensure that the employees see the Police Department as a lifelong career and strive to become the department's next generation of leaders."

The Training and Education Division is responsible for all basic and in-service training as well as implementation and oversight of the department's Field Training Officer program. The department uses a sound strategy of having a limited number of full-time personnel assigned to the academy, supplemented by outside experts and about 300 certified instructors from throughout the department who provide training on areas of their subject matter expertise. Overtime is available for instructors who teach during non-duty time. The division has recently concluded a yearlong process of revamping

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

lesson plans and curricula and has received an “exemplary” rating from the state’s certifying authority, the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST).

1. The Director’s Office

The Director’s office is composed of the Captain, a police officer serving as an aide, an officer acting as a payroll clerk, an civilian performing HRMS data entry duties and a Captain’s Clerk’s position which was vacant at the time of the study.

Recommendation: The Payroll position in the Director’s Office should be civilianized. The vacant clerk’s position should be filled to support the captain, eliminating the need of the sworn officer to act as a aide to the captain. The office, other than the captain, should be composed of three civilians.

2. Basic Academy and Core Competencies Section:

This section is managed by a lieutenant also referred to as the “Training Director” to comply with POST convention. The San Francisco Police Department Regional Training Facility is considered a local government operation certified by POST. Its primary function is to present all components of the Basic Police Officer Course in compliance with POST standards. Those successfully completing the academy should be prepared mentally and physically to advance into the Department’s Field Training Program and ultimately prepared to assume the duties of a police officer in San Francisco’s diverse communities.

Recommendation: This section should have responsibility for the Basic Academy and core competencies.

The Department’s basic course consists of over 1,200 hours of instruction, which is nearly twice the POST minimum standard. The department has integrated cultural competencies into academy training and incorporated a new report-writing class. The Academy also conducts a Citizen’s Academy Course for members of the community who wish to survey what SFPD police officers experience in their training.

Other responsibilities of the section include the Emergency Vehicle Operations Course, Force Options Training, and the Range. The SFPD has two police ranges to conduct firearms training; the Lake Merced Range and Airport Range. Long rifles may be used at the airport range, while the Lake Merced facility offers training facilities for handguns and shotguns. The department is instituting a field rifle program and is in the process of purchasing 225 rifles. Based upon two

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

range masters, it will take 5-7 years for all patrol officers to complete training. The section also uses Firearms Training System Inc. (FATS) training simulations for force options training. The age of the machines ranges from 8 to 16 years, and the equipment is becoming outdated.

This section also contains the Office of Experiential Learning which includes report writing. Simulations, audio/visual, physical training and defensive tactics and fitness coordination.

Recommendation: The SFPD should add two additional sworn positions to the Basic and Core Competencies Section in order to enhance its capability in firearms and force options training. One officer's position should be added for firearms training and qualifying, and a sergeant's position should be added for force options training. This will enable the department to provide additional and timelier training in these two areas while accelerating the rifle qualification program. The sergeant's position in force options training is considered necessary as the department continues training carotid artery hold training and possible TASER training as that tool is introduced to the department.

Recommendation: Three additional civilian positions should be added to the section. One new position should coordinate and schedule the department's 300 certified trainers as instructors in the various basic and in-service courses offered. The second civilian position, a curriculum development specialist, should be added to assist with experiential curriculum development. The third civilian position should replace the sworn officer performing audio/visual duties. Sworn status is not necessary for this position.

Recommendation: The department should develop its own scenarios based upon actual incidents that have occurred in the city to instruct on force options. This can be accomplished contractually, or arrangements could be made to work on this with the appropriate departments within the City College of San Francisco.

3. Career Development Section

Recommendation: The department should create a Career Development Section to manage advanced officer training to ensure compliance with POST requirements and offer opportunities for department personnel to advance vertically and laterally within the organization. This section will support the departmental Vision and serve to affirm San Francisco's dedication to develop its employees and supply the department with future leaders.

Units should include functions dedicated to career development, management training, technical courses and investigations training. A formal career development program is proposed in PERF's report on the department's Human Resources operations.

Recommendation: The career development function should provide both civilian and sworn personnel with continuing professional training to keep them informed of changes in laws, procedures, and department policies. Additionally this group should be actively involved in discovering outside training opportunities for departmental members. Staffing for the section should be as follows:

- Command: 1 Lieutenant
- Career Development Office: 1 Sergeant
 - Instructor Development/Roll Call Training: 1 Officer
 - CPT/CPA: 1 Officer, 1 Civilian
 - Sworn Career Development Coordinator: 1 Officer
 - Civilian Career Development Coordinator: 1 Civilian
- Management Training Coordinator: 1 Civilian
- Technical Courses: 1 Civilian Supervisor
 - CLETS Training: 1 Civilian
 - IT Training: 2 Civilians
- Investigative Training: 1 Sergeant with investigative experience

Recommendation: The Career Development Section should retain the responsibility for adherence to related POST standards and

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

guidelines. These units are key to improving the quality of personnel and development of future leaders as outlined in the department's Vision. As in the Basic and Core Competencies Section, a myriad of personnel within and outside the department are used as course instructors. This strategy has provided adequate instructors to meet the needs of the department.

Recommendation: As the department expands its use of civilians, the department should maintain a focus to develop similar professional training and career enhancement training for these members of the department.

4. Field Training Officers (FTO) Section:

The FTO program is responsible for developing and overseeing the department's 17-week field training program, and the Field Training Officers are tasked with training lateral officers and recruits graduated from the academy. During the FTO program, trainees are assigned to three different Field Training Officers who supervise, train, and evaluate them during application of practical field training.

The FTO program has a critical effect on the ability of the department to realize its Vision and provide quality police services. SFPD is in the middle of a major hiring phase, putting 250 recruits through the academy annually. The department risks "burnout" of FTOs when they are required to train too many trainees, one after another.

Recommendation: Staffing of the FTO Section should be increased from three to four officers to allow proper monitoring of both FTOs and the progress of their recruit officers. The number of FTOs should be increased by 10 percent to give trainers an opportunity to "recuperate" between trainees at regular intervals. Once this increase is made, the department should reassess the number of FTO's based on continuing field training needs. However, the quality of training officers should not suffer from increasing the pool. PERF believes it is in the best interest of the department to continue to compensate FTOs in between trainees as long as they remain in good standing and the amount of time between trainees is not excessive.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 57. Training and Education Division Full-Time Staff

	Current*	Recommended
Training and Education Director		
Captain	1	1
Officer	2	0
Civilian	2	3
Field Training Officer Section		
Lieutenant	1	1
Sergeant	1	1
Officers	3	4
Career Development Section		
Lieutenant	1	1
Sergeants	2	2
Officers	5	3
Civilian	1	7
Basic and Core Competencies Section		
Lieutenant	1	1
Sergeants	5	6
Officers**	20	20
Civilian	0	3

* As of May 5, 2008

** Number does not include 3 Officers at the Airport Range

Source: PERF Analysis, SFPD Training Division Report

* * *

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

MM. SUMMARY ADMINISTRATION BUREAU STAFFING

Table 58. Administration Bureau Staffing

Administration Bureau Staffing	
Rank	Recommended
Deputy Chief	1
Commander	1
Captain	1
Lieutenant	4
Sergeant	15
Investigator	4
Officer	40
Civilian	176
Total Sworn	66
Total Civilian	176

Source: PERF Analysis

ORGANIZING THE AIRPORT BUREAU

The Airport Bureau of the SFPD is equivalent to a stand-alone, full-service police department. Its size exceeds that of any law enforcement agency in San Mateo County, where the airport is located. The commanding officer is a Deputy Chief who performs all executive-level decisions, manages all aspects of the SFPD's operations at the San Francisco International Airport, and serves as liaison to all internal and external partners. External duties include constant liaison with federal agencies, the airport authority, airlines, and San Mateo County. Internally, it is imperative that the Bureau provide a high level of safety and security for the entire airport community. Security inside the airport must meet and exceed TSA standards. Traffic on airport roadways must be managed and controlled to promote efficient movement of vehicles and pedestrians. And security must be maintained in an era requiring constant vigilance to protect against terrorist threats.

The responsibilities of the Airport Bureau Deputy Chief are similar to those of a municipal police chief. Second in command is a Commander who oversees the day-to-day operations of the Airport Bureau and supervises all the divisions. These two commanding officers working in conjunction with each another are essential for managing the personnel and services provided by the Bureau. Each is supported by a secretary.


The Airport Bureau operates from two facilities on the airport grounds. The main office is located on the fifth floor of the International Terminal Building, and the South Substation is on the lower level of Terminal 1.

The Airport Bureau has a total authorized staff of 324. That includes 182 sworn positions and 142 civilian employees. Of these, 157 sworn and 134 civilian positions are funded, a total of 292. Airport positions are funded by the airport from its own revenues, not from the City's general fund. The lack of funded positions is not due to a lack of money available from the airport, but rather from shortages in the SFPD. Full staffing of airport positions would result in unacceptable vacancies in other SFPD units, so increased staffing at the Airport is dependent on the current hiring and training effort under way, which is designed to bring the entire department to full strength. As of July 2008, of the airport funded positions, 139 sworn and 113 civilian positions were available for unrestricted duty; the others were on limited-duty or were temporarily assigned to another section in the department.

The Bureau is organized into three primary divisions: Patrol, Traffic, and Administrative/Special Services, each overseen by a captain. The Bureau reports responding to 32,696 dispatched calls for service in 2007 and 121,481 self-initiated calls for service. The self-initiated activities included 111,755 "passing calls," which consist of checking on airlines, tenants, critical sites, AirTrain, BART, and airfield checkpoints. This is considered an effective and important deterrent strategy. The Bureau also handles over 500 VIP/dignitary movements per year. There are 10 security checkpoints throughout the airport. All personnel assigned to the Airport Bureau must pass a

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

SFPD Airport Bureau
Proposed Structure November 2008



**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

background check by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA). Those duties include responding to emergencies are covered by mutual aid agreements.

Staff works 10-hour days. Officers performing daily patrol functions are assigned to one of three shifts: days (6 a.m. to 4 p.m.), swings (4 p.m. to 2 a.m.) and midnights (9 p.m. to 7 a.m.). There are a number of specialized safety and security functions performed by non-patrol staff:

- Canine units work closely with Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) technicians;
- Traffic accident investigations;
- Ground transportation enforcement;
- Solo motorcycles;
- Inter-agency task forces;
- Bicycle patrol;
- Traffic control;
- Airfield entry control and perimeter security; and
- Investigation Services, including liaison with San Mateo Sheriff's Office detectives.

The Bureau utilizes these units to preserve the safety of the airport and to maintain a high level of security. While all the resources of the San Francisco Police Department may be at the disposal of the Airport Bureau as circumstances warrant, in practice the department's responsibilities to maintain emergency services within the city and county boundaries tend to limit the ability of the other Bureaus of the SFPD to respond to the airport on a timely basis and entail significant logistical challenges.

NN. AIRPORT BUREAU STAFFING

In addition to providing basic police services to San Francisco International Airport, the SFPD Airport Bureau has the responsibility to enforce the airport's Transportation Security Administration security plan, as well as providing support services for individual airlines' security plans. The Bureau also plays a crucial role in the airport's emergency response capabilities.

In reviewing the operations of the Airport Bureau, a comparison of staffing and operations was made with six other airports of similar size: Atlanta, Detroit, Miami, Minneapolis and Seattle. The information collected is included as an appendix to this report. With the exception of Detroit, that has nearly 90 million passengers a year passing through its airport, the others serve approximately 35 million. The number of terminals in the airports range from San Francisco's high of four to Miami's single terminal though it has eight concourses. The number of average number of officers per terminal varies from one airport to another as shown below. San Francisco PD's Airport Bureau staffing of officers remains ranked third at either its current level or those suggested by PERF.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 59. Number of Officers per Airport Terminal

Airport	Number of Terminals	Number of Officers	Officers Per Terminal
Miami	1	110	110
Atlanta	2	133	66.5
San Francisco	4		
* PERF recommended		207	51.7
** Current		157	39.2
Detroit	3	103	34.3
Minneapolis	2	62	31
Seattle	3	83	27.6
* PERF recommended staffing level			
** Current staffing level			

Source: PERF Analysis, PERF Survey 2008, 2007 HRMS

PERF's staffing recommendations are based upon several key premises: the department's intention to fully implement the recently adopted Vision Statement; the Airport Bureau's overall duty to fulfill its mission; and the Bureau's stated commitment to providing services within a community oriented policing environment.

1. Airport Patrol Division

To establish the staffing needs of the Airport Bureau's Patrol Division, PERF used a decentralized and geographic approach similar to that used for the department's Field Operations Bureau (FOB). The Airport Bureau and the FOB each have distinctive policing challenges and staffing needs. As in an FOB district, each airport terminal has its own area with unique physical features, commercial enterprises and clientele that affect demands for police service. As an example, one terminal contains a shopping mall; one has frequent flights to recreational locales that attract passengers who have been drinking; another is in close proximity to the BART station. These types of factors, along with FAA and TSA requirements, were considered in establishing PERF's staffing recommendations for the Airport Bureau.

Members of the Patrol Division act as first responders to all law-enforcement related activities that occur on airport grounds. They utilize foot and bicycle patrols throughout the terminals, and use motorized patrol in the Airport Operations Area (all areas designated for landing, taking off, or surface maneuvering of aircraft) and on surrounding surface roads. Patrol staff respond to emergency operations and assist as necessary, and work with their local, state and federal partners in enforcement activities. They also ensure compliance with TSA mandates.

Recommendation: Minimum staffing levels of the Patrol Division should be established by shift and function. As in the Field Operations Bureau,

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

whenever possible, personnel should be assigned to the same terminal so they can develop an expertise regarding the issues and problems at a given location, as well as a familiarity with airport workers and even frequent fliers. Supervisory staff should follow the same one- to-eight ratio of sergeants to officers as described in the FOB. The following chart depicts recommendation for assignments to be continuously staffed by the Airport Bureau's Patrol Division. In each terminal, officer positions include those both before and after TSA passenger screening check points. The exact allocation of these positions is not included in this report.

Recommendation: The department should temporarily use overtime to staff the terminals to maintain the minimum staffing levels of officers.

Table 60. Airport Bureau, Patrol Division Recommended Assignments

	Day Watch (6a.m.-4p.m.)	Swing Shift (4p.m.-2a.m.)	Midnight Shift (9p.m.-7a.m.)
Patrol Division Commander	1 Captain		
	1 Sr. Clerk Typist		
Watch Commanders	1 Lieutenant	1 Lieutenant	
Prisoner Transport	2 Officers	2 Officers	
Terminal 1 - Piers B and C	1 Sergeant	1 Sergeant	
	5 Officers	5 Officers	1 Officer
Terminal 2 – Pier D (Vacant)	1 Officer	1 Officer	1 Officer
Terminal 3 – Piers E and F	1 Sergeant	1 Sergeant	1 Sergeant
	6 Officers	6 Officers	2 Officers
International Terminal – Piers A and G	1 Sergeant	1 Sergeant	
	7 Officers	7 Officers	1 Officer
Mobile Units	1 Sergeant	1 Sergeant	1 Sergeant
	5 Officers	5 Officers	3 Officers

Source: PERF Analysis

The number of continuously staffed posts needed requires two lieutenants, ten sergeants and 60 officers each day. Dayshift requires continuous staffing of one lieutenant, four sergeants and 26 officers. Swing shift also requires one lieutenant, four sergeants and 26 officers. The midnight shift requires two

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

sergeants and eight officers. Because each position must be staffed seven days a week and because each shift is ten hours long, each position requires a staffing commitment of 70 hours per week. (The advantage of the ten-hour shifts is that two primary shifts, days and swings, provide 20 hours of coverage each day, allowing reduced staffing when there is very little airport use.)

The SFPD has determined that of the possible 2,080 hours per employee per year (40 hours times 52 weeks), department sworn personnel are available to work 1,700 hours, taking into account vacation, illness, training and other absences. The “show-up rate” is 81.7 % per year, or an average of 32.7 hours of work per week. Consequently, the staffing requirements per shift are as follows:

Table 61. Continuous Staffing

	Number Needed for Continuous Staffing	Total Hours per Week	Total Needed to be Assigned
Day Shift			
Lieutenants	1	70	2
Sergeants	4	280	9
Officers	26	1820	56
Swing Shift			
Lieutenant	1	70	2
Sergeants	4	280	9
Officers	26	1820	56
Midnight Shifts			
Sergeants	2	140	4
Officers	8	560	17

Source: PERF Analysis

A summary of the recommended staffing for the Airport Bureau’s Patrol Division is shown below.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 62. Airport Patrol Staffing

Airport Bureau Required Patrol Division Total Staffing	
Captain	1
Lieutenant	4
Sergeant	22
Officers	129
Civilian	1
Total Sworn	156
Total Civilian	1

Source: PERF Analysis

This represents minimum staffing required for airport terminal safety and security. This staffing level will allow the division to comply with current TSA regulations and provide the level of community oriented service and public safety outlined in the Vision Statement. It will also eliminate the current use of overtime to fill mandatory staffing vacancies. However, it is important to understand that the daily filling of these assignments will require a greater number of personnel than the number of assignments, because absences need to be taken into account when scheduling personnel.

Recommendation: When Terminal 2 is reopened, the staffing levels of the Patrol Division will need to be increased. Based upon the criteria and methodology described above, the following continuously staffed positions should be added to the Bureau.

**Table 63. Airport Bureau, Patrol Division Terminal 2
Continuous Assignment Recommendations**

	Day Watch (6a.m.-4p.m.)	Swing Shift (4p.m.-2a.m.)	Midnight Shift (9p.m.-7a.m.)
Fully Functional Terminal 2 - Pier D	1 Sergeant	1 Sergeant	
	5 Officers	5 Officers	1 Officer

Source: PERF Analysis

Using the same methodology as above, this translates into a need for a total of four additional sergeants and 24 additional officers.

Recommendation: The Bureau is currently researching Segway Personnel Transporters for use at the airport. These modes of transportation have

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

proven highly effective, cost-efficient and environmentally friendly for law enforcement purposes in such settings and are in use in a number of airports across the country. Because officers using Segways stand on a raised platform, they are visible to the public, and they have a good observation point to see what is happening around them. Segways allow officers to move quickly to the scene of an incident from a platform and enable quicker response without physical strain, allowing them to reserve their energy for any action they need to take upon arrival. Although not a substitute for the additional staffing recommended above, Segways will allow for enhanced visibility and productivity. The Airport Bureau should acquire these transporters and incorporate them into its patrol operations.

2. Airport Traffic Division

The Traffic Division of the Airport Bureau consists of sworn solo motorcycle officers and ground transportation enforcement supplemented by civilian Police Service Aides (PSA). The PSAs perform most of the traffic functions and serve as security guards. Personnel assigned to these positions at the airport work the day, swing, or night shift, and there is seven-day-per-week coverage. The division's primary responsibility is to ensure the smooth flow of traffic throughout the airport which also serves to enhance homeland security precautions. Traffic Division employees perform enforcement and regulation duties for all modes of ground transportation and provide motorcycle escorts as necessary for dignitary visits. They also oversee and maintain the Bureau's holding facilities and staff the Lost and Found Office and substation front counter, where members of the public can contact the police and Lost and Found Office.

The department has used a combination of civilian and sworn staff in the Traffic Division of the Airport Bureau quite effectively. Based upon the expectations of the current Airport commanders and the ability of staff to successfully manage the free flow of traffic through the airport terminals and surrounding surface streets, staffing of the division is adequate. Members of the division are providing timely service, and are doing so within a community policing philosophy. Education and engineering strategies such as the use of barriers, cameras, signage and warnings are utilized to manage traffic, rather than enforcement activities alone.

Recommendation: Airport Traffic Division
staffing should be as follows:

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 64. Airport Traffic Division Staffing

Airport Bureau Traffic Division Staffing	
Captain	1
Lieutenant	4
Sergeant	10
Officers (Solo Motors)	8
Police Service Aides	111
Security Guards	8
Clerk Typist	1
Total Sworn	23
Total Civilian	120

Source: PERF Analysis

3. Airport Administrative/ Special Services Division

The department has consolidated the former Administration Division and Special Services and Security Division into the Administrative/Special Services Division. A lieutenant, who reports directly to the Administrative/Special Services captain, commands the Special Services Section; and a new civilian manager oversees the Administration Section. The functions performed by the Administration Section include Clerical Support/Payroll, Information Services, Payroll Management, Purchasing and Supplies, Records, Training, and Personnel.

Recommendation: PERF's review of these operations shows that current staffing is adequate but all of these positions should be civilianized. Recommended staffing is as follows:

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 65. Administrative Staffing

Airport Bureau Administrative Section; Recommended Staffing		
Assignment	Sworn	Civilian
Captain	1	
Civilian Manager		1
Purchasing		1
Personnel		1
Clerical/Payroll		5
Training Coordinator		1
Records		4
Information Services		4
Total Sworn	1	
Total Civilian		17

Source: PERF Analysis

The Administrative Section should be directed by a civilian manager. Officers in Information Services and Records should be replaced by appropriately qualified civilians. The functions of the Training Coordinator do not require sworn status, and a civilian can perform the duties of that position.

The Special Services Section, which should be headed by a lieutenant, is composed of a number of operational specialized functions including K-9 teams, SFPD personnel assigned to various Inter-Agency Task Forces, the Explosive Ordnance Detection Unit (EOD), Threat Assessment, Dignitary Movement and the Range.

K-9 teams are a vital element in the airport security umbrella. Those working at the airport are single-purpose, with the single mission of explosives detection. Ideally they should be used to consistently screen both passenger baggage and air cargo.

Recommendation: The Airport Bureau should have a total of 20 K-9 teams, divided into two squads of ten each with a sergeant. If they work a schedule similar to the Tactical Division K-9 teams, they will have a common day that allows for training and they will be able to provide around-the-clock coverage.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Participation in Inter-Agency Tasks Forces (such as with DEA for drug interdiction and with San Mateo for cargo theft) is part of how the Bureau deals with “ordinary” crime at the airport. Identity theft, fraud, pickpocketing, shoplifting, baggage theft, auto theft and theft from autos can all be problems in a target-rich environment like a major international airport. The BART system provides a means of easy transport for those that might be criminally inclined and who view the airport patrons as a suitable crime target.

Recommendation: The Airport Bureau should have the capacity to increase its efforts with regard to drug interdiction and cargo theft as well as to deal with other crimes. A sergeant and eight officers should be assigned to this function.

A firearms range is located on the airport property. It is used by officers assigned to the airport Bureaus and by other officers from the SFPD. Other law enforcement agencies also use it. Current staffing of three officers is adequate. These officers have some flexibility to assist in other airport police operations when necessary.

Another vital part of the airport security blanket is the Explosives Ordnance Detection team. This team’s resources should be sufficient to not only react to calls from TSA and other airport officers but also to engage in proactive screening.

Recommendation: The airport E.O.D. unit should be staffed by a total of six suitably qualified technicians, supervised by a sergeant. The department should consider whether some positions may be civilianized through employment of war veterans who have already been trained in this specialty. With the right set of technical qualifications, these positions may not need to be sworn police officers.

Another function of the Special Services Section is dignitary protection and threat assessment. There are some 700 episodes annually which require escort services of varying intensity. Officers assigned to this function are able to leverage other airport police officers to assist with these tasks, but the frequency of escorts requires continual focus.

Recommendation: Special Services should have six persons assigned to it and should be led by a sergeant. Staffing should include an analyst position and an officer assisting with threat assessment. The analyst should not only assess

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

information provided by members of the Airport Bureau and its partners, but should also be in regular contact with the department's CompStat and Crime Analysis Section within the Strategic Management Division and the Investigations Bureau's analysts.

The timely collection and analysis of information are critical for providing police services to a high-profile enterprise such as an international airport, especially in the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. The Airport Bureau has a cadre of officers working together with their federal, state and local law enforcement partners for this function. Obtaining information is important not only for the safety and security of airport workers and passengers and to protect commerce; it also provides benefit to other Bureaus of the San Francisco Police Department. As an example, illegal activities ranging from smuggling, narcotics trafficking, and gang activity to vehicle thefts may have a direct impact on crime in the jurisdictions surrounding the airport and the City and County of San Francisco.

**Table 66. Summary of Airport Bureau
Special Services Staffing Recommendations**

Airport Bureau Special Services	
Lieutenant	1
Sergeant	5
Officers	70
Civilian	1
Total Sworn	76
Total Civilian	1

Source: PERF Analysis

* * *

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

OO. SUMMARY: AIRPORT BUREAU STAFFING

The following table summarizes staffing recommendations for the Airport Bureau:

Table 67. Staffing Recommendations for the Airport Bureau

Airport Bureau Staffing	
Deputy Chief	1
Commander	1
Captain	3
Lieutenant	9
Sergeant	37
Officers	207
Civilian	141
Total Sworn	258
Total Civilian	141

Source: PERF Analysis

HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEMS OVERVIEW

The recently completed strategic Vision established for the San Francisco Police Department lays out a path for the future. The SFPD has made a commitment to being a world-class police department that reflects the values of the world-class city it serves. Not only will the department be committed to the human values of the city's populace, it also will unite with the people of the city's communities "in their commitment to addressing crime, violence, and quality-of-life issues by engaging one another and all city agencies in problem-solving partnerships."

The department is committed to using strategies and tactics that "must be driven by accurate, timely and reliable information supplied by current and emerging technologies and supported by the Department's systematic engagement of all of San Francisco's diverse neighborhoods."

The department's Vision also describes an important commitment to its employees: "To make this Vision a reality, the Police Department must reward the hard work, ingenuity, and resourcefulness demonstrated by its employees, and must offer state-of-the-art training development and career opportunities for advancement and retention."

This portion of the organization review examines vital human resources operations of the SFPD. Each of these functions has important implications regarding whom the department hires, how they are trained, how they are promoted, and their professional development. This report makes recommendations for a number of alterations to current human resources processes, each aimed at improving the department's structure and enhancing its ability to implement its Vision.

PP. THE IDEAL SFPD OFFICER

San Francisco has not developed a formal profile of its "ideal" officer which could be used to focus recruiting efforts. Many persons who were asked about this during PERF interviews said that officers should have the characteristics of integrity, ethics, intelligence, an ability to work with diverse people, and a desire to provide public service. An important characteristic cited by many people, especially community members, is that police officers should be "local," or at least should fit well with the City's diverse communities.

The department's Vision indicates that SFPD should be made up of people who "adhere to the highest standards and reflect the diversity of its community members." SFPD employees are expected to exhibit "hard work, ingenuity and resourcefulness."

In the past, the city's and the department's approach, especially in the current highly competitive recruiting environment, was much like that employed by other large-city police departments throughout the nation. The department would throw out a broad net and gather as many applicants as possible. This large applicant pool was then filtered to find those who will make the best officers in the San Francisco context.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

However, with this approach it typically took five months from the time an applicant submitted an application until he/she was referred to the background investigation phase of the selection process. It has long been recognized by police recruiters and hiring officials in metropolitan areas that many of the best applicants apply to more than one department and accept positions not with their first choice – but with the department that is first to offer a job. In 2007, the city shifted from its long-standing traditional hiring model to an accelerated approach that processes applicants in smaller, more manageable groups, so as to significantly shorten the time from application to the point at which they may be offered a position. The results of this change, detailed later in this report, are impressive.

QQ. RECRUITMENT

The San Francisco Police Department uses a variety of techniques to attract prospective officers to the department. The department has identified a number of “recruitment campaign” goals that serve as a guide to recruiters as they work to attract applicants to the department. In keeping with the desire to focus recruitment on applicants from the city, there is not only a strong emphasis on the attributes of the city and the department, but also a recognition that potential applicants can be found among existing city employees and through referral from current officers.

Through the Current City Employee Police Recruitment Program, qualified city employees may be eligible for hiring incentives at the police department. To capitalize on “word of mouth” recruiting, referrals are rewarded with a \$1,000 bonus for the veteran officer who successfully recruits a new officer. As has been a common finding among police agencies, the Internet – through departmental and city recruiting sites and commercial site job postings – has proven to be the most productive source of applicants. A February 2008 survey of applicants found that 54 percent of applicants were the result of Web/Internet efforts (46 percent through the city or department website). The Department of Human Resources reports that unique visitor website visits had reached 10,000 per month by February 2008. Another 27 percent of applicants came by way of referrals (mostly through officers). These two initiatives accounted for 81 percent of applicants, while all media advertising and recruiting events attended at community, career, military and academia venues combined accounted only for 19 percent of applicants.

SFPD uses various mediums to communicate to the public job opportunities and testing information. “Outdoor media” advertising includes billboards on buildings, roadways and mass transportation. Recruiting events and testing times/locations are listed on the SFPD’s website, as well as in media such as billboards, radio and television commercials, and newspapers and newsletters.

Recruiters are well prepared and equipped to attend recruiting events throughout the area. The SFPD’s displays at these events have a professional appearance, utilizing videos and featuring well-outfitted and attractive police vehicles – even the department’s command van – to show the department in a good light. At the conclusion of each recruitment

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

event, recruiters complete an event assessment describing the event, the extent of the department's involvement, and the relative success of the event. This information is then used to determine whether the department will attend the event in the future.

Though the recruiters' attendance at various community events has not been the most productive of its various recruitment initiatives, it is a critically important one. The Recruitment Unit maintains a vigorous schedule and attends a variety of community events to attract and test qualified applicants. In keeping with the department's Vision and the stated goal of hiring local applicants, the Recruitment Unit is dedicated to reaching out to all members of the community, particularly those who have not historically sought out policing as a career, such as women, the LGBT community, and people of color. This is accomplished through Recruitment Unit representation at cultural events such as festivals and street fairs.

There has been some discussion as to the viability of requiring either city residency of officers or establishing a requirement to reside within a specified commuting distance or time from the city to ensure a prompt response in the event of a critical incident call-back. Throughout the nation there are police and sheriff's departments that have enacted one or the other of these rules. In SFPD there is no residency requirement, but there are response requirements for canine officers. Often the higher cost of housing within larger cities makes residency requirements a hardship, especially for new officers receiving entry-level salaries. In San Francisco, the implementation of a "down payment" program to help offset this issue has not seen many takers.

These policies are most often driven by similar expectations. Officials want a quick call-back response and they believe officers will be more dedicated to the city in which they reside. Sometimes there is a desire to keep the officers' salaries and the property taxes they pay in the city. In New York City, for example, the residency requirement was dropped, but officers who live elsewhere are faced with a commuter tax to offset these losses. Other jurisdictions stay away from residency requirements except for the department's top officials, because they hope to attract the best qualified police officer applicants – those with the greatest level of knowledge, skills and abilities that most closely match the job description of a police officer, those they feel will have the greatest probability of success in the position – regardless of whether the applicants are residents.

Many officers are quick to point out that they don't want to live in their work jurisdiction. They don't like to police their own neighborhoods on-duty, much less live up to their neighbors' expectations of an "always on-duty officer" after hours. Many feel it puts unjustified stress and anxiety on their families and targets them at home. As competition for new officers has forced some department to offer as much as \$12,000 in signing bonuses and applicant pools are still too small, many of these requirements have been relaxed or lifted.

In the SFPD there is recognition that local applicants are desirable, but not all the events and venues targeted by recruiters are within the city, nor are events intended to attract only city residents. The SFPD is facing considerable attrition in its ranks (currently at

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

109 officers per year). Of the current 2,361 sworn officers, 586, or 24.8 percent, are eligible for retirement. Given that the department reports a 4-percent selection ratio (only four of 100 applicants are selected for hire) and the attrition rate during the academy and the FTO program currently stands at over 30 percent, nearly 3,600 applicants would be needed to actually fill each 100 officer positions with recruits likely to complete their probationary period. Keeping up with attrition alone, with no consideration for growth, would require 3,900 applicants a year. Given the large number of applicants needed to fulfill the city's need for officers, it would be insufficient to focus only on city residents.

Review of the recruitment event schedule from 2006 through the first half of 2008, as provided by the department, revealed that 25 to 40 events each month were typical. The list of events attended demonstrates the breadth of the recruitment outreach effort to diverse groups. Included were:

LGBT Oriented Events

- Lesbian and Gay Fair
- Pride Event
- FTM Gender Odyssey
- LGBT Career Fair
- Castro Street Fair
- Folsom Street Fair

African American Oriented Events

- Juneteenth
- Black Expo
- Family Emergency Day
- Jones Family Arts and Crafts Festival
- African American Health Summit
- Alpha Phi Alpha Fundraiser
- March Gladness
- Kwanzaa Festival

Asian/Pacific Islander Oriented Events

- Tahiti Fete Festival
- Tahitian Festival
- Cherry Blossom Festival

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Asian Heritage Street Fair
- Nihonmachi Street Fair
- Pistahan Filipino Street Festival
- Aloha Festival
- Oakland Chinatown Event
- Dragon Festival
- Dragon Boat Festival
- Chinatown Night, Oakland
- Hula Festival
- Chinatown Community Street Fair
- Sing Tao Expo

Indian/Hindu/Middle Eastern Oriented Event

- Diwali Mela Indian Fair

Latino Oriented Events

- Carnival
- 24th Street Fair
- Viva Las Americas
- Dias de los Meuertos, Oakland

Women Oriented Event

- Women's Expo

In addition to events focused on specific ethnic and gender orientation populations, recruiters also regularly attend events at 13 military venues, 11 law enforcement venues, 42 educational venues, and another 55 events (job fairs and expos) drawing the general public. Recruiting events are listed on the SFPD's website as well as through media sources.

Recruiter presence at this expansive list of events gives the department access to an extremely diverse potential applicant pool. The overall success of the department's recruitment efforts, which are impressive, are demonstrated in the table below. In order to further ensure that recruitment efforts are focused on making the department truly representative of the community, Bay Area Census data are used to establish the specific demographic targets. This includes not only information about race and gender, but even attributes such as the percentage of the population over 25 who have meet the department's educational requirements.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

The following table depicts the breakdown of population in the Bay Area by race, compared to the current makeup of the department and the applicant pool resulting from the department's recent recruitment efforts.

**Table 68. Comparison of Percent of Population (By Race)
City, Department, Recruitment Efforts**

Race	Bay Area (2004 Estimate)	Currently on Department	Recruitment Effort Nov. 07 – Feb. 08
African/American	6.7	9.4	11.6
Am Indian/Alaska Native	.4	.33	1.1
Asian (including Filipino)	21.9	21.0	23.4
Hispanic (all races)	19.9	15.0	19.0
White	47.2	54.1	40.3
Other	2.9	.25	4.4
Female	50.4	16.4	10.8

Source: 2004 U. S Census Data, SFPD Recruitment Data

This table shows that the department's recruitment efforts have been relatively successful in bringing the makeup of the department to where it closely represents the breakdown of race in the San Francisco Bay Area. The only area in which a suggestion for improvement could be noted is in Hispanic representation. However, a review of the most recent recruitment efforts shows that that improvement has been realized. In fact, other than the very slight (.9%) difference in Hispanic representation in the Bay Area and the applicant pool, the department's current recruitment effort exceeds representation expectations for all other non-white categories.

As for female recruitment, recent efforts have resulted in almost 11 percent females in the applicant pool, compared to 16.4 percent % in the department and 50.4 percent in the Bay Area. The department's representation of female employees exceeds the average of 14 percent female officers found in police departments in the United States, but the female representation in the applicant pool should be increased.

Recommendation: Each year, in conjunction with planning and budgeting of the next recruitment effort, a formal assessment of the productivity of the prior year's activities that were productive in attracting applicants who were successful in completing the selection process should be undertaken. Currently, recruiters survey applicants who appear for the written test and document the results of individual activities and events they

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

attend to ensure that there is value in continuing them. So far, the department's array of recruitment initiatives employed has been effective at producing the large numbers of acceptable police officer candidates needed to fill its hiring goals. But as the competition for the best applicants becomes more fierce, the department will need to continuously improve its efforts.

Recommendation: The recruitment strategy undertaken by the department is multi-faceted and well thought out. Collectively, the recruitment initiatives currently in place in SFPD are exemplary and represent the best practices in recruitment among law enforcement agencies. While it recognizes that Internet recruiting and officer referrals are responsible for a large volume of applicants, the department still maintains a focus on community outreach to provide a diverse group of applicants with a local perspective. This is an important balance for the department to retain. As other police departments around the nation offer large signing bonuses and engage in long-distance recruiting to maintain their sworn strengths, SFPD should first continue to rely on its proven strategy. Applicants who are drawn to bonuses that only exist in the first year of employment and to jobs far from their current home are often the first to become disenchanted. Continuing to make the San Francisco Police Department the most professional and desired law enforcement job in the Bay Area is a better investment and more likely to attract city residents as potential police recruits. Since it is clear from the community input into the visioning process that San Franciscans have a distinct preference for police officers who share their values and know their communities, the department needs to continue to maintain this focus.

Recommendation: Recognizing that it has enjoyed a high rate of success with its own officers and civilian employees referring friends and family as police applicants, the department should exploit this opportunity. However, it is critical to understand that current employees won't be inclined to

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

recommend employment with the department to a friend or relative if they don't believe that person will be treated well on the job. In some departments this has been especially true among female and minority members. There is no suggestion that there is any perception of a problem between SFPD and any group or class of employees, but the department should always be mindful that one of its most valuable recruiting tactics depends on the treatment of its already on-board members.

Recommendation: It is clear that the department is interested in recruiting from all the groups represented in San Francisco's population. Measurable success is seen among most protected class groups. As previously pointed out, because of their current under-representation on the department, additional focus should be directed at attracting greater numbers of Hispanic and female applicants. Additionally, the department recognizes its responsibility to ensure the inclusion of the LGBT community in its recruitment effort. However, representation of this community among the makeup of the department and the applicant pool cannot be accurately tracked as it would be an EEO violation to inquire as to the sexual orientation/preference of an applicant. There is concern by some that the representation of this community within the department is far less than among the city's overall population. The list of events currently attended by recruiters hoping to attract LGBT applicants is formidable. But successful recruitment of LGBT applicants often demands more than attending events. It entails ensuring the department sends a clear message that a fully diverse array of applicants is encouraged to apply and that all qualified persons will be welcomed to join the department and will enjoy equal career opportunities

The department should create a corps of officers of various ethnicities and gender orientation willing to serve as "pre-employment mentors." By making all applicants aware of the availability of a diverse

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

group of mentors, interested applicants could request these officer-mentors to liaison with them if they are still uncertain about joining the ranks of the department. By linking potential applicants with officer-mentors who may have once faced the same anxieties, the department may be able to address LGBT applicant's concerns and thereby cast a wider recruitment net. The department also should make a clear statement on its recruitment Web page that all qualified persons are encouraged to apply and that current officers of various ethnicities and gender orientation are available as pre-employment mentors to any potential applicant who would desire such contact for reassurance about the department as an employer.

Recommendation: The department offers a signing bonus for lateral officers who accept employment as officers with SFPD. Bringing in experienced and fully trained officers can be cost-effective, but the practice can also occasionally attract officers looking to switch agencies for less than ideal reasons. Whether attracted by a signing bonus or an opportunity for a fresh start, the department needs to be very vigilant in its background process to ensure the quality of the lateral officers it accepts.

Recommendation: Young people today are not as inclined to seek out careers in law enforcement as was once the case. Recruiters should aggressively seek out qualified potential applicants from among those who are targeting private-sector employment. This means understanding who the competition is and what they are offering. This is not a new strategy for most recruiters, but the focus may be. Good recruiters have long known that they need to be familiar with the salary and benefits offered by competing law enforcement agencies, but they have not focused on the non-law enforcement competition. Recruiters must be able to compare the short- and long-term career benefits offered by the department. They need to be conversant about the supervisory and managerial opportunities within the department and how they compare to the management track in the major private-sector

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

employers in the region. Recruiters need to be able to build not only a case for a career in policing, but also a strong case for how the SFPD can offer a rewarding and exciting career that meets or exceeds private-sector opportunities.


A matrix should be developed that draws comparisons between the department and its competitors in policing and the local private sector; and recruiters should be made familiar with the material. Then in the future, especially when visiting college campuses, recruiters can expand their efforts to include a focus well beyond law enforcement. Desirable applicants can be found among students and graduates in communications, psychology, marketing, engineering and other disciplines, especially during difficult employment markets.

RR. SELECTION

In 2007, the Accelerated Police Officer Hiring Program was adopted to expedite the selection/hiring process and place qualified candidates in the academy as quickly as possible. This program has proven to be successful. The process, depicted in the following flow diagram, was designed to identify which applicants are best suited to be San Francisco Police Officers. Under this program, hiring announcements are written in English, Spanish, Russian, and Chinese (although recruits must be U.S. citizens). Minimum hiring criteria include a high school diploma, GED, or California High School Proficiency exam. Applicants must be at least 20 years old and must pass a background investigation before being eligible for service. The current starting salary is \$75,868 and may range to \$97,656 after five years.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

1. The Accelerated Selection Process



2. Written Exam

Applicants for the police department are now offered a written test once a month. The test is provided free to the city by the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and is changed each month. Applicants are given two and a half hours to complete the test. The answer sheets are sent to POST and the results are returned in approximately one week on a diskette. The passing score is determined by each agency. Currently the minimum score for the SFPD is 42. Approximately 300 to 400 applicants take the test each month.

On the same day the applicants take the written test, they complete a pre-background survey. All applicants are notified of their test results by mail, and those who pass are notified of a date for an oral board. Applicants who do not pass the test may retake it but are advised they will need to acquire additional knowledge if they expect to be successful. Applicants who pass may not retake the test to try for a higher score. As the test is created by POST, anyone taking the test anywhere in the state may submit their results to the SFPD and begin the application process as long as they have scored the minimum 42.

3. Oral Interview

Oral boards are conducted with one civilian and one sworn officer. The officer must have at least three years of service, and the civilian must be a graduate of the Community Police Academy or someone recommended by one of the district captains. Typically 22 to 26 sets of oral board members are needed for each series of oral interviews.

POST provides the questions; however, POST does not provide pass/fail guidelines. There are six questions: three on problem-solving and three on interpersonal skills. Applicants are allowed to review the questions a few minutes prior to entering the room. The raters may give one of three ratings: A (highly recommended), B (recommended), or C (not recommended). The raters must agree on their ratings. Applicants who fail the oral board are allowed to retake the board one time only. Fifty percent of the applicants who retake the oral board pass on the second attempt.

4. Physical Ability Test

Applicants who pass the oral board are invited to take the physical ability test. The ability test was designed five years ago for the city by a consultant. The test is given at the police academy, where officers assist with the “work sample” portion, which is similar to an obstacle course, followed by tests for sit-ups, arm lifts, leg endurance (pedaling a stationary bike), and trigger pull. Points are assessed for each section, with a minimum passing grade of 666; ultimately the test is pass/fail. An applicant who completes the “work sample” in 44.4 seconds or less is allowed to skip all remaining parts of the ability test with the exception of the trigger pull.

Applicants may re-take the physical ability test but are advised that they will need to improve their fitness if they expect to be successful.

5. Personal History Form

Each candidate who passes the physical test and who wants to remain in the process completes a personal history questionnaire. This is set up as a Scantron answer sheet. The instrument includes questions about prior drug use, driving history and criminal history. The form and cutoff scores have been developed by Roberts and Associates, the consulting firm used by the department for psychological and human resources issues. This firm has a long history with the SFPD and has developed its testing approaches through extensive research.

6. Initial Screening Interview

Candidates who advance past the Personal History Form are requested to come to the department for a prescreening interview with the background investigator

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

assigned to their application. This session is designed to review elements of the personal history form, to fingerprint the applicant, and to collect hair and urine samples for drug testing. Although the department has standards that tolerate some prior drug use, the standards are not publicized in order to prevent attempts to “game” the system. The standards evolve over time based on perceived community standards. Prior to this interview, checks usually are performed on the applicant’s criminal and driving history based on information supplied in the personal history questionnaire.

7. Background Investigation

Those remaining in the process are given a full background history booklet to complete. This information is to be returned within two weeks or the candidate is disqualified. Each person completing the package is placed in the “to be assigned” group. The department uses 20 part-time and eight full-time background investigators. Once cases are assigned, the objective is to conduct thorough investigations as quickly as possible so as not to lose candidates because of a delay. Typically the goal for each background investigator is five to eight cases, with all interviews to be completed within three weeks. Getting work letters and some written references may take longer, but the department strives to move forward expeditiously.

8. Conditional Offer of Employment

Typically a conditional offer of employment is given after a candidate passes the background check. At times, to expedite processing and when preliminary investigation indicates that the applicant is likely to satisfy the requirements of becoming a bona fide candidate, a conditional offer of employment may be given while a few loose ends are being tied up.

9. Psychological Test Battery, Polygraph, Clinical Interview, and Medical Examination

The exact sequence of these aspects of the selection process may vary depending on the availability of some of the service providers. However, because both polygraph and the battery of psychological test results are needed for the clinical interview, these tests take place before the interview.

The battery of psychological tests, developed through research by Roberts and Associates, requires four to seven hours of test-taking. Test results are then tabulated and prepared for the clinical psychological interview. These interviews, conducted by staff from Roberts and Associates, are designed to find the best candidates for working as an SFPD officer. The Roberts firm has a long history with the department, and the process undergoes constant assessment and review to ensure the reliability and validity of the background process.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

10. Qualifications Review

The department conducts monthly hiring meetings during which each candidate is discussed. Typically the meetings include the lieutenant overseeing the hiring process, the background investigators, the sergeant in charge of the background investigations, HR representatives, and Dr. Roberts or another clinical interviewer. Consensus is sought as to whether each candidate is qualified or not qualified.

Qualified Pool: All of those who pass the entire process are placed on the “certified” list. If more are certified than are needed for the next recruit academy, the department’s human resources lieutenant chooses the best candidates to start the academy. Those not selected may be held over for the next pool and can stay on the list for two years.

11. First-Year Successes

Information provided by the Department of Human Resources indicates that in 2006, prior to the adoption of the accelerated program, the testing cycle started in February with 1,639 applicants who were processed over a five-month period. Of those applicants, 633 passed the written exam, and in July, 347 were placed on an eligibility list and referred for background investigations. In 2007 under the accelerated program, since applicants were no longer required to complete a full application at the start of the process, the number who actually started the process was not reported – only the number of applicants who passed the exam (999). Of those, 543 were forwarded to the background phase of the process.

When comparing those who passed the exam to those who were forwarded to the background phase, both years were nearly identical at 54 percent, but under the accelerated process five smaller groups of applicants were tested and forwarded for background investigations, one in each of five consecutive months. By cutting the processing of each group through the written, oral and physical abilities exams to under two months, the department is far better able to make job offers to the best applicants before they are lost to other employment opportunities. A compressed schedule of selection events can be arranged to minimize the number of trips to the city by out-of-town applicants. Moreover, the processing of smaller groups is less labor-intensive and far less logistically complex.

Since the accelerated process was adopted, the department has convened seven recruit classes with a total of 316 recruits (13 were lateral officers). It is interesting to note that from 2001 through 2006, the average attrition (voluntary separation and termination) of recruits from the academy or the Field Training Officer (FTO) Program was just over 32 percent. Data relative to the first three

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

recruit classes convened after the accelerated process was adopted indicates a total academy and FTO attrition average of less than 21 percent.⁷

The SFPD offers a Pre-Academy Program to help ensure that potential applicants are given an accurate picture of the job of a San Francisco police officer and information about testing and the hiring process. Self-assessments of reading and writing skills are provided to test readiness for the exam, and applicants take physical ability practice tests and obtain information about courses to prepare for the exam and the academy. The non-credit class offered by City College of San Francisco was offered in both a one-day, eight-hour course, and a multiple-day, 18-hour session. These orientations were considered very effective but have not been continued due to their high fiscal cost. The department is producing a video which is intended to give candidates the same information but in a different medium.

The SFPD also makes use of a Lateral Hiring Program to attract current law enforcement officers in outside agencies. California POST certification and patrol experience are required, although candidates are able to attend an accelerated seven- or eight-week academy. Opportunities are available to transfer to specialized units. A \$5,000 signing bonus is provided to candidates after completion of field training. Opportunities for Reserve, Intern, and Civilian positions are also available and described on the SFPD website.

Recommendation: By all accounts, the Department of Human Resources and the San Francisco Police Department have developed a continuously open application and hiring process that produces the number of acceptable officer applicants needed each year. This new accelerated process is streamlined and works well to reduce the time it takes to present qualified applicants to the police department. It is more user-friendly to applicants in that it can group activities into a single week or a few days. Because high-quality applicants can more quickly be encouraged about the chances for placement in an upcoming academy, they will more likely be hired than lost to competing agencies. The process saves city and police department resources by eliminating time-consuming steps without diminishing the quality of the selection process. The accelerated

⁷ Though seven recruit classes were convened in 2007, only three are referenced here because one was a lateral class in which no attrition occurred and the data provided for the last two classes of the year did not account for their FTO periods – which had not been completed when the data was compiled. However, the academy attrition for those two classes was under six percent, which is markedly less than prior classes.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

selection process is regarded by PERF as a “best practice” and should be continued.

Recommendation: Although the department does periodically examine its process, it should, on an annual basis, formally review each component of the selection process – and the process as a whole – to determine if the process and its components are valid and useful and do not have an improper adverse impact on any group of applicants. Only components that demonstrate validity, utility and minimum adverse impact should be part of the process.

Recommendation: The department should conduct an ongoing review of the recruits hired to ensure that the selection process is effective at promoting those with the characteristics described in its Vision. The best candidates should be people who “adhere to the highest standards and reflect the diversity of [the city’s] community members.” Their backgrounds should exhibit the values of “hard work, ingenuity and resourcefulness.”

Recommendation: The decision about choosing the best candidates from the certified list should not be made by a single person. This final review should include the Administration Bureau commander and deputy chief and the Field Operations Bureau deputy chief since those who successfully complete the new officer training program will begin their careers in the Field Operations Bureau.

SS. BASIC ACADEMY TRAINING

The San Francisco Police Academy conducts its Regular Basic Course at the Law Enforcement Regional Training Center. This five-acre facility (formerly a school purchased from the San Francisco Unified School District) houses the training division of the SFPD and also serves as the facility for in-service and allied agency training. The Center contains five classrooms, three computer labs with desktop computers, administrative offices, locker rooms, a gym/auditorium, a cafeteria, weight and physical fitness rooms, driving simulator room, and a FATS III training room, as well as additional ancillary rooms. There is a separate adjoining weight-training building and modular classroom on site. A paved running track and outdoor field area are located at the adjacent George Christopher Park. The facility currently operates at maximum capacity, and recommendations have been made to expand the training space. Basic

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

firearms training is conducted at the Lake Merced Range, along with the Airport Range which is used for additional officer survival training. Scenario-based testing is conducted at the Presidio. EVOG facilities are located at Pier 94 of the Port of San Francisco. The Academy is certified to conduct nine academies per fiscal year, with classes overlapping by approximately one to two months. The average number of recruits is expected to be at 250 annually for the next several years.

In terms of training development and delivery, the SFPD Academy is working to move from a traditional pedagogical model of adult learning to a more andragogical model. Essentially, this means the role of the educator is redefined and students “learn by doing,” as opposed to lectures and rote memorization. To this end, the SFPD invests in the latest technology and presentation equipment to facilitate a variety of instructional methods and to accommodate a variety of learning styles.

The Academy Director is a lieutenant who is supported by two sergeants, two Recruit Training Officer (RTO) sergeants, four RTOs, and a part-time RTO who provides instruction on report-writing. Four clerical employees (three full-time and one part-time) assist sworn Academy staff.

The California Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST) completed an audit of the SFPD Academy in 2007. The POST team listed recommendations for change and cited exemplary aspects of the recruit training program.

1. Summary of POST Recommendations for Change

- The Academy facility is currently utilized at maximum capacity. The review team supports development of a formal strategic plan for upgrading the Academy’s infrastructure. Plans for future expansion of Academy training space should be developed and submitted for approval, and supported by the Department.
- The current Recruit Training Officer (RTO) staff-to-student ratio exceeds the POST recommended maximum ratio of 1:25. The number of full-time RTOs should be increased to lower the ratio. The Academy has recently obtained approval to add one RTO sergeant and two RTOs, and interviews for those positions were under way at the time of the review.
- Due to capacity limitations in the Academy Training Center, it is recommended that the Youth Services Unit/School Resource Officer Program and Recruiting units be moved offsite, so that those offices can be made available for training.
- The classroom, which held a class of 214 at the time of the review, is too small and does not have adequate air conditioning. Large classes cannot be accommodated in this classroom. Due to the lack of space, recruits in this class indicated they wanted to move to a classroom in the modular building, and Academy staff accommodated their request.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- The Academy should have additional clerical support to assist with course certification and administration duties.
- Beginning with the next Academy class, the Academy schedule should be revised to meet POST continuity and frequency requirements for Physical Conditioning. Corrections to the schedule were made during the review.
- Restrooms in the Academy facility and at the Presidio are inadequate for the number of Academy recruits and staff. Additional restrooms should be added, or the training should be relocated to an area with more restrooms.
- Parking and locker space at the Academy facility is not sufficient for the number of recruits and staff. Additional parking and lockers should be added, or the training should be relocated to an area with more lockers and parking.
- The weapons vault capacity at the Lake Merced Range has been exceeded. Additional secured space for firearms storage should be identified.
- The virus checking program on the TMAS computers is expired and should be updated.
- Additional computers and access points should be identified and installed to increase recruit testing capacity.
- The Academy should ensure that the four Lifetime Fitness required learning activities meet POST requirements, and are not presented only in lecture format.

2. Exemplary Aspects of the Program According to POST

- The Academy Training Center is clean and well cared for. There are many indications of agency pride and commitment to law enforcement training.
- Academy staff members demonstrate leadership and motivation in a success-oriented environment which contributes to recruit achievement.
- Strict limitation of access to TMAS and testing materials ensures test integrity.
- The quality of the Basic Course documentation is superior and signifies that substantial efforts have been made to create and maintain course records. This allows for immediate access to records and thorough documentation of Academy guidelines and recruits' performance.
- The San Francisco Police Department has made recruit training a priority, confirmed by long-term planning to upgrade computer training resources at the Academy Training Center.
- The academy exceeds minimum curriculum requirements in the area of stress management knowledge and comprehension by having students practice stress management in 5-6 sessions.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Pre-academy orientation workshops for potential recruits help to minimize attrition rates and enhance recruit performance during Academy training.

Overall, the SFPD Academy is successfully providing basic law enforcement training to as diverse a group of recruits as the city's recruiting operations are able to provide. The staff is enthusiastic, dedicated, and open to innovation. Staff members continue to examine all aspects of the recruit training process, looking for ways to improve the instruction and produce a well-trained recruit.

The areas of report-writing and English language skills continue to present challenges to the training staff. The report-writing difficulty is not unique to the SFPD, as most agencies report that writing skills of new recruits have declined, even for those with college degrees. The city's efforts to recruit more diverse applicants are bringing in more applicants whose primary language is not English. This presents problems in several areas where verbal and written communications are key elements. Some thought has been given to raising the "T" score on the written test, which could reduce the number of applicants with English language deficiencies; however, there is concern that this could have an adverse impact on some of the groups that the department is working hard to recruit.

The Department of Human Resources' current requirement for applicants to achieve a minimum 42 T-score is rooted in CA POST's suggestion that a 40 score, or less, equates to below average. The following is POST's description of T-score ratings.

"When POST electronically scans your test answers, statistical calculations are performed to convert your raw score (the number of items you answered correctly) into a 'T-score.' A T-score is a standardized score that places your performance on the test into a distribution (bell-shaped curve) with a midpoint (average) of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. If your score falls around 50, your performance is considered 'average' when compared to other applicants who have taken the test. If you score 40 or below, your performance is considered 'below average' when compared to other applicants who have taken the test. If you score 60 or above, your performance is considered 'above average' when compared to other applicants who have taken the test. Research shows that the likelihood of successful academy completion increases for every point above 42 your score."

POST's research clearly states that applicants with higher scores will have a greater likelihood of successful academy completion. With some 32 percent of applicants not completing the academy or the FTO program, the costs associated with the hiring of applicants who do not have a successful academy experience are significant. Raising the T-score requirement closer to 50 would likely eliminate some of those who would later fail, but it would also eliminate some

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

who would go on to successfully complete the academy and become productive officers. The makeup of those eliminated cannot be accurately predicted.

Applicants who have taken the entrance exam, anywhere in the state, within the past two years, and scored the required minimum of 42 may submit their results to begin the San Francisco Police Department's application process.

Thorough documentation throughout the training process has enabled the staff to perform detailed analysis of where and when in the training cycle and why recruits leave the program. This analysis is then used to examine training practices to identify any causal factors which the academy can address. "Family Issues" have been one of the more perplexing reasons recruits leave the academy. This could include situations in which a spouse or other significant family member has withdrawn their support for the job, a realization that off-duty restrictions and rules of behavior impact activities at home which other family members find hard to accept, or other reasons that result in a family member bringing pressure on the recruit to quit. The academy staff is working on strategies to address the attrition due to "family issues." Attrition due to academic or disciplinary reasons is relatively clear-cut, and some of those losses are natural and necessary in the whole recruit training process. Overall, the attrition rate is declining.

Basic recruit training averages 32 weeks. The exact length can vary according to how many scheduled holidays fall within the training cycle. The basic curriculum is prescribed by the state under POST (Peace Officer Standards and Training). POST has set the minimum number of hours for each subject area. All instructors must be POST-certified, which requires that each instructor must attend an instructor/presenter training course. Instructors in high-liability areas (EVOC, firearms, and defensive tactics) must have additional specialized training in their specific subject areas. Regular contact hours are required to maintain instructor certification. Eighty percent of the instructors are sworn.

The basic academy is operated in a quasi-military atmosphere where the students are expected to address the staff by rank and name. Students and staff members are in uniform. While the academy is based upon a military structure, the teaching program is "success-based," rather than "failure-based," as is some military training. The academy staff's focus is on helping all students succeed in their training, rather than trying to "wash out" weaker students.

Academy staffing is currently structured with six officers and two sergeants being assigned to basic training. The current classes have staggered starting times, which allows for flexible coverage by staff. A team of one sergeant and three officers is assigned to a class, which maintains continuity throughout the training cycle. The team handles all administrative duties, assists with some training, and coordinates with the specific subject matter instructors.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

If the city successfully seeks and accepts police applicants at an increased rate, the training staff will not be able to keep up with the demand without a strong commitment from the administration. Either staffing levels will need to be augmented by paying overtime for instructors, or additional instructors will need to be “detailed” to the academy for specific periods of time. Most instructors come from the various areas within the department where they currently work in their area of expertise. As the number of recruit classes grows, the instructors will have an ever increasing teaching load as well as their regular duties. Many of these same instructors teach in-service training as well as basic, which means they will be stretched even farther.

POST requires that California basic recruit classes offer at least 664 hours of instruction in 43 Learning Domains as well as on reviews, demonstrations and examinations. Of the total 48 POST-required instructional categories, the San Francisco Police Department requires that its recruits receive more than the POST-mandated training in 37 categories. Additionally, the SFPD has established five other categories to which it allocates academy time – administration, additional examinations, additional lectures, practical exercises, and staff instruction.

Examples of topics added by the SFPD not included in the POST curriculum include airport Police Operations, Elder Abuse/Seniors, 290 Registrants, I.V. Drug Users, Mobile Assistance Patrol, Municipal Codes, Office of Citizen Complaints, Victim Services, and Vice Crimes. Other additions include sessions with the SFPD police employee groups and discussions of the department’s field training program.

The table below shows POST Learning Domains in which the department regularly schedules five or more hours of additional instruction.

Table 69. Post Learning Domains and SFD Academy Hours

LD #	POST Learning Domain	POST Required Hours	SFPD Scheduled Hours	SFPD Added Hours
33	Defensive Tactics	60	151.5	91.5
SFPR	Practical Exercises	0	66	66
SFLE	Lectures	0	44.25	44.25
30	Preliminary Investigation	12	48.5	36.5
SFSI	Staff Instruction	0	30	30
29	Traffic Accident Investigation	12	40	28
42	Cultural Diversity/Discrimination	16	44	28
18	Investigative Report Writing	52	76	24
43	Emergency Management	16	40	24
SFAD	Administration	0	23	23
19	Vehicle Operations	24	44	20
36	Information Systems	2	22	20

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

LD #	POST Learning Domain	POST Required Hours	SFPD Scheduled Hours	SFPD Added Hours
32	Lifetime Fitness	44	61	17
3	Police and the Community	18	30	12
28	Traffic Enforcement	16	28	12
31	Custody	2	10	8
CASD	POST Scenario Demonstrations	18	26	8
21	Patrol Techniques	12	19	7
34	First Aid and CPR	21	28	7
38	Gangs Awareness	2	8	6
35	Firearms/Chemical Agents	72	77	5

Source: California POST Data; SFPD Training Academy Data

The department has made substantial increases in defensive tactics and practical exercises. The increased instruction in defensive tactics can assist officers in ensuring their own safety and decreasing harm to suspects who choose to resist the police. The addition of practical exercises is an important element to better prepare recruits for the actual work of police officers on the street.

The department's minimum basic recruit hours of instructions are 1,225, almost double the POST minimum of 664. In some recruit classes the hours may increase to accommodate emerging or other important local issues that may arise.

The SFPD recruit curriculum extends over approximately 32 weeks. It is somewhat longer than San Jose at about 23 weeks, San Diego at approximately 26 weeks and Los Angeles at approximately 26 weeks. The longer curriculum is justified by the complexity of police work in San Francisco, with a need for special emphasis on working with the City's diverse cultures, enhanced defensive tactics, and practical exercises.

Recommendation: The department should develop an academy for the families of applicants being processed to attend the recruit academy. Over a few evenings, instructors could give family members and significant others an understanding of the job of a San Francisco police officer as well as the rigors of the academy. This can open the door to valuable discussions – before the academy starts – between the applicants and those who could potentially cause a recruit to drop out later. Clearly, the academy format and focus need to be positive and should not “solicit problems,” but it should present an honest depiction of the stresses and rewards (to the family) of the academy and life as an officer.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Recommendation: Although the San Francisco Police Academy is a very good example of an advanced traditional basic police training academy, the department should continue to enhance its approach to recruit training in order to align the critical process of training new officers with the department's Vision statement. This requires the department to enhance its approach to training recruits in three areas: instructional methodology, curriculum enhancement in areas critical to Vision attainment, and topic sequencing. Changes in each of these areas will help the department implement its Vision with regard to:

- Developing a workforce reflective of the city through training recruits to become a part of the community through active engagement and community policing;
- Moving from reactive to proactive policing by helping recruits learn how to develop problem-solving partnerships, gaining a thorough understanding of problems and then working with community members to develop responses;
- Ensuring accountability by emphasizing the necessity for recruits to always behave in an ethical manner; and
- Building careers and developing personnel by ensuring that recruits acquire lifelong learning skills while they are at the academy.

3. Instructional Methodology

The training academy has expressed a commitment to a more “andragogical” model of instruction in which learners are partners in the educational process. The role of the educator is redefined, and students “learn by doing” as opposed to lectures and rote memorization. Thus, the academy has expressed a desire to move away from the traditional “pedagogical” model in which the educator leads the students to knowledge primarily through lecture and guided discussion. The academy indicates that it has invested in the latest technology and presentation equipment to facilitate a variety of instructional methods and to accommodate a variety of learning styles.

Full implementation of an andragogical model requires more than technology and presentation equipment. Academy data does not determine the extent to which

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

classroom training is lecture format rather than learning activity-based. The following chart from the Academy does not distinguish the allocation of time between the two instructional methodologies.

Table 70. Training Venues and Time Allocation

Training Venue	Hours	Percent
Classroom	785	64%
Physical Training/Defensive Tactics	200	16%
Emergency Vehicle Operations	40	3%
SIMS (Tactical Simulations)	35	3%
Range	60	5%
Officer Safety Field Tactics	40	3%
Drill	7	1%
Testing	60	5%
TOTAL HOURS	1227	

Source: SFPD Training Academy Data

Recommendation: The POST Learning Domain lesson plans include wide ranging “Learning Activities.” The academy should endeavor to incorporate these activities to the maximum extent possible and should record for each class the ratio of lecture to activity. It should continually strive to minimize lectures.

4. Royal Canadian Mounted Police Training as a Model

The Cadet Training Program conducted by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police serves as a benchmark for the SFPD training program, for several reasons. The RCMP uses an andragogical approach; its training is based on the principles of community policing; and it emphasizes the importance of embracing diversity and rejecting intolerance.

Under the RCMP’s andragogical approach, “Cadets are responsible to a large extent for their own learning and development. They are required to seek out appropriate information, resolve problems in consultation with partners, and ensure continuous assessment and improvement of work practices.” Furthermore, “Training is delivered using a variety of methods, such as scenario training (problem-solving exercises), role play, lectures, panel discussions, research, presentations and community interaction. The emphasis is on life-like scenarios.” The academy grounds include a model station complete with booking and a holding cell and various dwelling and commercial structures to provide a wide array of sites for practical exercises.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

The RCMP also informs its cadets that the department's approach to cadet training is guided by the principles of community policing. The RCMP states that:

“Your training will emphasize:

- the philosophy and principles of community policing;
- problem-solving approaches;
- service and client-orientation;
- development and maintenance of partnerships and alliances in the context of diversity; and
- continuous learning and improvement.”

The RCMP's reference to “client orientation,” above, means learning how to understand the needs and expectations of the public. This includes training in “establishing and maintaining partnerships, answering calls for assistance, calls to incidents in progress and investigations after a crime has been committed, as well as requests by clients and community groups to address identified problems.”

Furthermore, the RCMP tells its cadets that it “holds sensitivity to diversity as essential to interpersonal relations and building partnerships for quality policing. Discrimination and harassment are behaviors which the RCMP will not tolerate. As a potential RCMP member, you will be expected to actively seek to prevent, and rigorously oppose, any form of discrimination or harassment and any violation of laws, policies and procedures.”

The San Francisco Police Department and its training academy should fully embrace and implement the RCMP interactive learning instructional methodology described by the RCMP as follows:

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police Training Academy and the Canadian Law Enforcement Training Unit have modified all courses to incorporate the most advanced teaching techniques. No longer are course candidates expected to sit and absorb knowledge by listening to the traditional lecture mode of instruction. Instead, the candidates are asked to actively participate in the learning process.

Today's methods focus on adult learning. We provide the necessary tools for learning, and the candidates use these tools to direct their own learning. The instructor/facilitator facilitates the learning process, and while lectures as a means of training have not disappeared, they have been complemented by such methods as problem-based learning, individualized instructional modules, and research assignments.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Problem-based learning, which includes scenarios, is one of our most popular and successful instructional methods. It allows the candidates to practice what they have learned under the guidance of their course facilitator and other resource personnel, who then provide the feedback creating a dynamic learning environment.

Recommendation: Curriculum Enhancement: In SFPD's current curriculum, community policing and problem-solving, community engagement, and ethical behavior are shown as being taught as discrete modules toward the beginning of the course of instruction. The department should infuse these topics into the entire curriculum as both philosophical and practical foundations of how policing is to be conducted in San Francisco. PERF developed such an integrated curriculum for the Massachusetts Criminal Justice Training Council some years ago, embedding community policing, problem-solving, and ethical behavior through the course of instruction.

Recommendation: Topic Sequencing: As part of revising the basic recruit curriculum, the department should seek to more closely integrate topics according to the work flow that a new officer is likely to encounter. For example, a substantial portion of the self-initiated work of a patrol officer is vehicle stops. Well-integrated training should have the vehicle stops skills sequenced immediately after each other. For example, officers might need the skills to answer the following questions in sequence:

- What are the legal requirements to stop a vehicle?
- How do I announce to dispatch my intention to stop a vehicle?
- What emergency equipment must I activate and how do I do so?
- What do I do if the vehicle flees or refuses to stop?
- How do I drive my vehicle safely during a vehicle stop?

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Once the subject vehicle stops, how do I put my vehicle in the most advantageous and tactically safe position?
- What should I tell my partner or back-up to do?
- How do I get out of my vehicle and best approach the subject vehicle?
- What signs of danger should I be alert for?
- What should I say to the driver?
- How do I check license, registration, and/or insurance?
- What search and seizure regulations must I observe?
- When can I require the driver to get out of the vehicle? Passengers?
- What threats should I be looking for when they get out?
- When can I cite the driver?
- When can I arrest the driver and/or passengers?
- ... and, the sequence would continue, reflecting different scenarios and issues that arise during vehicle stops.

The current curriculum, like many recruit training programs, provides skill development in these areas, at times out of sequence, and at times some distance removed from each other. For example, no specific topic of “vehicle searches” is listed in the course outline. “Traffic Enforcement” appears two weeks before “Vehicle Stops.” “High Risk Felony Vehicle Stops” is not introduced until seven weeks later. The department should fine tune the curriculum sequence and redesign it around the core tasks that new police officers will be expected to perform.

Recommendation: Any time the department expands the force options available for use by its officers, it is critical that officers are first trained. This is true both for defensive tactics and proficiency with issued equipment such as tasers, batons, chemical agents, etc. When applicable, this type of training should be mandatory for all sworn personnel before any new force option is authorized, and then incorporated into recruit and in-service training.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

TT. FIELD TRAINING

The FTO (Field Training Officer) program is charged with the continued training of officers after they graduate from the academy. The FTO program also monitors probationary officers (officers who have been officially released from training are considered probationary for one year). The FTO program is part of a POST requirement that new officers spend three rotations (five weeks, five weeks, and six weeks—the last two weeks being evaluation only) with a field training officer. Three different FTOs are placed on three different watches. Lateral transfer officers have two rotations of five weeks. Per General Order 3.13 (rev. 10/07/98), “all probationary officers who have completed the POST Basic Course must satisfactorily complete the Field Training Program prior to being assigned regular patrol duties.”

Approximately one-fourth of the new officers are given an additional (extended) rotation for various reasons. Of those who are extended, approximately 50 percent fail to pass field training and are discharged from the SFPD.

Only eight of the ten district stations are used for FTO training, as two are considered not busy enough for adequate training. As the number of new recruits increases, it may become necessary that one of these stations be used for training.

Each district station used for training has an FTO lieutenant, two FTO sergeants, and a varying number of FTOs. FTOs earn extra pay for each day they have a trainee assigned to them. POST regulations dictate that trainees may only work with an FTO or FTO Sergeant. If neither is available, the trainee is assigned to station duty. The FTO program is struggling to staff the FTO positions. There are currently about 200 trained FTOs, 50 of whom are not in patrol assignments. Thirty others are unavailable for other reasons. FTOs (both Officers and Sergeants) must have three years of experience in patrol before they may apply to become an FTO.

San Francisco’s program is based upon the San Jose model, though the SFPD has indicated that it is gradually moving toward the Reno model, which uses learning styles favored by adults and promotes scenario-based training. It was indicated that problem-solving receives prominent attention throughout an officer’s field training. SARA problem solving is measured daily through phases 2 and 3.

However, in reviewing the SFPD’s Field Training Manual, it is fairly evident that the problem-solving and community-oriented policing components that are associated with the Reno model do not appear to be emphasized to any considerable extent in San Francisco. Trainees are assessed on “Dimension 34: Community Policing Problem Solving Techniques,” but the outline for problem-solving in “The Field Training Manual for Police Officers, January 2006 Edition” provides instruction that is limited predominantly to how to complete forms:

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Guidelines For Completing the COPPS “Problem Solving Worksheet”
- Problem Solving Worksheet SFPD 43
- Community Policing Problem Solving Worksheet (Field Training Program)

This material is presented in week six but is not referred to thereafter. The outline for Community Policing consists almost exclusively of the procedure for conducting and recording “passing calls.”

As the Reno model is specifically designed to incorporate community policing and problem-solving principles into field training, the SFPD will need to give considerable thought to expanding these concepts across its FTO curriculum. However, SFPD does make an effort to match recruit learning styles with FTOs who share similar traits, so in this manner the training is more personalized to a given recruit’s learning style.

A Daily Observation Report (DOR) consisting of 33 categories is completed by the FTO for each tour of duty and is reviewed daily by the FTO and the trainee. These reports are currently completed manually, and there is no plan to automate this process. The following issues have been identified regarding trainees who do not make it through the program: lack of motivation, unwillingness to accept criticism, unwillingness to do work on own time, and failure to accept responsibility for one’s own success or failure.

The department compiles information as to which recruits failed to complete their field training and probationary period and the reasons why. This is being used as feedback to both the recruit training staff and the department’s recruiters. From a training perspective, it serves to identify training areas that need to be strengthened during academy training. Recruiters can use the information to determine where their efforts are most and least successful at finding recruits who survive their first year.

Recommendation: The SFPD should revise its FTO program and accompanying documents to integrate ethics, community policing and problem-solving throughout the curriculum. The Reno model is not an exact match to the needs of the SFPD, but it should serve as a basis for a customized derivative. While the SFPD’s FTO manual makes mention of topics such as integrity and the commitment to solving neighborhood problems, a review of the manual shows that concepts such as ethics/integrity, community policing, and problem-solving are not given consistent attention throughout the length of the program. When these topics are mentioned, they are addressed in isolation. Instead, they should be seamlessly integrated across all topics in the curriculum.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

For example, while the Elder Abuse component (page 111/2.45) indicates that Adult Protective Services is to be involved in abuse cases, there is no discussion concerning the establishment of proactive collaboration with APS and nonprofits to deliver services to clients, seek treatment for the abuser, and reduce the likelihood of future harm. Similarly, the Domestic Violence component concerns itself mostly with evidence collection, restraining orders, and determining the primary aggressor. There is no substantive discussion of making referrals to shelters, obtaining counseling for the aggressor, or considering other forms of counseling (such as financial counseling in cases where perpetrators or victims have financial problems). Similarly, the Traffic Enforcement section could include language about racial profiling and ethics.

As the SFPD moves from the traditional San Jose field training model and toward the more community-oriented Reno model, significant revisions to the FTO program and the manual will need to be made. Such revisions will assist the department in continuing to move toward full implementation of its Vision. As stated in the PERF/COPS Office publication *PTO: An Overview and Introduction*, the Reno PTO⁸ model was established when the Reno Police Department discovered that concepts such as community policing and problem-oriented policing did not fit well with the San Jose model; recruits considered these topics to be two in a series of other training topics, as opposed to philosophical and attitudinal shifts on the part of police departments. Hence, recruits were not encouraged to practice these concepts in their day-to-day activities. Reno developed a new model that incorporated these techniques and made them inherent to the training program.

⁸ Note that one of the primary nuances of the Reno model is that their program is called a *Patrol* Training Officer program (PTO) vs. a *Field* Training Officer program (FTO). This is a deliberate change based upon the belief that “field” is a military term, and hence incorporating military terminology into the program would condition officers to have a military mindset.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Additionally, the Reno model employs problem-based learning methods which use problem-solving as the basis for learning. Students are presented with a real-life problem they are expected to solve. The goal is for trainees to learn to look at problems in a broad community context. It encourages trainees to explore, analyze, and think systematically.

1. Qualifications for Field Training Officers and Sergeants

Per General Order 3.13, unless a candidate obtains an exemption from the Chief, field training candidates (both officers and sergeants) must have a minimum of three years experience in the Patrol Division. Selection is based on demonstrated overall competency as an officer or supervisor, as well as the capacity to train others, provide positive reinforcement, and act as a role model. Candidates who have a significant history of complaints or who are deemed inappropriate role models based on their personal history are ineligible for selection into the program.

After the application process is announced, applications are accepted and recommendations are obtained by the applicant's most recent supervisor. A selection panel is established, consisting of the Field Training Coordinator, a commanding officer from the Patrol Division, and a lieutenant or sergeant with field training experience from the Patrol Division. The panel proceeds to review supervisor recommendations and other records which include (but are not limited to): Performance Improvement Program, Personnel Division, Office of Citizen Complaints, Management Control Division, Legal Division, Equal Employment Opportunity, and training records. Candidates are interviewed before the selection panel, two field trainers, and a lieutenant or sergeant from another patrol station.

The Field Training Coordinator then forwards a list of candidates who are approved by a majority of the panel to the Assistant Chief and the Chief of Police. The Chief is also provided with a list of candidates who were not selected and the reasons why. Applicants who are not accepted are notified in writing, given the reasons for their exclusion, and encouraged to meet with the Field Training Coordinator to discuss the issue. Non-selection is subject to grievance procedures.

Upon selection, candidates attend a 40-hour POST-certified field training course and receive ongoing update training as required (generally consisting of a 20-hour refresher every two years). Performance is continuously reviewed to determine if the member should be removed as an FTO/FTO Sergeant.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Recommendation: The department should give significant weight to service as a Field Training Officer in the secondary qualifications for promotion to Sergeant and to advance in a professional (career) development program. Both promotions and career development are discussed later in this document.

UU. SERGEANT/INSPECTOR

For many years, the San Francisco Police Department used inspectors and sergeants, with the sergeants acting primarily as investigators and, only occasionally, as supervisors. Appointments to rank of “assistant inspector” which, prior to 2007, was a paygrade above that of police officer. After two years, assistant inspectors were automatically promoted to “Inspector.” Inspectors were on a pay status equivalent to sergeants. The city recently negotiated with the Police Officers’ Association so that now assistant inspector, inspector and sergeant all receive the same rate of pay.

One consequence of this equivalency was that inspectors are not supervised by a sergeant, but report directly to a lieutenant. As a result Investigation Bureau lieutenants have a very large span of control, in some instances supervising over 20 inspectors. With this span of control, inspectors receive little direct supervision.

Although inspectors and sergeants were equivalent pay grades, separate civil service processes were used to create lists for those eligible for promotion to assistant inspector and those eligible for promotion to sergeant. The last process for assistant inspector was in 1998 and the last inspector was hired from the resulting list in 2006. Sergeants’ processes took place more frequently.

One consequence of this dual testing process was that, although the inspector pay was the same as a sergeant, inspectors were not eligible to take the test for lieutenant. Therefore, inspectors who wanted to be considered for lieutenant positions would first have to take the sergeants exam. Some of the inspectors who passed the sergeants exam would transfer to work in the Field Operations Bureau as a supervisor, others would accept a one day appointment as sergeant but continue to work as an investigator in the Investigations Bureau. Because seniority is determined by the date of an appointment, even an inspector who had been appointed as a sergeant for only one day could promote to the rank of lieutenant, assuming successful performance on the promotional exam. This was true even though these “dual-rank Inspector/Sergeants” had no experience serving in the field as a supervising sergeant.

To resolve these issues, the Department launched a plan in 2006 to expand its use of sergeants in the Investigations Bureau while reducing the use of the inspector rank over time through attrition. The Department, through DHR's Safety Examinations Unit, administered an updated sergeant’s examination in 2006. Sergeants appointed following

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

the examination who were assigned to the Field Operations Bureau received specific training in supervision. Sergeants who were assigned to the Investigations Bureau received specific training in investigations. The Department is further refining the next sergeant's examination in 2009, incorporating additional input from sergeants assigned to the Investigations Bureau.

Further, the lieutenant's promotional process announced in July 2008 now allows inspectors to qualify to take the lieutenant's examination, provided they work for one year in the Field Operations Bureau as an acting Sergeant, gaining needed supervisory experience.

The current process presents several difficulties. The department lacks a layer of supervision between investigators and lieutenants in the Investigations Bureau. A narrower span of control, and closer supervision, especially when coupled with the addition of civilian investigative aides as proposed elsewhere in this report, should improve investigator productivity, provide guidance on the best investigative techniques, improve case management, and lead to higher clearance rates.

The department needs a better structure to utilize the best potential investigative talent. Maintaining the inspector rank in the Investigations Bureau limits the department's flexibility. For example, departments such as San Jose have investigator positions that are interchangeable with police officer positions so that investigators can be periodically rotated to patrol. This achieves several positive impacts: providing a greater experience base in patrol; improving preliminary investigative reports resulting in greater investigative productivity; and opening investigator positions to more departmental members thereby enhancing career development. Such rotational programs include substantial training for newly assigned investigators and may include a selection process to determine those with the greatest potential to be good investigators.

Recommendation: The department should create a system that clearly differentiates between criminal investigators and supervisors. The skills, knowledge and abilities required to be successful in one position do not necessarily translate to the other. There are several ways to institutionalize the differentiation between investigators and sergeants.

1. The department could establish a new investigator position that would be the pay equivalent of a police officer. The civil service testing process used for sergeants could be retained for sergeant promotions. The department could create an internal investigator selection process along the lines of that used to fill Tactical Unit vacancies. Assignment of police officers to investigations would be equivalent to other special

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

units and would be subject to the department's new mandatory rotation policy. This is the practice in many police departments throughout the United States. Current inspectors, and sergeants serving as investigators, would be grandfathered at their current pay rates. Over time, through attrition, these positions would be replaced by the new investigator positions. By policy, sergeants would become the direct supervisors in investigative units to provide immediate supervision and create an acceptable span of control.

- One possibility in this option would be to retain the inspector position as a career development step for criminal investigators similar to the professional development plan described for patrol officers described elsewhere in this report. Through a combination of training, education and experience, investigators could advance to inspector. These positions, attained through career development, might not be subject to rotation.

2. A second method to create differentiation between sergeants and inspectors is to retain the inspector rank (and fill vacancies through a process that uses a civil service inspector promotional test) and increase sergeants' pay. Sergeants would become direct supervisors in investigative units. Current investigators with sergeant's rank could choose to remain as an investigator and give up the sergeant's rank, or place their name on a list to fill vacant supervisory sergeants' positions and make a transition to a supervision/management track. Part of this scenario would be a new policy establishing that eligibility for lieutenant would require supervisory training and at least one year of experience as a supervisor. This approach would solve the span of control and differentiation issues, but probably this would require giving every sergeant in the department a pay increase. This would be costly and could potentially result in salary compression issues for lieutenants and captains.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

3. The Department could keep the same pay structures in place for the Inspectors and Sergeants. By policy, sergeants would become investigations supervisors. Current investigators with sergeant's rank could choose to remain an investigator and give up the sergeant's rank, or place their name on a list to fill vacant sergeants' positions and make a transition to a supervision/management track. A new policy would establish that eligibility for lieutenant would require supervisory training and at least one year of experience as a supervisor.

Of these options, the first option provides the department with the most flexibility, achieves an appropriate span of control, and is cost-effective.

VV. PROMOTIONS

Promotion to captain, lieutenant and sergeant are governed by rules established by the San Francisco Civil Service Commission. Applicable rules include Rule 210: "Examination Announcement and Applications"; Rule 211: "Examinations"; Rule 212: "Eligible Lists"; Rule 213: "Certification of Eligibles"; and Rule 214: "Appointments."

Promotions to captain, lieutenant and sergeant are achieved through a partnership between the Police Department and the Public Safety Exam Unit, which is part of the city's Department of Human Resources. The objective is to have a promotional process every year with the ranks rotating.

The process begins when the Exam Unit identifies subject matter experts (SMEs) at the rank being tested. The SMEs assist in updating the job analysis to ensure that the duties tested for are appropriate. Once the job analysis has been updated, a study guide is developed and made available for all those eligible to take the exam, once minimum qualifications are set.

Certification rules are established before the exam. Certification rules are set for each list of eligible candidates that will result from the process and may include such criteria as points awarded for years of service. Then, the Public Safety Exam Unit develops the actual exam, which usually is a mix of written, oral, and performance-related criteria. Each exam is always more than just a written test. Different types of oral assessment are constructed and may include presentation skills and/or negotiation skills. Test components may be weighted to compile final scores. The exams differ for the different ranks; for example, the captain's exam is more focused on presentation and leadership skills. The department strives to evaluate each testing process and its job-relatedness. Those who pass the exam are placed on a certified "Eligible List." This list is posted with scores and rankings. Multiple candidates might have same ranking.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

An inspection (appeal) period takes place in which candidates can ask for reviews of their scores. The list may be amended, and then it is finally adopted.

At this point, secondary criteria are publicized. The secondary criteria also are sent to City HR and compiled and reviewed for those on the list. Secondary criteria are not part of the testing process, but are available for review by the candidates. Criteria might include each candidate's disciplinary record and personnel file. Forms for candidates to appeal or ask for corrections are on the department's Intranet. A candidate can request that old disciplinary issues be purged/sealed or that information be added to or deleted from his/her personnel file.

When the chief is ready to proceed, the candidates are notified. A Rule of Five (under which the appointing authority can select for promotion any one of the top five candidates) is used for the first 15 appointments. Thereafter, selection is based on status and grouping. The chief evaluates the candidates and matches them to vacant assignments.

A comparison of the applicable Civil Service Rules to the standards developed by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) showed that San Francisco generally meets the applicable standards. CALEA standards and the best professional practices found in law enforcement agencies cover a wide array of concerns that deal with issues such as Eligibility, Application, Process, Promotion, Appeals and Review.

Recommendation: The department should strive to be sure that knowledge, skills and abilities associated with crime-fighting, CompStat, problem-solving and community policing are a key part of the testing process. Consideration should be given to additional or enhanced community policing/problem-solving skills necessary at each level of increased responsibility and how best to incorporate such differences in the testing process.

Recommendation: The department should consider facilitating promotional preparation classes and after-process debriefing sessions. This could improve the preparedness of promotional candidates for future processes. These could become part of the professional development process described elsewhere in this document.

Recommendation: The Civil Service Rules and departmental promotional practice are in line with national standards. However, not all promotions-related information can be found in a single place.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Some information is in the Civil Service Rules, while other information is found in the Department of Human Resources, in the Public Safety Exam Unit, or in the SFPD's bulletin system. In order to ensure that it meets all professionally accepted standards, the department should review the following elements:

Eligibility:

- There should be a checklist of completed elements or "demonstrated competencies" for the rank applied to.
- A promotional eligibility evaluation should require supervisors to attest to the candidate's readiness by both confirming completion of the checklist items and demonstrated proficiency in a core list of evaluative criteria (dealing with the public, being a team member, leadership qualities, problem-solving, etc.).
- The superior officers who complete such evaluations should be scored for their skill and competence in evaluation of subordinates as part of their own promotional evaluations.
- The evaluation should coincide with the promotional process – allowing for its completion before applications for promotion are due.
- Minimum educational achievement should be linked to each rank above first-line supervisor.
- Some weighting should exist for sustained complaints/disciplinary actions.

Application

- A promotional announcement should be directed to all eligible candidates (receipt signature required) six months ahead of time. (This allows for study time as well as time for the completion of checklist items needed for eligibility.)

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Process:

- Practical or simulation exercises (assessment centers) and oral interviews should be attended and scored by outside police officials of a rank higher than the rank being sought by the candidates, and these officials should be from city police departments of a size similar to San Francisco's.
- The promotional process should consist of components that are weighted for the rank being tested (e.g., the weight given to an oral interview of assessment center should carry greater weight for higher ranks than for lower ranks).
- All such assessors/scorers should be trained by the process administrators regarding the process, assessment techniques, scoring methodology, rater biases, etc. to ensure fairness and consistency in the process.
- Every component of the process should have a minimum passing score that, if not achieved, renders the candidate ineligible for further competition.
- A review of questions and answers for the written exam component should be held for all candidates to attend.

Review:

- Well in advance of the next promotional process, the last process should be formally reviewed by a promotional committee of members at various ranks, and all problem areas should be addressed before the next process is announced.

WW. ROTATION

The San Francisco Police Department has recently implemented a "Mandatory Rotation Policy" in the Field Operations Bureau (FOB) for all officers hired after January 1, 2007 and for FOB sergeants promoted after June 1, 2007. The stated goal of the policy is "to expose both newly hired officers, along with future hires, to the various diverse communities in our City. As a result of the wide array of experiences, it is believed that

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

officers will increase their overall knowledge of the communities they serve.” This policy sets five-year terms for most positions and seven-year terms for special units such as Canine, Tactical, the Marine Unit, and Homeland Security. This policy will change elements of Department General Order 11.06, Personal Transfers.

Recommendation: The goal of the Mandatory Rotation Policy is very much in keeping with the department’s Vision. The department is striving to enhance officers’ knowledge of the diversity of the City and its residents. Yet the policy is limited to only new hires and new promotions. For the policy to have its desired impact, the department should extend it to all sworn personnel. This policy should include veteran officers and sergeants as well as lieutenants, captains, commanders and deputy chiefs.

Elsewhere in this document, a recommendation suggests that the department create a new investigator position that is equivalent to a patrol officer. If this model is adopted, then investigators should be subject to rotation. Departments that have rotation policies that include investigators have found that these veterans, when rotated back to patrol, improve the education of new patrol officers and improve report-writing. The vacancies that are more frequently created in investigative units offer patrol officers greater career development and bring fresh perspectives and energy to the investigative process.

Exempting all but new officers and sergeants results in substantial delay in getting the desired impact of developing officers with greater knowledge about the communities they serve. The department should begin negotiations with the Police Officers Association to explore ways to achieve this goal. A major impediment in some specialized units may be that veteran officers might lose special assignment pay.

Recommendation: The rotation policy should include a provision that allows the Chief to exempt some positions from mandatory rotation to make sure the department can maximize its investments in certain highly specialized jobs. Such exemptions should be rare and granted only to be sure that a replacement has been suitably trained and fully equipped to assume the specialized duties.

Recommendation: The department should adopt a policy that service in the Airport Bureau is akin to that of working in a specialized unit. Officers assigned to the Airport Bureau should be experienced members of the department who are tactically sound, alert to the terror risks associated

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

with the assignment, and aware of the importance of customer service in an environment where weary and stressed travelers may be forming their first impressions of the city. The department should create a selection process to ensure that the officers best suited to work in the airport environment are assigned to that Bureau.

Recommendation: Lieutenants, captains, commanders, and deputy chiefs should change position periodically to prevent “silo thinking” and an “ownership” mentality. Police managers should have a common set of skills that will allow them to function well in any departmental assignment regardless of where they work in the organization. Leaving managers too long in one place can result in their attempting to put the interests of their unit above the general good of the department. Long tenure in one position prevents them from developing the well-rounded perspectives that are needed for the next generation of police leadership in San Francisco.

Residents in some districts may view moving district captains as the antithesis of community policing, but SFPD captains should be adaptable, flexible, and able to bring all of the knowledge and community-policing experience they have gained in one district to their next assignment. Each should be part of the same management culture that is community-oriented, problem-solving, crime fighting and data-driven. The department should strive to keep its managers sufficiently trained and informed so that the movement of district captains should not have an impact on how services are delivered, how the district is policed, or the level of community engagement. The transition to a new district captain can be eased if (and when possible) the outgoing captain stays on for two weeks to overlap the incoming captain.

XX. TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Embedded in the Vision’s emphasis on developing the department’s own employees is that the department must provide “state-of-the-art training, development and career opportunities for advancement and retention.”

1. Advanced Training

SFPD General Order 3.12, “Department Training Plan,” describes the policies and procedures regarding various training provided to members of the Department. It defines three types of training which are to be included in the training proposed for each fiscal year:

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Intra-Departmental training provided by the Training Division (including Basic Training, Advanced Officer Training, Supervisory Training, etc.);
- Outside training provided by private contractors (such as the Department of Justice, Chapman College, Sacramento Public Safety Center, etc.); and
- Intra-Bureau training provided by members within a Bureau (such as Tactical, Canine, etc.).

The Commanding Officer of the Training Division is mandated to produce the Intra-Department Training Plan, and the Deputy Chiefs are responsible for coordinating and approving requests for outside training and intra-Bureau training for their Bureau. They are also responsible for designating the amount of training funds to be reserved for each division. A training budget must be submitted annually and must include requests for funds for the necessary intra-department training and requests for funds for outside and intra-Bureau training.

Then, the Commanding Officer of the Training Division must provide the Department with a list of available training courses from which departmental members are to submit training requests via the chain of command for review “to ensure that the needs of the division are met and the costs are in line with the funds allocated.” Ultimately, the deputy chiefs will forward a copy of the approved training requests to the Training Division.

Although this directive lays out a systematic process for annually planning and funding training, not all of the documents described in the General Order were available for PERF’s review. Training that occurs subsequent to Field Training for recruits seems to occur more on a case-by-case, decentralized basis. For example, Department Bulletin 07-183, “Outside Training and/or Outside Conferences/Seminars” describes the process for submitting requests for such training. No reference is made to the list of available training courses from which departmental members are to submit training requests, as described in the General Order, or to the spending plans for intra-Bureau, intra-department, and outside training.

The department does publish a list of courses titled the “SFPD Course Catalog” which describes offerings of the San Francisco Law Enforcement Regional Training Facility. The catalog for July through December 2008 list 35 courses, although only 17 of the course are scheduled to be taught during that period. Those scheduled include the following:

- Police Academy - S.F.P.D.
- Booking and Detention
- California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS)
- Continuing Professional Training-Inspector/Sergeant

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Continuing Professional Training-Patrol Officer
- Domestic Violence ICI Investigations Course
- Driver Training [EVOC] Refresher [18 Hrs.]
- Driver Training Vehicle Special Ops 4-Wheel Drive
- Firearms / Tactical Rifle
- Institute of Criminal Investigation Core Course
- Instructor Development
- Media Relations
- Plain Clothes and Undercover Operations (Detective School)
- Police Crisis Intervention Training
- Retirement Seminar
- Robbery Apprehension Team (R.A.T.) - Advanced
- Robbery Apprehension Team (R.A.T.) - Basic

Other courses listed in the catalog, but which are not scheduled, include:

- Arrest and Control / Field Training Officer
- Arrest and Control / Plainclothes Officer
- Bicycle Patrol
- Crisis Communication for First Responders
- Domestic Violence / The Recanting Witness
- Driver Training - Executive Protection
- Driving Under the Influence, Update
- Drug Influence 11550 H&S
- Drug Influence 11550 Update
- Field Training Officer
- Firearms Instructor Update
- Motorcycle Training
- Officer Safety / Field Tactics
- School Resource Officer
- Search Warrant and Arrest

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Search Warrant and Arrest - High Risk
- Traffic Collision Investigation
- Use of Force Update, Experiential

All 35 courses are described in the course catalog but there is no cross reference to G.O. 3.12 or to Bulletin 07-183.

Other department bulletins describe opportunities for enrollment in the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Command College (Bulletin 08-032), the POST-sponsored Sherman Block Supervisory Leadership Institute (Bulletin 08-085), and City University (Bulletin 07-304). None of these bulletins refers to the Department Training Plan or to the process described in the General Order.

The department does provide In Service and Advanced Training. POST requires 32 hours of training every two years for Sergeants and below (approx 1,900 people). The SFPD adds eight hours of departmental training that is usually specified by the Police Commission. Sergeants, Inspectors and Officers may ask to attend advanced training via a memo submitted up the chain of command, as described in Departmental Bulletin 07-183 referenced above. Reportedly, 50 to 60 requests are made per year.

The department does provide an array of training for its members each year but it lacks the systematic planning that General Order 3.12 envisions. The directive specifies the following sequence:

- By February 1, the Training Division Commander submits a proposed budget that is to cover all department training;
- By March 1, the Training Division Commander provides the department with a list of available training courses;
- By April 1, members must submit training requests for available courses;
- By May 1, a list of training requests is submitted to each deputy chief; and
- By May 15, the deputy chiefs forward the approved training requests to the Training Division.

By altering this process, and adhering to the provisions of G.O. 3.12, the department can adopt a more systematic and predictable approach to training its members.

Recommendation: General Order 3.12 should be revised so that, first, the Training Division Commander provides the department with a list of available training courses for the upcoming year. Then members should submit training requests for

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

available courses. Based on these requests, the training division commander should submit a proposed training budget. The deputy chiefs should then, based on organizational need and individual development, submit a prioritized list of training requests. Based on the training funds that become available, a final list of approved training should be generated. Creating a systematic plan is important to implementing a career or professional development plan which places a premium on acquiring advanced and specialized training.

2. Professional (Career) Development

The Vision not only commits the department to providing “state-of-the-art training” but also “development and career opportunities for advancement and retention.” However, the San Francisco Police Department has no formal career or professional development system in place. Throughout the policing profession, it is recognized that a police department’s personnel represent its greatest resource, often accounting for 70 percent or more of operating budgets. As such, it is critically important to develop both sworn and civilian members of the department to their greatest potential. The San Francisco Police Department has demonstrated that it places a high value on its personnel through the various processes it has established to select, train, and promote them. Developing a workforce through a well designed and structured professional or career development program will enhance its personnel even more.

The competitive environment of police recruiting and retention in which all police departments operate today requires agencies to excel in their efforts to give their members a level of professional development aimed at meeting their career goals. It is no longer sufficient to offer incremental pay increases based upon acceptable performance ratings. Officers who rise to the challenge of being the best expect recognition for their accomplishments. The attainment of knowledge, skills, and abilities that make members of the department more effective brings value to the department and to the public, and should be rewarded. This gives high-quality employees an incentive to remain with the department. An effective plan should be flexible so that members at any stage of their career can attain individual goals while acquiring the skills, knowledge and abilities that the San Francisco Police Department has decided its members need in order to succeed in the department.

The return for the city and the public on the combined efforts of the department and its members to cultivate an accomplished, experienced, and professionally satisfied police force is a more highly trained, professional corps of police officers and civilian employees who are committed to providing a safe environment for all of San Francisco.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Professional development plans should be constructed for both civilian and sworn personnel. This report includes recommendations to increase the number of Police Service Aides and to create two new civilian categories – Police Investigative Aides and Crime Scene Technicians. A civilian career development plan could provide for progression from Police Service Aide to Police Investigative Aide to Crime Scene Technician, with commensurate increases in responsibility and compensation.

Professional development for sworn members of the department should include tracks for patrol officers and for investigators and supervisors. Several career development steps for sergeants could be incorporated as part of the development process.

In addition, the department should create leadership development plans for middle managers –lieutenants and civilian equivalents and above. The Training Plan should include appropriate police management education, seminars, and conference opportunities that will enhance the skills and professional knowledge of department managers. Although the current training plan is formulated on an annual basis, the leadership development plan should be multi-year. Each manager should be afforded opportunities for professional development outside the department over a multi-year period, not only to enhance her/his own professionalism, but also to bring to the department information about approaches, programs, and projects that are working well in other police agencies.

Recommendation: The San Francisco Police Department should create and implement a formal professional development program. Education, training, experience, and high-quality performance should be key aspects of such a program. A sample professional development program for police officers is presented as an Appendix to this report.

YY. RESERVE OFFICERS

Like many other agencies in California, the SFPD makes use of a Reserve Officer Unit to augment the full-time staff of the department. These Reserve Officers handle a variety of duties such as providing a police presence at fairs, parades and sporting events. They may work either at a police district or in a specialized unit.

As a condition of their employment, reservists are required to work during maximum-deployment assignments (such as certain holidays or major events). Reserve Officers may be required to work extended 12-hour shifts.

Reserve Officers generally donate 20 hours per month to the department, though they are free to work more. Reserve officers undergo four hours of training per month on various topics.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

The minimum requirements to become a SFPD reserve officer are as follows⁹:

- Be at least 21 years of age at the time of appointment;
- Not have any felony or serious misdemeanor convictions that would prohibit them from possessing a firearm;
- Be a United States citizen or have applied for U.S. citizenship;
- Possess a High School diploma or GED equivalency;
- Possess a California driver's license;
- Successfully pass a complete Peace Officer Background Investigation;
- Successfully pass a polygraph exam, psychological screening, and medical examination;
- Successfully pass an Oral Interview;
- Possess the required P.O.S.T. training certificate (either Basic Police Academy, Reserve Officer Level I, Level II, or Level III).

The table below from P.O.S.T. summarizes the state's Reserve Officer requirements:

⁹ Taken directly from http://www.sfgov.org/site/police_index.asp?id=21348

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 71. Reserve Officer Status

RESERVE PEACE OFFICER STATUS SUMMARY - JULY 1999

APPOINTMENT	AUTHORITY	ASSIGNMENT	SUPERVISION	TRAINING
LEVEL I 830.6 (a) (1) PC 832.6 (a) (1) PC	24 hours* or only for the duration of the person's specific assignment	GENERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT	Same as Regular Officer (Determined by the agency)	Regular Basic Course (664 hours)** Field Training Program (400 hours) CPT (24 hours every 2 years)
LEVEL II 830.6 (a) (1) PC 832.6 (a) (2) PC	Only for the duration of the person's specific assignment	GENERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT LIMITED SUPPORT DUTIES: May work assignments authorized for Level III Reserve Officers	Immediate supervision by a peace officer who has completed the POST Regular Basic Course Without immediate supervision	Level III and Level II Modules (386 hours) CPT (24 hours every 2 years)
LEVEL III 830.6 (a) (1) PC 832.6 (a) (3) PC	Only for the duration of the person's specific assignment	LIMITED SUPPORT DUTIES: Traffic control, security at parades and sporting events, report writing, evidence transportation, parking enforcement and other duties that are not likely to result in physical arrests. May transport prisoners without immediate supervision.	Supervised in the accessible vicinity by a Level I Reserve Officer or a full-time Regular Officer employed by a law enforcement agency authorized to have reserve officers.	Level III Module (162 hours)

* Agencies may appoint a Level I Reserve Officer (who has completed the POST Regular Basic Course) to full 830.1 PC powers and duties (24 hour) by authority of a city/county ordinance/resolution (830.6 (a) (2) PC).
 ** The POST Regular Basic Course may be satisfied by attending an intensive or extended format academy, the Modular Format, Module D with pre-requisites: (a) Modules A, B, and C (222 hours) and (b) current First Aid/CPR (Title 22-EMSA Standard), or the Transition Program - Pilot Format.

Source: California POST, 1999

An example of an expansive Reserve Officer Program is the one developed by the San Jose Police Department. The program is staffed by over 160 reservists who must agree to be available on-call 24 hours a day. Reservists must work all three shifts (day, swing, midnight). Reserve training is identical to full-time San Jose police training. Reservists also receive 500 hours of FTO training on top of basic training and are expected to be able to perform solo beat officer work by the end of their training.

While reserve programs can be a great benefit to agencies in terms of acquiring additional staffing for little to no cost, reserve officers usually lack the full training and experience of full-time officers. Without constant supervision and maintenance of standards, reserve programs can be problematic.

Recommendation: The SFPD should consider increase staffing in the Reserve Officer Unit. Increasing the number of reserve officers will increase flexibility for the department and enable it to deal with special events more cost-effectively. The department should continue to find ways to

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

recognize the efforts and commitment of its reserve officers.

New reserve officers should be classified as either Level II or Level III to ensure that they receive proper supervision and backup from experienced, full-time officers. Reserve officers should be used to *complement* the duties of full-time sworn officers, and should not be used as a *replacement* for them. Expanding the reserve program in this manner will ensure that the SFPD has a ready pool of officers with baseline law enforcement training to draw from, while at the same time ensuring that they are properly supervised and deployed.

ZZ. CHIEF OF POLICE TENURE

A Human Resources issue that arose during PERF's review of the San Francisco Police Department is related to the tenure of the police chief. San Francisco as a combined City and County government has a complex structure. To be successful, the Chief of Police must interact regularly with many city agencies with various degrees of oversight over the Police Department. These include the Police Commission and the Office of Citizen Complaints, the Mayor and the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice, and the Board of Supervisors and its Public Safety Committee. The San Francisco Chief of Police is an at-will employee.

PERF reviewed other comparable jurisdictions to examine the tenure of their police chiefs. There were several different processes in place. For example, in Seattle, Portland (OR), Boston, Oakland and San Diego, the police chief is appointed by the Mayor and serves at the pleasure of the mayor.

In both Austin (TX) and Sacramento, the chief is selected by the city council. In Austin, the city council also can fire the chief. In Sacramento, the chief serves at the pleasure of the city manager. San Jose and Charlotte-Mecklenburg have systems in which the city manager is the hiring and firing authority.

In both Indianapolis and Columbus (OH), the Public Safety Director appoints the chief. In Indianapolis, the Public Safety Director can also fire a chief. Columbus is moving to a system in which, after appointment, the chief will have a five-year term, renewable once.

Los Angeles, Kansas City (MO), St. Louis Metro, and Milwaukee each have a Board of Police Commissioners (Milwaukee has a Fire and Police Commission). In both Kansas City and St. Louis, the chief is an at-will employee of the police board. In Los Angeles, the chief of police serves a five-year term of office, renewable once at the discretion of the board. In Milwaukee the chief has a five-year term of office.

Jacksonville (FL) has a merged city and county government. When the merger took place, a decision was made to merge the city police department into the county sheriff's office. Hence, the chief law enforcement officer is the elected sheriff.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

In both Los Angeles and Milwaukee, creating a fixed term of office for the police chief was designed to limit the tenure of the chief. Previously in both cities, chiefs had been protected by civil service rules that gave them virtually unlimited tenure. The set term of office was designed to retain protection from day-to-day politics while preventing a long autocratic reign. Medium-size U.S. cities, especially those with a city manager form of government, are adopting contracts for police chiefs. Contracts, while holding the chief to agreed-upon goals and objectives, also are designed to give the chief protection to make changes to improve operations that may be, at times, politically controversial. A contract, generally for a three- to five-year term, still gives both the municipality and the chief specific expectations and conditions concerning employment: performance objectives, goals, an annual salary review, and a severance agreement.

Recommendation: San Francisco should provide a five year contract for the position of Chief of Police. It is difficult for a police department to undergo long-term significant change when questions concerning a chief's tenure are raised constantly. A large city police department undergoing major reform and change needs stable, consistent leadership. A five-year contract with renewal possibility offers the needed stability, but also ensures that the chief is responsive to the needs of the city's residents as expressed through the political process.

AAA. OVERTIME

As part of the Organization Review of the SFPD, PERF was asked to examine written policies and procedures regarding overtime. Analysis of overtime expenditures and patterns was outside the scope of the study. Sources of information that PERF did review include the department's General Order that includes overtime policy, the Memorandum of Understanding between the department and the San Francisco Police Officers Association, and department bulletins.

According to General Order 11.01, officers working overtime will be compensated at a rate of time and one-half. Overtime can be earned for: work performed during legal holidays and beyond a normally scheduled watch or work week; appearances in court or hearings; requalification at the Police Range during off-duty hours; court standbys; and investigative on-call. Compensation requests must be submitted to the member's commanding officer after completion of the overtime worked. Overtime compensation for non-sworn members is determined by the annual salary standardization ordinance. Officers are not eligible for compensation during time on sick pay, vacation, compensatory overtime, floating holiday or disability pay.

Department Bulletin 05-221 modifies the list of overtime circumstances by stating that "no overtime is available for qualification at the Police Range. If necessary,

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Commanding Officers shall adjust members' hours in order to allow them to appear during on-duty hours at one of the scheduled qualification sessions." This bulletin, issued 11/30/05, states that "DGO 11.01 is being modified to reflect this change." This modification has not yet occurred.

Officers are compensated for court appearances according to the following guidelines.

- **Court Premium Pay**

Officers will receive three hours of overtime for their first court appearance on watch-off days. Those who appear in court for more than three hours will receive overtime on an hour-for-hour basis.

Officers who appear in court less than three hours prior to the beginning of their scheduled watches will receive overtime rounded up to the nearest hour. Three overtime hours will be given to officers scheduled to work at 1200 hours, regardless of the time on the subpoena.

Off-duty officers who are on court standby will receive two hours of overtime. There is no limit on the amount of overtime for on-duty officers. Members on sick leave, disability, or suspension are not given any additional compensation, and are paid at their regular rate.

Officers not appearing in court, but attending an attorney's conference, will receive overtime on an hourly basis.

Requests for overtime during civil cases that do not involve the City or Department must be approved by the commanding officer and Fiscal Division. Those that do involve the City or Department must be reviewed by the Legal Division. Overtime for both types of civil cases will be awarded on a half-hour basis.

- **Other overtime provisions include;**

Officers attending administrative proceedings while off duty will be paid overtime at time and one-half, or three hours, whichever is greater.

Off-duty officers who must complete mandatory requalification at the Police Range will be compensated on a half-hour basis.

Officers on investigative on-call will receive two hours of pay per day.

According to the Memorandum of Understanding between the SFPOA and the City, any officer ranked below Captain will be compensated for overtime at one-and-one-half times their base hourly rate. This includes hours worked during vacation leave and legal holidays. The rate also applies to mandatory, unscheduled overtime. To calculate overtime, the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) has determined that the work period for

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

sworn officers is 28 days, or 171 hours. Captains are exempt from application of the FLSA. Due to the excess of 40 hours that they are often required to work each week, Captains receive an 8-percent wage increase. However, Lieutenants on a Captain assignment will not be eligible for overtime.

The department limits the amount of overtime that officers can work. Department bulletins such as 06-127, 06-210 and 07-146 describes the limits as:

- Members shall not work more than 20 hours of voluntary overtime within any pay period week (Saturday – Friday) and not more than 40 hours in any single pay period.
- Members shall not work more than 14 hours in any 24-hour period. The 14-hour limit includes a combination of on-duty and voluntary assignments and secondary employment.

These limits are to provide for the “overall health and safety of our members. Members who work in excess of voluntary overtime hours may become fatigued, which could result in a decrease in performance and judgment during the course of normal work or in critical situations.”

General Order 11.01 also charges commanding officers and officers-in-charge to “investigate the necessity of overtime by their members and take measures to ensure that the amount of overtime is kept to a minimum.”

A Field Operations Bureau General Order, 03-13, issued December 30, 2003 provides guidelines for district station commanders “to ensure the fair and equitable distribution of all discretionary overtime at all district stations.” It includes provisions for posting overtime signup sheets, advance notice, saving slots of each shift and seeking to ensure that officers “shut-out” of a signup may have the first opportunity for the next overtime signup. It also reminds officers of several limitations of overtime described elsewhere in departmental policy.

The overtime procedures described in these documents are typical of U.S. police agencies similar to the SFPD.

Recommendation: Although this is outside the scope of this study, PERF notes that the following actions have been used in other police agencies to control overtime. If not currently doing so, the SFPD should consider implementing them.

- Conduct an ongoing assessment of how many overtime hours were for end-of-shift and/or emergencies versus the number used for scheduled special events or shift backfill.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Confirm that approval controls are sufficient and consistently practiced.

- Identify the number of OT hours subject to reimbursement by grants or other outside funding sources.
- Identify the number of OT hours consumed for in-service training.
- Assess to what extent overtime hours could be funded by grants, or instances in which overtime work could be shifted to other agencies, to volunteers or reserves, or to less costly civilians.
- Use data on OT patterns and schedules to determine the extent to which overtime expenditures might indicate persistent staffing shortages that may indicate a need for additional personnel.
- Assess the extent to which compensatory time awarded rather than overtime creates staffing gaps later on that may eventually have to be filled by officers on overtime. Some administrators have found that, although compensatory time may seem less expensive in the short run, it may be more costly over longer periods.

OVERVIEW: USE OF FORCE

The San Francisco Police Department's recently adopted strategic Vision reflects the department's commitment to preserve the human and Constitutional rights guaranteed to those who live in, work in, and visit the world-class City of San Francisco.

From the Vision Statement:

San Francisco has an international reputation for its commitment to human values: compassion, fairness, diversity, human rights, and justice. These values must be at the forefront of the SFPD as it fulfills its public safety mission.

Certainly, the manner in which a police agency employs, reports, investigates and oversees its use of force against community members plays an integral role in achieving the trust of the citizenry it serves. PERF conducted an assessment of key use-of-force policies of the San Francisco Police Department in light of legal requirements, implementation, and comparison with similar jurisdictions and national "best practices" in policing. SFPD's policies and practices were reviewed to determine if they serve both the community and members of the department, with transparency and accountability in support of the strategic Vision's component which states:

The Police Department must always strive to maintain the trust of San Francisco community members. Officers must be involved in the neighborhoods they serve, and the Police Department must seek to make its policies and operations as "transparent" as possible. When there are complaints involving the police department, both the public and the police are best served by a system of accountability that is expeditious and fair to all involved.

The department recognizes the responsibility it has to its employees, the organization's most valuable resource. This philosophy is directly integrated into the department's Vision, demonstrating a commitment to all members of the department:

To make this vision a reality, the Police Department must reward the hard work, ingenuity, and resourcefulness demonstrated by its employees, and must offer state-of-the-art training, development and career opportunities for advancement and retention. This will ensure that employees see the Police Department as a lifelong career and strive to become the department's next generation of leaders.

This section of the PERF review of the San Francisco Police Department examines key policies and practices regarding use of force by the SFPD. This report recommends a number of modifications to policies, as well as changes in reporting procedures and investigative timelines. Each is designed to improve the department's operations, its

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

accountability to the community, and its commitment to its employees in order to fully implement its Vision statement.

In addition, this section of the report evaluates the SFPD's Early Intervention System (EIS). The EIS, a new generation of the SFPD's longstanding Early Warning System, is designed to help the SFPD develop and retain its employees, rather than merely detecting improper behavior. The EIS has been designed as a non-disciplinary system to improve the performance of the department and its individual members through coaching, training, and other types of professional development.

BBB. METHODOLOGY FOR USE OF FORCE POLICY REVIEW

PERF conducted an assessment of the San Francisco Police Department's written policies and procedures that regulate the use of weapons and force by members of the department. The following policies were reviewed:

- General Order 3.10 – Firearms Discharge Review Board
- General Order 5.01 – Use of Force
- General Order 5.02 – Use of Firearms
- General Order 8.03 – Crowd Control
- General Order 8.11 – Investigation of Officer Involved Shootings and Discharges
- General Order 10.02 – Equipment
- Field Operations General Order 05-02 – Use of Extended Range Impact Weapons During Crowd Control Situations

This report uses the following format to assess the policies and procedures of the San Francisco Police Department related to force:

- **Description of General Order:** A brief description of the contents of the General Order being examined.
- **Strengths of the General Order:** This section highlights strong points of the General Order:
- **Opportunities for Improvement:** This section identifies areas in which the General Order should be modified. Recommendations are offered.
- **Compliance with National Accreditation Standards:** This section describes applicable aspects of the General Order that comply with CALEA standards. Specific standards are cited to facilitate a greater understanding of how the General Order compares to the standards.

CCC. SFPD GENERAL ORDER 3.10 – FIREARM DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD

Effective 9/21/05

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Description of the Order

This General Order calls for the Firearms Discharge Review Board (FDRB) to be convened to review every firearms discharge by a member of the department, whether or not it results in injury or death (even if it is an accidental discharge). Determination is made as to whether the discharge was In Policy, Not in Policy, or Further Investigation Needed. Findings of In Policy or Not in Policy include a review of applicable policies, lack of policies, and recommendations for policy adoptions.+

Strengths of the General Order

The San Francisco Police Department provides a systematic review of all occasions in which a member of the department discharges a firearm. The circumstances that cause an officer to discharge a weapon should be reviewed independently of whether or not the intended target is struck. It is therefore prudent that the department investigates all incidents in order to assure adherence to policy, identify training needs/opportunities, and maintain the confidence and trust of the community. This strategy is a nationally recognized “best practice” in law enforcement.

Opportunities for Improvement

It is in the best interest of the department, the involved officer(s), and the community to have timely dispositions of investigations into instances in which a weapon was discharged. The current makeup of the review board and associated timelines create challenges for the judicious review of firearm discharges. There must be a balance between achieving the timely disposition of a shooting investigation and transparency in the review process.

Recommendation: The department should change the composition of the Firearms Discharge Review Board that reviews discharges of a firearm by a member of the SFPD. PERF proposes that the board be made up of three full-time members of the department: the Deputy Chief of the involved officer (who also serves as chairperson), the Training Captain, and the Risk Management Director. Advisory members, whose attendance is based upon their availability at scheduled meetings, should include: a member of the Police Commission, Director of the Office of Citizen Complaints, Range Master, and commander (rank of lieutenant) of the new Office of Officer Involved Shootings, who also may serve as Administrator of the Board to coordinate meetings, distribute copies of investigations, and assist the chairperson to ensure the board meets established timelines.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Persons who the department believes have expertise and may contribute to the Board in an advisory capacity, such as the Fire Arms Training Simulator (FATS) Coordinator, may be invited to attend board meetings as necessary.

Recommendation: The department should significantly tighten the timeline for review of Officer Involved Shootings (OIS) and Officer Involved Discharges (OID). This may be achieved by the adoption of PERF's recommendation to initiate an Office of Officer-Involved Shootings within the Internal Affairs Section. With a single section responsible for the investigation of all OIS and OID incidents, these cases should be processed through the Firearms Discharge Review Board as expeditiously as possible.

It should be noted that PERF recommends the same timeline for OIS and OID with the exception of an OID accidental discharge. The circumstances that cause an officer to discharge a weapon are independent of whether or not the intended target is struck. Therefore, incidents should be reviewed by the department in the same manner, regardless of whether the target was struck, to determine a finding as well as to identify training or policy issues.

The department should adhere to the following timeline for Officer-Involved Shootings and Officer-Involved Discharges, with the exception of accidental discharges in which no one was injured:

- Within 10 calendar days following receipt of investigative reports, a meeting of the FDRB shall be convened to determine if the shooting was within or outside of policy. All three full-time members must be present, and advisory members' attendance should be based upon their schedule.
- Within 10 calendar days following the board meeting, the Chair, with the assistance of the Administrator, shall report the status of the matter to the Chief of Police and Commission.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Within 45 calendar days following the initial FDRB meeting, the panel shall complete its investigation and submit its findings to the Chief of Police for concurrence indicating whether the shooting is “In Policy” or “Not in Policy.”
- The Chief shall forward the FDRB’s summary findings with concurrence to the Police Commission and Director of OCC within 10 calendar days of receipt for their review and comments. If the Chief does not agree with the finding, the investigation may be either returned for further action or forwarded to the PC and OCC with a notation and explanation for the disagreement.
- The OCC Director shall review the findings and recommend further action to the Police Commission within seven calendar days.
- The Police Commission shall review the findings of the police department and OCC recommendation within 14 days of receipt and take action as appropriate.

Recommendation: The accidental Officer-Involved Discharge incidents that remain may continue to be reviewed on a quarterly basis unless the Chief of Police or commander of the Office of Officer-Involved Shootings determines that circumstances are such that it is in the best interest of the department and community that these incidents be reviewed by the FDRB immediately. In those cases, the commander of the section should initiate the review process and call for a meeting of the board.

Recommendation: Since the chairperson of the FDRB rotates based upon the officer involved, the administrative duties of the Chairperson as outlined in the current version of General Order 3.10, such as maintaining statistical data and submitting quarterly reports, should be fulfilled by the commanding officer of the Office of Officer-Involved Shootings.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Recommendation: The department should compile the quarterly reports outlined in this order into an annual report that may be presented to the Police Commission and made available to the public.

Compliance with National Accreditation Standards

CALEA describes its weapons standards in Section 1.3., Use-of-Force. SFPD General Order 3.10, *Firearm Discharge Review Board*, is in compliance with the following weapons-related national accreditation standards:

Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA)

- 1.3.6** A written report is submitted whenever an employee:
- a. discharges a firearm, for other than training or recreational purposes;
 - b. takes an action that results in, or is alleged to have resulted in, injury or death of another person;
 - c. applies force through the use of lethal or less-lethal weapons.

1.3.7 The agency has a written procedure for an administrative review of each report required by standard 1.3.6.

The SFPD goes further than the minimum CALEA requirements in that a summary report and the Chief's decision become public record (with the exception of any information deemed confidential by law). The Firearm Discharge Review Board is also responsible for generating a quarterly report to the Police Commission and the Director of the Office of Citizen Complaints. Note that CALEA Standard 1.3.13 calls for a documented annual analysis of the reports required in Standard 1.3.6. While there is quarterly reporting, SFPD's policy does not explicitly call for an annual analysis. General Order 3.10 does indicate that the purpose of the review board is to ensure that the department "is continually reviewing its training, policy and procedures in light of the circumstances that lead to firearm discharges by members and to determine if the discharge was in policy." Standard 1.3.13's commentary states that "A review of incidents of force may reveal patterns or trends that could indicate training needs, equipment upgrades, and/or policy modifications." PERF finds the spirit of Standard 1.13.3 is being met and recommends that the department compile the quarterly reports into an annual report for public review.

DDD. SFPD GENERAL ORDER 5.01 – USE OF FORCE

Effective: October 04, 1995

Description of the General Order

General Order 5.01 describes the circumstances under which officers may resort to the use of force. The order defines the circumstances in which force may be used; categories of force employed; what is reasonable force and what is unnecessary force; circumstances

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

justifying the use of force; circumstances requiring medical assistance to persons against whom force was used; and the reporting and investigation of use-of-force incidents.

Strengths of the General Order

General Order 5.01 clearly states that it is the policy of the San Francisco Police Department to accomplish the mission of the department with the “highest regard for the dignity of all persons and with the minimal reliance upon the use of physical force.” It also indicates that officers may use that force which is necessary to protect themselves and others, but they must articulate the reasons for employing such force. The policy outlines specific consequences to members of the department who apply force unnecessarily or indiscriminately.

Opportunities for Improvement:

Recommendation: The department should eliminate all references to non-lethal force in its policies and procedures and instead use the more appropriate term of “less-lethal” force.

Recommendation: The department should deploy CEDs as a less-lethal force alternative for selected field personnel. The CEDs should be integrated as a new option (between the department-issued baton and carotid restraint) on the use-of-force continuum outlined in the order; thus, the new use-of-force continuum will contain seven categories of force rather than six.

Recommendation: The integration of CEDs by the department should be done thoughtfully and should include a community education component along with an implementation plan that gradually introduces CEDs into the workforce.

The use of CEDs has the potential to reduce officer and suspect injuries that would normally occur when officers go “hands-on” to control and apprehend a suspect. The device has proved effective among police departments that are searching for less-lethal weapons.

The National Institute of Justice, in a June 2008 report titled *Study of Deaths Following Electro Muscular Disruption: Interim Report*, produced the following conclusion:

“Although exposure to CED is not risk free, there is no conclusive medical evidence within the state of current research that indicates a high risk of serious injury or death from the direct effects of CED exposure. Field

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

experience with CED use indicates that exposure is safe in the vast majority of cases. Therefore, law enforcement need not refrain from deploying CEDs, provided the devices are used in accordance with accepted national guidelines.”

The *PERF CED Guidelines for Consideration*, attached, addresses these and other concerns.

CEDs appear to reduce injuries to officers and suspects. One study found that use of CEDs in Miami–Dade, Fla. resulted in a 67 percent decline in the likelihood of officer injury and an 87 percent reduction in the likelihood of suspects being injured. A recent study in Calgary, Alberta found that batons were associated with a higher rate of injury than other weapons used by police during arrests. The two-year study examined 562 cases where Calgary police used CEDs, pepper spray, batons, weapon-free control techniques, and vascular neck restraints on people resisting arrest. CEDs were used in nearly half of all the incidents in which the suspect resisted arrest, only one percent of the suspects were hospitalized, and 87 percent sustained either minor injuries or no injuries, the study found.

“The commonly held belief [that CEDs carry] a significant risk of injury or death . . . is not supported by the data,” concluded the report, researched by Dr. Christine Hall, an epidemiologist based in Victoria, and Calgary use-of-force expert Staff Sergeant Chris Butler. The report concluded that CEDs are “less injurious than either the baton or empty-hand physical control.”

A review by PERF of the 16 most populous cities in the United States revealed that only Detroit and San Francisco do not currently deploy CEDs in the field¹⁰

¹⁰ CED Deployment is defined as having CED equipment in the field and available for immediate use by either uniformed personnel or specialized units.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 72: CED Use in 16 Largest US Cities

Ranking	U.S. City	2007 Census Population	Deploy CEDs
1	New York, N.Y.	8,274,527	Yes
2	Los Angeles, Calif.	3,834,340	Yes
3	Chicago, Ill.	2,836,658	Yes
4	Houston, Tex.	2,208,180	Yes
5	Phoenix, Ariz.	1,552,259	Yes
6	Philadelphia, Pa.	1,449,634	Yes
7	San Antonio, Tex.	1,328,984	Yes
8	San Diego, Calif.	1,266,731	Yes
9	Dallas, Tex.	1,240,499	Yes
10	San Jose, Calif.	939,899	Yes
11	Detroit, Mich.	916,952	No
12	Jacksonville, Fl.	805,605	Yes
13	Indianapolis, Ind.	795,458	Yes
14	San Francisco, Calif.	764,976	No
15	Columbus, Oh.	747,755	Yes
16	Austin, Tex.	743,074	Yes

Source: 2007 U.S. Census Data; PERF survey/research

PERF also looked at police departments similar in size to San Francisco, according to the number of sworn officers (from 2,050 to 3,399), and their use of CEDs. Of 16 agencies, only the Memphis and San Francisco Police Departments do not deploy CEDs.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 73 CED Use in Police Departments of Comparable Size to San Francisco

Police Agency	# Sworn	Deploy CEDs
San Antonio Police Department	2054	Yes
Honolulu City-County Police Department	2062	Yes
San Diego Police Department	2063	Yes
Milwaukee Police Department	2135	Yes
San Diego County Sheriffs Department	2163	Yes
Memphis Police Department	2200	No
San Francisco Police Department	2328	No
Broward County Sheriffs Office	2600	Yes
Maricopa County Sheriffs Office	2681	Yes
Suffolk City Police Department	2700	Yes
Miami-Dade County Police Department	2787	Yes
Dallas Police Department	3000	Yes
Nassau County Police Department	3000	Yes
Phoenix Police Department	3092	Yes
Baltimore City Police Department	3200	Yes
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department	3382	Yes

Source: PERF Survey/Research

Two appendices have been included for study and consideration. The first, PERF's *CED Guidelines for Consideration and Glossary of Terms*, was developed with the assistance of law enforcement experts throughout the country. The guidelines are intended to help police executives develop and refine CED policy for their agencies. The guidelines tightly limit the use of CEDs by officers. For example, the guidelines recommend that CEDs be used only against persons who are "actively resisting or exhibiting active aggression;" that no more than one officer activate a CED against a person at a time; that officers stop and evaluate the situation after a single activation of the CED; that training protocols emphasize that multiple activations appear to increase the risk of death or serious injury; that CEDs not be used solely because a subject is fleeing; that CEDs not generally be used against pregnant women, elderly persons, young children, or visibly frail persons; that use of CEDs be avoided when a subject is in a location where a fall may cause substantial injury or death; that all persons subjected to a CED activation be given a medical evaluation; and so on. For a complete list of the 52 guidelines, refer to the included *PERF CED Guidelines for Consideration* appendix.

The second appendix, *Use of Tasers in Controlling Humans: Training and Other Prerequisites*, identifies a number of training issues and other considerations for a department when adding CEDs to its use-of-force options.

Recommendation: PERF strongly recommends the department implement an education campaign with

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

the community to describe the purpose of CED's and how they will be tightly controlled.

Recommendation: The SFPD should design a new and separate Use of Force Report to be completed by all members of the department any time force is used. This form should be used not only to more thoroughly document the particular use of force, but also to allow for maintaining records and statistics on use-of-force incidents and the effectiveness of uses of force.

Currently in San Francisco, any incidents involving the use of force by officers are included in the narrative of the crime or crime/arrest report completed by officers. In some cases, sergeants are required to respond to the scene when force has been deployed. The sergeants must always review the officer's report to ensure that all information is included and to make a notation in the appropriate Use of Force Log. That information is forwarded to the Academy for review and accountability by members of the defense tactics instructors.

Approximately 100 reports involving the use of force were reviewed by the PERF Team. Some were quite thorough and detailed, while others omitted pertinent information. It should be noted that language in the reports was consistent with training techniques, which speaks well to the defensive tactics training offered by the department.

A report exclusively for documenting use-of-force incidents should be initiated by the department. It may be comprised of primarily check boxes to capture a good deal of information without creating an undue burden on officers and supervisors. The form should minimally include the following information:

- Incident and officer involved (whether the officer was handling or assisting, reason for encounter, date, time, location)
- If self-initiated activity, what type of activity was involved
- Suspect information (name, address, physical description including race, observed impairments, type of weapon used, level of resistance, level of any injury observed)
- Officer information (type of force used against officer, injury to officer, whether officer believed suspect had a weapon)

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Specific information related to OC spray, CED deployment
- Supervisory review and approval.

Such a form will allow the department to keep accurate records of force used by members of the department and its effectiveness.

Recommendation: Unless extenuating circumstances exist, a supervisor should respond to all field incidents in which force was used by a member of the department. Personal observations should be noted, and in all cases photographic evidence should be taken to show the presence or absence of injuries to the suspect. Photos should also be taken of the officer if the officer is injured or if damage was sustained to the officer's uniform.

SFPD General Order 5.01, Section I. D. outlines the categories of force that may be deployed by members of the department. In ascending order they currently are: Verbal Persuasion, Physical Control, Liquid Chemical Agent, Carotid Restraint, Department-Issued Baton, and Firearms.

The "carotid restraint" is a technique in which an officer can incapacitate a person by pressing against the carotid arteries in the subject's neck and reducing the flow of blood to the brain.

In its 2006 use-of-force statistics, the SFPD reported 19 incidents in which the carotid restraint was used. This represents 3.3 percent of the 582 incidents of force used by members of the department during that year, and none of these incidents resulted in death or serious injury. A further review of the information revealed this category of force was used proportionately throughout the department; seven districts and the Tactical Unit reported using the carotid restraint hold at least once in 2006.

Training in the use of the carotid restraint is found in chapter four of the San Francisco Police Department's Arrest and Control Manual as well as in the California Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training learning domain 33 IV, Arrest Methods/Defense Tactics. The POST learning purpose in this domain is, "Peace Officers must know the advantages of the use of a Carotid Restraint Hold, the risks involved, the follow-up procedures and safety precautions." Five learning objectives are associated with this domain:

- Discuss the justification for using the Carotid Restraint Control Hold.
- Describe factors which cause unconsciousness when a Carotid Restraint Control Hold is applied including:
 - Structures of the human neck

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Breathing
- Circulation
- Describe potential hazards associated with the proper or improper application of a Carotid Restraint Control Hold including
 - Physiological responses a subject may experience
- Demonstrate procedures for handling a subject after a Carotid Restraint Control Hold has been applied
- Explain procedures regarding medical care after a Carotid Restraint Control Hold has been applied.

PERF has found that in San Francisco, where the practice is tightly controlled and regular training, practice and testing is conducted, the application of the carotid restraint has been an effective means to control combative suspects. It provides an additional force option that may be used to prevent the need for deadly force.

However, the SFPD Use of Force policy allows officers to use the carotid restraint in non-lethal circumstances, and the carotid restraint is placed in the middle of the force continuum between liquid chemical agent and department-issued baton. This policy subjects the department and officers to unnecessary liability.

The following five recommendations are intended to modify SFPD policy to increase controls on the use of carotid restraints, beginning with a recommendation that the position of the carotid restraint on the use of force spectrum be raised. The carotid restraint control hold should be ranked just below firearms and restricted to situations in which other control techniques are ineffective or inappropriate and deadly force may become objectively reasonable if the carotid hold is *not* applied.

Recommendation: The categories of force deployed by members of the SFPD as outlined in General Order 5.01 should be modified to reflect the carotid restraint as the second highest use of force, just before firearms. The new ascending order (which also includes the addition of CEDs to the list, as recommended by PERF in Recommendation 2), should be: Verbal Persuasion, Physical Control, Liquid Chemical Agent, Department-Issued Baton, CED, Carotid Restraint, and Firearms.

Recommendation: The use of the carotid restraint control hold by members of the San Francisco Police Department should be restricted to only those incidents in which other control techniques are

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

either ineffective or not appropriate and deadly force may become objectively reasonable if the carotid restraint control hold is not applied.

Recommendation: As in all incidents of force used by members of the department, the application of the carotid restraint control hold shall be immediately reported to a supervisor. The supervisor should respond to the scene and document the event, including medical attention, in accordance with PERF recommendations for reporting and investigating use-of-force incidents. This will allow the department to capture data on the frequency and outcome of such uses of force.

Recommendation: All employees should be re-certified in the carotid restraint control hold every 24 months as part of their Continuing Professional Training (CPT) in perishable skills. Curriculum and learning objectives should follow the five areas outlined in “Chapter IV of the Arrest and Control Manual and POST learning domain 33 IV, Arrest Methods/Defense Tactics: justification for using the technique; factors which cause unconsciousness when applied including; potential hazards associated with the proper or improper application; procedures for handling a subject after the carotid restraint control hold has been applied; and procedures regarding medical care after application.” Tests should include both knowledge of policy and practical application of the carotid restraint control hold with testing standards and verifiable passing scores of 100 percent for certification.

Recommendation: Medical attention should be provided to all subjects against whom the carotid restraint control hold has been applied.

EEE. SFPD GENERAL ORDER 5.02 – USE OF FIREARMS

Effective 11/1/95

Description of the Order

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

General Order 5.02 establishes policies and reporting procedures regarding the use of firearms by members of the department.

Strengths of the General Order

General Order 5.02 has many of the elements of a strong order regulating the use of a firearm by members of the department. In some instances, the directive goes further than CALEA standards. It contains language on holstering weapons, cocking of firearms, and the use of firearms when making an arrest. General Order 5.02 also establishes a series of circumstances when firearms discharges are prohibited, such as warning shots, disabling a moving vehicle, firing at or from a moving vehicle, or firing in misdemeanor cases (unless such circumstances can be justified under the section on Permissible Circumstances).

Opportunities for Improvement

As American cities have become more populated, police departments began to recognize the inherent danger to the community of discharging weapons at moving vehicles. Agencies began modifying their shooting policy to restrict officers from firing at moving vehicles over 35 years ago. New York Police Department made this policy change in 1972. Other major city police departments including Boston, Miami and Philadelphia have since followed suit in adapting their shooting policies to restrict discharging firearms at moving vehicles.

While General Order 5.02 specifically prohibits officers from firing at or from a moving vehicle as well as with the intent to disable the vehicle, PERF recommends that further language be added to clarify officers' responsibilities in such circumstances.

Recommendation: The department should add the following sections to General Order 5.02, C 5 b:

Firearms should not be discharged at a moving vehicle unless a person in the vehicle is immediately threatening the officer or another person with deadly force by means other than the vehicle itself.

Officers should employ all reasonable means available to move to an area of safety if a vehicle becomes a threat, including retreating from the threat if practical.

Officers should not intentionally place themselves in harm's way by standing or moving in front of a vehicle, standing directly behind, or reaching inside an operating vehicle.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Recommendation: This significant change in policy should be pre-empted by training for all sworn members of the department. Attendance of training should be documented to record the acknowledgement by all sworn personnel that they have received the new shooting policy.

Compliance with National Accreditation Standards

CALEA describes its weapons standards in Section 1.3. Use-of-Force. SFPD General Order 3.10, *Use of Firearms*, is in compliance with the following national accreditation standards:

Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA)

1.3.1 A written directive states personnel will use only the force necessary to accomplish lawful objectives.

1.3.2 A written directive states that an officer may use deadly force only when the officer reasonably believes that the action is in defense of human life, including the officer's own life, or in defense of any person in imminent danger of serious physical injury. Definitions of conditional terms, such as those for reasonable belief, serious physical injury, or similarly used terms that are used to qualify the directive shall be included.

1.3.3 A written directive governs the discharge of "warning" shots.

1.3.6 A written report is submitted whenever an employee:

- a. discharges a firearm, for other than training or recreational purposes;
- b. takes an action that results in, or is alleged to have resulted in, injury or death of another person;
- c. applies force through the use of lethal or less-lethal weapons.

FFF. SFPD GENERAL ORDER 8.03 – CROWD CONTROL

Effective 8/3/94

Description of the Order

General Order 8.03 establishes protocols for dealing with mass demonstrations and specifies acceptable crowd control techniques and levels of force to be used if necessary.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Strengths of the General Order

This order reflects the department's commitment to preserve First Amendment activities and ensure that the rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and the California Constitution are upheld for all individuals. It also supports elements of the department's Vision, recently adopted by the Police Commission.

Opportunities for Improvement

San Francisco has a long history as a locale for individuals and groups wishing to exercise their First Amendment rights to freedom of expression and assembly. The department is well trained and experienced in dealing with such events. San Francisco is the site of frequent protests and demonstrations involving representatives of ethnically and culturally diverse communities. The department should continue to be prepared to work effectively with all groups of law-abiding people.

Recommendation: The department should add the following language to General Order 8.03:-
Dispersal orders and announcements should be communicated in languages other than English when necessary.

Compliance with National Accreditation Standards

While CALEA does not have standards specifically dealing with mass demonstrations and crowd control, the following standards are tangentially related to the topic:

Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA)

1.3.1 A written directive states personnel will use only the force necessary to accomplish lawful objectives.

SFPD's General Order 8.03 specifies that horses cannot be used to move or disperse passive resisters (who are sitting or lying down) and that motorcycles and motorbikes are not to be driven into a crowd or otherwise used for the purposes of physical contact. These are sound directives.

**GGG. SFPD GENERAL ORDER 8.11 – INVESTIGATION OF OFFICER INVOLVED
SHOOTINGS AND DISCHARGES**

Effective: September 21, 2005

Description of the General Order

General Order 8.11 outlines the policies, procedures and protocols to be followed when a member of the department is involved in an officer-involved shooting (OIS) or officer-

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

involved discharge (OID). The order identifies the distinctions between the criminal and administrative investigations of such incidents. It details the duties and responsibilities of the officer(s) involved, responding supervisors, and personnel delegated with the authority to complete the criminal and administrative investigations. The policy also summarizes the review of shooting incidents with timelines.

Strengths of the General Order

The San Francisco Police Department is unique in that it is responsible for providing police service at the San Francisco International Airport, located in San Mateo County. General Order 8.11 correctly distinguishes responsibility for the criminal investigation of shootings occurring within or outside the city and county of San Francisco as well as at the airport. The policy outlines the responsibilities of those involved in these incidents as well as those of responding supervisors and investigators. It provides a list of department personnel to be notified of the incident and assigns responsibility.

Opportunities for Improvement

Recommendation: The department should establish an *Office of Officer-Involved Shootings* headed by a lieutenant and staffed with two sergeants. This new section within the Internal Affairs Section should report to the Director of Risk Management who is under the direct command of the Assistant Chief of Police. It should be the responsibility of this office to respond to and conduct the administrative investigations of all discharges of weapons (regardless of whether the intended target was hit) other than in the performance of training or disposing of an animal. The office would also conduct the administrative investigations of in-custody deaths. The sergeants may also assist the Internal Affairs Section to supplement staffing as needed.

The circumstances that cause an officer to discharge a weapon are independent of whether or not the intended target is struck. It is therefore prudent for the department to investigate all incidents in order to assure adherence to policy, identify training opportunities, and maintain the confidence and trust of the community.

The Internal Affairs Section is in the process of completing a backlog of investigations into officer-involved shootings and officer-involved discharges that date back as far as 2000. This process has been helpful in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the department's administrative investigation of such incidents. It has also revealed the need

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

for such a specialized section to conduct the thorough and timely investigation of OISs and OIDs.

Recommendation: General Order 8.11 should be modified to add a section to provide for an on-duty command officer (the rank of lieutenant or higher) to immediately respond to the scene of all officer-involved shootings and officer-involved discharges unless extenuating circumstances exist.

The order currently provides for the notification of command officers and notes that the Officer-In-Charge of the Homicide Unit is in charge of the scene of an OIS. However, such incidents are often hectic and it may take time for members of the Homicide Section and Internal Affairs to arrive at the scene. The presence of a command officer will help to ensure that the scene is maintained, the investigation is not jeopardized, and officers' and citizens' rights are upheld.

Recommendation: The department should provide for the secure and orderly filing of all OIS and OID investigation case files.

Officer-involved shooting investigations are currently maintained in an interview room within the Management Control Section. The department should provide a secure area for the case files and should maintain them in an orderly and chronological manner.

Recommendation: The department should modify and streamline the format of OIS and OID reports submitted to the Police Commission.

Currently, a significant amount of time is spent in providing a "synopsis" of the investigation of officer-involved shootings and officer-involved discharges to the Police Commission. A review of the reports showed they simply restated the information included in the investigation, in its entirety. This process is time-consuming for the department to produce and for commissioners to read, and will no longer be necessary with the initiation of the Office of Officer-Involved

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Shootings. A brief synopsis may be provided to the members of the Police Commission. Because the sergeants will now respond to all shootings with the exception of training and destroying animals, they will be intimately familiar with the investigation and will be able to answer any questions a member of the Police Commission may have.

Compliance with Use-of-Force Policy Benchmarks

In its two-year use-of-force study entitled *Creating a Culture of Integrity: A Force Accountability Model*, the Police Executive Research Forum developed a comprehensive list of benchmarks for policies related to police use-of-force. The research underlying this report and resulting benchmarks arise from both national and international authorities.

An analysis of the San Francisco Police Department General Order 5.01 reveals that it is consistent with the following benchmarks:

- The department has a policy that clearly delineates who is to be notified under what circumstances after an officer shooting incident occurs;
- Field supervisor notification;
- Department policies define the role of the on-scene commander;
- The department's policies provide clear direction on what is required of supervisors at the scene of critical incidents.

Compliance with National Accreditation Standards

SAPD General Order # 705, *Officer Involved Shooting*, is consistent with the following national accreditation standards:

Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA)

- 1.3.6** A written report is submitted whenever an employee:
- a. discharges a firearm, for other than training or recreational purposes;
 - b. takes an action that results in, or is alleged to have resulted in, injury or death of another person;
 - c. applies force through the use of lethal or less-than-lethal weapons; or
 - d. applies weaponless physical force at a level as defined by the agency.
- 1.3.8** A written directive requires the removal from line duty assignment, pending administrative review, any employee whose actions or use-of-force results in a death or serious physical injury.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

HHH. SFPD GENERAL ORDER 10.02 – EQUIPMENT

Effective 4/07/07

Description of the Order

General Order 10.02 specifies required and optional equipment for uniformed and non-uniformed personnel, including both sworn and civilian members of the department.

Strengths of the General Order

The order clearly distinguishes between sworn and civilian employees as well as uniformed and non-uniformed personnel. It lists equipment which is mandatory versus optional, in language that is easily understood and available for reference. It also mandates that all uniformed officers must wear their bullet-restraint vests.

Opportunities for Improvement

San Francisco patrol officers are authorized to carry a concealed, secondary firearm, which is a prudent policy. In order to do so, they must have the approval of the Chief of Police and the Rangemaster. The order describes the types of weapon and ammunition that are authorized and unauthorized as well as qualification requirements. However, the order is silent on whether the weapon must be carried in an authorized holster.

Recommendation: The department should establish holster criteria for carrying secondary weapons. The holster criteria for civilian-dressed personnel may be adapted as the same standard for concealed secondary weapons. All firearms should be carried in a holster and not simply placed in a pocket or small of the back.

Recommendation: As part of the authorization for carrying a concealed secondary weapon, the department should require that the weapon be carried in a holster approved by a department rangemaster.

Officers' requests for authorization to carry a concealed, secondary weapon should include not only the type of weapon and ammunition requested, but also a description of the holster in which it is to be carried. The department's rangemaster should inspect the holster at the same time as the firearm as part of the approval process to be sure the weapon may be carried in a safe manner.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Compliance with National Accreditation Standards

CALEA describes its equipment standards in Section 41.3, Equipment. SFPD General Order 10.2 , *Equipment*, is in compliance with the following national accreditation standards:

Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA)

41.3.4 A written report designates the specifications for all authorized personal equipment and apparel not issued by the agency to be worn by uniformed personnel.

41.3.5 A written directive makes available protective vests for all sworn personnel and establishes written guidelines for the wearing and availability of those vests.

III. SFPD FIELD OPERATIONS BUREAU GENERAL ORDER 03-11 USE OF EXTENDED RANGE IMPACT WEAPONS (EFFECTIVE 12/18/03) AND SFPD FIELD OPERATIONS BUREAU 05-02 – USE OF EXTENDED RANGE IMPACT WEAPONS DURING CROWD CONTROL SITUATIONS (EFFECTIVE 8/24/05)

Description of the Orders

Field Operations Bureau General Orders 03-11 and 05-02 define and establish policy for the deployment and use of extended range impact weapons during crowd control situations or to apprehend a suspect when other means would be ineffective.

Strengths of the General Orders

FOB General Order 03-11 outlines which members of the department may use the extended range impact weapon as well as required training and qualification of those individuals. The order covers the use of the weapon, including storage and inspection as well as reporting requirements when deployed. It identifies responsibility for monitoring subjects struck by extended range impact munitions and the requirement for providing medical attention. The policy closes with a notation on use of the weapon during crowd control situations.

FOB General Order 05-02 restricts the use of extended range impact weapons to crowd control situations or to capture a suspect when other means of control or apprehension would be ineffective. The procedure limits who has the authorization to deploy the weapon in the field, order its use and fire the weapon. According to the policy, prior to using the weapon, the on-scene supervisor must assess the risks to persons or property and must determine that its use offsets the potential of harm.

The department has scored all extended range impact arms with orange markings to clearly delineate them from lethal weapons. Munitions for less lethal weapons (12 gauge, 37mm and 40mm) are issued only to those personnel assigned an extended range impact delivery weapon. The uniforms of those officers are also distinguishable from those of

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

other officers. The procedure also addresses supervisory notification requirements prior to firing an extended range impact weapon and specifies that its use is to be recorded in compliance with Department General Order 5.01, Use of Force.

Opportunities for Improvement

Recommendation: Field Operations Bureau General Orders 03-11 and 05-02 should be consolidated into one order. The best features of each may be merged into one complete order. The following components should be incorporated into the single order:

- FOB GO 03-11 I – Purpose
- FOB GO 03-11 II – Policy
- FOB GO 03-11 III – Procedure
- FOB GO 05-02 III C – Ceasing the Use of Extended Range Impact Weapons
- FOB GO 03-11 III F – Use of Extended Range Impact Weapons During Crowd Control. (Should be expanded to include the following sections from FOB GO 05-02).
 - Section III A. - Who May Authorize and Use Extended Range Impact Weapons in Crowd Control
 - Section III B. – When Extended Range Impact Weapons May Be Used in Crowd Control
 - Section III D - Procedure for the Use of Extended Range Impact Weapons in Crowd Control

Recommendation: EMT (paramedics) should be called to examine all subjects struck with an extended range impact weapon, not just those having difficulty breathing or losing consciousness.

Recommendation: In support of recommendations under the review of DGO 5.01, all uses of extended range impact weapons should be thoroughly investigated and documented by a supervisor. Inquiry into the use should minimally include photographs showing injuries or the absence thereof, and such information as: identification of

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

all involved parties (police and public), circumstances which led to deployment of the weapon, effectiveness of its use, medical attention or absence thereof, and criminal charges. Documentation will satisfy record keeping needs, statistics on use-of-force incidents, and efforts to measure the effectiveness of extended range impact weapons.

Recommendation: At least annually, all personnel authorized to deploy (supervisors) and discharge (officers) the extended range impact weapon should be required to receive in-service training of policies and demonstrate proficiency in the weapons every six months.

Compliance with National Accreditation Standards

CALEA describes use of force standards in Section 1.3, Use of Force. SFPD Field Operations Bureau General Order 05-02, *Use of Extended Range Impact Weapons during Crowd Control Situations*, is in compliance with the following national accreditation standards:

Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA)

- 1.3.4** A written directive governs the use of authorized less-lethal weapons by agency personnel.
- 1.3.5** A written directive specifies procedures for ensuring the provisions of appropriate medical aid after the use of lethal or less-lethal weapons, and other use of force incidents as defined by the agency.
- 1.3.6** A written report is submitted whenever an employee:
- c. applies force through the use of lethal or less-lethal weapons.
- 1.3.9** A written directive requires that only weapons and ammunition authorized by the agency be used by agency personnel in law enforcement responsibilities. A directive shall apply to weapons and ammunition carried both on and off duty, and must address:
- the types and specifications of all lethal and less-lethal weapons approved for use including those weapons used by members of a tactical team or other specialized personnel;

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

the types and specifications of ammunition approved for use including ammunition used in specialized weapons for members of tactical teams or other specialized personnel;

the procedure for review, inspection and approval of all weapons intended for use by each employee in the performance of their duty [and]...

guidelines for safe and proper storage of agency authorized firearms.

- 1.3.10** A written directive requires that only agency personnel demonstrating proficiency in the use of agency-authorized weapons be allowed to carry such weapons.

The policy recommendations proposed by PERF are also in alignment with many of the recommendation of the Stern Commission that was tasked with exploring the events which occurred outside Fenway Park in Boston, Massachusetts on October 20-21, 2004. In that event, extended range impact weapons were deployed with tragic results. The recommended policy addresses specific areas mentioned in the report including training, role clarification and restricting the use of less-lethal weapons to certified officers.

JJJ. SPECIAL WEAPONS AND TACTICS TEAM

The San Francisco Police Department's Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) Team was formed in the late 1960s and provides the department with a professional, specialized unit to be used in high-risk situations that regular police officers are not specifically trained to handle. These situations include critical incidents (e.g., hostage rescue, barricaded subjects, and snipers), high-risk warrant service, crowd management, active shooter incidents, dignitary protection, counterterrorism, maritime interdiction, airport duties (e.g., hijacked aircraft), railway interdiction, and the support of specialized SFPD units (specifically, the Special Investigations Division, Gang Task Force, Narcotics, Robbery Detail, Canine Unit, and EOD).

SWAT training is rigorous and highly specialized to reflect the hazardous duties asked of the unit. New members of the SWAT Team are mandated to attend 160 hours of instruction in a California POST-approved Basic SWAT Course. Monthly training is conducted to keep members' skills at the highest levels of proficiency. The California Commission on Police Officer Standards and Training (POST) recommends that a Level-3 SWAT Team (the level of the San Francisco Police Department's team) spend 25 percent of its on-duty time on SWAT training.¹¹ The National Tactical Officers Association also recommends that a minimum of 25 percent of on-duty time be spent on training for fulltime teams.

¹¹ "SWAT and the Law: A California Commission Has Drafted SWAT Standards that Agencies Nationwide Would Be Wise to Adopt," appearing in *Police: The Law Enforcement Magazine*. Vol. 27, Issue 5. May 2003.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

SFPD tactical units have expressed a desire to increase their training to 37% of on-duty time to a total of 630 hours a year. This is based on the department's estimation of available work time per year of 1,700 hours. The 630 hours would not include time consumed for mandatory firearms qualifications and academy crowd control training.

Currently, tactical units are scheduled so that all the units work on Wednesday, which is usually devoted to training. They work a ten-hour shift, which means that, based on 52 weeks a year, they now can devote 520 hours per year to training. During their training day, if they are needed to deploy on a SWAT operation, they break free from training to conduct operations.

Following is a comparison of the department's SWAT Core Competency/Specific Mission Training compliance with the California POST *SWAT Operational Guidelines and Standardized Training Recommendations*.¹² The underlined text identifies current training conducted by the San Francisco Police Department SWAT Team. The shaded text that follows details the applicable POST recommendations for each area of training.

SFPD SWAT Weapons Training (not including mandatory qualifications)

California POST addresses this topic in *SWAT Core Competencies, Weapons, Munitions and Equipment: Firearms Skills*. Training is mandated by POST in handguns and shoulder-fired weapons, which covers the three principal weapons deployed by SFPD SWAT: the Sig Sauer handgun, Colt M4 assault rifle, and the HK MP5 submachine gun. A variety of practical applications are trained on, including lowlight training, night vision shooting drills, tactical and combat reload drills, full auto fire, obscure positional shooting drills, multiple target threat/no threat drills, etc.

¹² California POST *SWAT Operational Guidelines and Standardized Training Recommendations* was used in the compilation of this section as were the following appendices:

Appendix A: Basic SWAT Team Operational Components

Appendix B: Basic SWAT Course Topics

Appendix C: SWAT Core Competencies

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

SFPD SWAT Entry Tactics Training

California POST addresses this topic in *SWAT Core Competencies, Individual and Team Movement/Tactics: Entries*. Related topics are also covered in *Individual and Team Movement/Tactics*:

- *Conducting Evacuations*
- *Cover and Movement*
- *Covert Clearing*
- *Downed Officer/Citizen Rescues*
- *Dynamic Clearing*
- *Rescue Operations—Basic*
- *Searching Techniques*
- *Small Unit Tactics*

Additional training in Entry Tactics is also covered by POST in *Weapons, Munitions and Equipment*:

- *Firearms skills*
- *Mechanical Breaching*
- *Munitions (which contains the following subcategories):*
 - *Chemical agents*
 - *Less lethal impact munitions and delivery*
 - *Light/sound diversionary devices*
 - *Other less lethal devices*

SFPD SWAT SKIDD Training (Canine Tactical Operations)

California POST addresses this topic in *SWAT Course Competencies, Specialized Functions and/or Supporting Resources: SWAT Canine Integration*.

SFPD SWAT Team Task Training

California POST does *not* address this topic in *SWAT Course Competencies*. While POST guidelines do not mandate the specific team composition of the SFPD (Reconnaissance Officer, Intelligence Officer, Operations Officer, Weapons and Equipment Officer), nor do they mandate SFPD's cross-training in all specialties, SFPD's Team Task Training would most likely be covered under *Basic SWAT Course Topics, Basic SWAT Concepts: Team Composition and Duties*.

SFPD SWAT Less Lethal Training

California POST addresses this topic in *SWAT Core Competencies, Weapons, Munitions, and Equipment: Munitions*.

SFPD SWAT Distraction Device Training

In POST, Distraction Device Training is covered as a subset of *Munitions*.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

SFPD SWAT Breaching Training

California POST addresses this topic in *SWAT Core Competencies, Weapons, Munitions, and Equipment: Mechanical Breaching*. Explosive Breaching is covered under *SWAT Core Competencies, Specialized Functions and/or Supporting Reserves: Explosive Breaching*.

SFPD SWAT Chemical Agent Training

California POST addresses this topic in *SWAT Core Competencies, Weapons, Munitions, and Equipment: Munitions (Chemical Agents)*.

SFPD SWAT Rappel Training

California POST addresses this topic in *SWAT Core Competencies, Individual and Team Movement/Tactics: Rappelling*. Note that while POST covers both Airborne and Static Rappelling, SFPD does not specify as to whether its training covers both aspects.

SFPD SWAT ASP Baton Training

California POST does not specifically cover this in its *SWAT Core Competencies*, though it may be reasonably inferred that it would fall under *Weapons, Munitions, and Equipment*.

SFPD SWAT Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Training

California POST addresses this topic in *SWAT Core Competencies, Specialized Functions and/or Supporting Resources: WMD Response*.

SFPD SWAT Waterborne Operations Training

California POST addresses this topic in *SWAT Core Competencies, Specialized Functions and/or Supporting Resources: Waterborne Operations*.

SFPD SWAT Vehicle Assault Training

Bus and LRV Assault Training

B.A.R.T. Assault Training

California POST addresses these topics in *SWAT Core Competencies, Individual and Team Movement/Tactics: Vehicle Assaults*.

SFPD SWAT Aircraft Assault Training

California POST addresses this topic in *SWAT Core Competencies, Specialized Functions and/or Supporting Resources: Airborne Operations*.

SFPD SWAT Active Shooter and High-Rise Training

California POST addresses this topic in *SWAT Core Competencies, Individual and Team Movement/Tactics: Active Shooter Response*, but does not appear to have specific coverage of High Rise Training. Note that SFPD incorporates schools in its high-rise training.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

SFPD SWAT Officer/Citizen Down Rescue Training

California POST addresses this topic in *SWAT Core Competencies, Individual and Team Movement/Tactics: Downed Officer/Citizen Rescues*.

SFPD SWAT Crowd Control Training (not including training at the Academy)

California POST addresses this topic in *SWAT Core Competencies, Specialized Functions and/or Support: Riot Response*. SFPD's description of crowd control training essentially implies that such situations are riots (or have the potential to turn into riots).

SFPD SWAT Dignitary Protection Training

California POST addresses this topic in *SWAT Core Competencies, Specialized Functions and/or Support: Executive Protection*.

In addition to Core Competency/Specific Mission Training, SFPD SWAT conducts training and lists responsibilities that fall outside of Core Competency/Specific Mission Training. Training in these areas is not included in the 630 hours of core competency training listed above.

- **Team Level Training:** California POST calls for documented and verifiable monthly training to maintain individual and team core competencies.
- **Specialty Equipment Training:** Although California POST does not specifically address this topic, it may be included in both *SWAT Core Competencies, Weapons, Munitions and Equipment* and *Basic SWAT Course Topics, Overview of Individual and Team Equipment*.
- **Joint Training Exercises:** California POST does not specifically address this topic, though coverage is included in *Basic SWAT Team Operational Components, Command and Control Element*.
- **Tactical Emergency Medical Support (TEMS) Training:** Although California POST does not specifically address this topic, it is covered in *SWAT Core Competencies, Individual and Team Movement/Tactics: Downed Officer/Citizen Rescues*.
- **Outside Instructor Training :** California POST does not specifically address this issue.
- **Update and Refresher Training :** California POST calls for 24 hours of POST-certified SWAT update or refresher training, or its equivalent, every 24 months, in its *Operational Guidelines and Standardized Training Recommendations*. SFPD SWAT complies with this requirement.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- **Legal Update Training** : California POST addresses this topic in *Basic SWAT Course Topics, Policy Issues: Legal Issues, Civil Liability*.
- **Physical Fitness Training**: California POST addresses this topic in *Basic SWAT Course Topics, Physical Considerations*.
- **Annual Entrance Testing**: California POST does not specifically address this issue.

PERF's assessment indicates that the weaponry and equipment employed by the San Francisco Police Department's SWAT Team are in compliance with best practices in policing and are similar to that of other large city agencies across the United States.

Recommendation: If SFPD SWAT training only met the 25-percent of on-duty time POST standard, tactical units would devote 425 hours (based on 1700 hours of available on duty time) per year to training. The current schedule allows for 520 hours annually. The training curriculum matches almost all POST requirements for content and exceeds POST and National Tactical Officers Association recommended minimums.

In a world-class city like San Francisco, with its iconic landmarks, airport, port, and tourist population, a well-trained SWAT team is an operational necessity. An increase in time devoted to training needs to be weighed against the loss of the resources that the tactical team offers to address the everyday problems of crime, violence and disorder which detract from the city's livability. The tactical teams are an important element to the district-based problem-solving approach described in earlier sections of this report. Consequently, the department should maintain its current time commitment to SWAT training at 520 hours per year. This represents a commitment of 31 percent of available time for Core Competency/Specific Mission Training.

Recommendation: Should the department wish to employ the additional training outlined in the responsibilities that fall outside of Core Competency/Specific Mission Training, this

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

training should be conducted during the regularly scheduled training days. A review of these items reveals they may easily be integrated into the core competency training.

KKK. SPECIALIZED POPULATIONS AND USE OF FORCE

The San Francisco Police Department provides guidance about arrest and control tactics, use of force, and officer and subject safety pertaining to special populations in a variety of places.

- Use of force in general is described in General Order 5.01.
- Use of force and control tactics to be used with juveniles are described in General Order 7.01.
- In the basic academy, “POST Learning Domain 37, People with Disabilities” includes information on force and control and includes a scenario test that requires the “student to demonstrate proficiency in contacting people with simulated disabilities.” Key competencies that are to be evaluated as part of basic academy testing include:

Use of force – the ability to distinguish and apply reasonable force options in given circumstances, and

Officer safety – Tactical and situational awareness and response to surroundings.

Additional instruction is provided in the San Francisco Police Department’s “Disabilities Awareness Guide” published in 2008. It includes outlines for roll call training that are designed to further officers’ knowledge about people with special needs.

Officers also have access to the San Francisco Police Academy “Arrest and Control Manual 2005.”

Recommendation: The department should create a single directive that provides guidance to its members regarding arrest and control tactics, use of force, and officer and subject safety for dealing with special populations. This will assist officers with dealing with persons who require an elevated level of care, thus improving both officer and subject safety.

LLL. CANINE UNIT

The San Francisco Police Department deploys canine units in both the Field Operations and Airport Bureaus. At the time of PERF’s May 2008 site visit, the department reported 14 canines working in the FOB and 13 at the Airport, for a total complement of 27. Most

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

of the dogs are specialists. Canine sergeants also are dog handlers and all handlers work a 4/10 schedule, with training conducted in one 10-hour work day.

In 2007, canines were deployed 951 times, with seven of those incidents resulting in a suspect being bit. The dogs performed 346 bomb sweeps resulting in eight alerts and three found devices.

The department operates from the *Dog Unit Policies and Procedures Manual*, last revised in July 1998, which outlines the organization and duties and responsibilities of the Canine Unit as seen below. Personnel advised that the manual is going to be updated in the near future.

1. Organization of the Dog Unit

- Duties of a Dog Unit Trainer
- Selection Requirements for Handlers and Dogs
- Rules for the Dog Unit
- Police Dog Veterinary Service
- Assignment to the Dog Unit
- Searches by Police Dogs
- Application of Police Dog Bites
- Dog Unit Records
- Call-Out of the Dog Unit
- Outside Agency Requests for the Dog Unit
- Dog Unit SWAT Operations
- Dog Unit Explosives Detection Team
- Dog Unit Narcotic Detection Team and Training Aids

Dogs are used for drug and explosive detection and also for patrol duties. When dogs are used to control suspects, the department has a “Grab and Hold” (also referred to as “Bite and Hold”) policy rather than “Bark and Hold” approach. In Bite and Hold, the dog continues to hold the person in its jaws until ordered to release by the handler. In Bark and Hold, unless the person makes threatening movements, the dog will bark at the suspect until controlled by the handler. Debate as to which approach is most effective continues among canine trainers – who largely endorse and make a case for the method they have become adept at providing.

It is important to note that stipulations in recent U. S. Department of Justice Federal Consent Decrees in which police departments have agreed to revamp canine operations

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

have been for “Guard and Bark” (Bark and Hold) training and practice. Thus the practice of the San Francisco Police Department is contrary to U.S. Justice Department recommendations.

The Justice Department has recommended the canine tactical practice of Bark and Hold in several consent decrees. In January 2001, the Justice Department published *Principles for Promoting Police Integrity*, which includes “Examples of Promising Police Practices and Policies.” This document, based on visits to several canine units throughout the U.S., highlights the “Bark and Hold” approach rather than “Bite and Hold” policy. Although the Constitutional issue in a canine deployment is the handler’s control and decision-making according to the 1989 Supreme Court case *Graham v. Connor*, there is a risk that a Bite and Hold dog can do substantially more damage than a Bark and Hold. Although the Department of Justice has allowed departments to implement a “Bite and Hold” policy, it recommends stringent operational policies that recognize the potential for increased liability.

Chapter Eight of the SFPD’s *Dog Unit Policies and Procedures Manual* delineates the circumstances in which canines are permitted to bite suspects. The department places these situations into two categories: officer protection and apprehension of fleeing suspects. The policy states:

Officer Protection - Dogs will be used as a physical force in the following circumstances:

- To protect an officer who is under attack from another person
- In situations where the safety of officers is immediately threatened and time does not allow the use of other options
- In situations where the nature of resistance indicates that the use of less force would be ineffective
- In situations where the circumstances reasonably indicate that the use of dogs would alleviate a potential loss of life or serious injury if officers alone were used
- To subdue and arrest combative persons and less forceful methods have failed
- While engaged in a SWAT operation
- In protection of any person who is in danger of receiving great bodily harm or injury from another person
- In any building or field search situation where the suspect will not surrender, has concealed himself/herself, or presents a threat to the officer's safety
- In defense or protection of the dog when it is being teased or tormented.

Apprehension of Fleeing Suspects - Dogs may be used to apprehend fleeing suspects in cases where the handler determines it is necessary to accomplish

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

the arrest. The handler must take into account the immediate circumstances including the nature of the case, the character and behavior of the offender, and the safety of himself/herself and fellow officers.

- When a dog is out of the vehicle guarding a suspect, he may apprehend the suspect without command to protect his master or if the suspect attempts to escape.
- Officers shall refrain from using police dogs when apprehending known juveniles, except in cases where the seriousness of the crime demands that the juvenile be apprehended by whatever means are necessary and reasonable (i.e., homicide, armed robbery, etc.).
- Officers will refrain from using police dogs to apprehend misdemeanants due to the lack of seriousness of most misdemeanor crimes. Exceptions to this would be in the case where an officer is assaulted or in the case of a suspect who may have committed a misdemeanor but is armed with a weapon.

Chapter Four of the manual covers the policy for dog bites. Officers are to report a bite to the Dog Unit Supervisor. The circumstances surrounding the incident are to be documented in an incident report. The type and severity of the injury are to be noted and entry is to be made in both the Yearly Dog Bite and Use of Force Logs.

Given the current “Bite and Hold” practice of the SFPD’s canine units, the department reports a remarkably low number of bites: seven in 2007. This demonstrates a high level of training and restraint on the part of both handlers and their dogs. It remains, however, a higher-risk practice than the alternative of “Bark and Hold.”

Recommendation: The department should change its canine policy from “Grab and Hold” to “Bark and Hold.” This significant modification is in keeping with national best policing practices. Although the number of canine bites is a small fraction of the instances in which a dog is deployed, the direction of the Department of Justice is clear and the exposure to liability for the department is potentially greater than with Bark and Hold.

Recommendation: The department should complete its update of the Canine Manual in the next six months.

Recommendation: A canine sergeant should respond to each incident in which a bite occurs and should conduct an administrative investigation into

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

the matter. Canines are an extremely valuable asset to the department, yet they represent a significant potential liability. A supervisory investigation is warranted and should minimally include the circumstances that led to the bite; suspect, witness and officer statements; photographs; and complete documentation of medical attention received by the person who was bitten.

EARLY INTERVENTION SYSTEM

Within law enforcement, first-line supervisors are not only critical to the delivery of services, but also are integral to the self-discipline of a police department. They are routinely called upon to serve as problem-solvers, counselors, teachers, coaches, and leaders. One of their primary responsibilities is to serve the public by ensuring that the actions of officers are appropriate, ethical, within department policy and procedure, and consistent with the public's expectations. An Early Intervention System (EIS) gives first-line supervisors and upper-level managers a mechanism to identify potential deficiencies in officers' performance and behavior, and to design an intervention strategy and offer employee assistance to an officer who is potentially at risk. Ideally, such assistance can be provided in a timely and clearly non-disciplinary manner, before the performance or behavior problem escalates to a level that is subject to formal or punitive action.

In 1994, the San Francisco Police Department initiated an Early Warning System (EWS) to identify and address performance issues or behaviors of employees that, if continued, could potentially lead to disciplinary action. In retrospect, although the EWS was progressive for its time, the system was narrow and limited in that it considered only two criteria – incidents of use of force, and complaints submitted to the Office of Citizen Complaints. Supervisors were expected to look for patterns of behavior by officers under their command and to take appropriate action to prevent the deeds from becoming disciplinary matters. According to some in the department, few supervisors identified behavior patterns; and initiation of action to change officers' behavior was rare. Moreover, the EWS was not supported by the Police Officers Association (POA). It was perceived as another way to initiate discipline against officers, rather than as a positive tool to identify members of the department who could benefit from one of many sources of available assistance.

In keeping with national best practices in policing and responding to a series of articles in the *San Francisco Chronicle* on the police department's use of force, the department committed to transition the EWS into an Early Intervention System (EIS) in 2005. This change, though seemingly subtle in nature, marked a significant philosophical change. Instead of merely warning supervisors about potential "problem officers," the EIS is intended to provide a comprehensive analysis of officers' behavior in order to *help* members of the department. The EIS has been designed as a non-disciplinary system to improve the performance of the department and its individual members through coaching, training, and other types of professional development.

The department initiated several steps to integrate an Early Intervention System into the department. The lieutenant in command of the Professional Standards Unit was tasked with the responsibility of implementing the EIS. Research was conducted on early intervention systems and model policies throughout the country. Site visits were undertaken in Oakland, Santa Clara and Phoenix to personally examine their systems. The department initiated a Request for Proposals and selected Target Performance Systems to serve as the software provider for the department's EIS. The Professional

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Standards Unit lieutenant held regular meetings with representatives throughout the department as well as the POA in order to keep them directly informed of progress of the EIS implementation and to solicit their input on the development of the system and accompanying policies.

The department identified 10 performance “indicators” to track as part of the Early Intervention System:

Table 74: EIS Indicators

Use of Force Incidents *
Officer-Involved Shootings
Officer-Involved Discharges
OCC Complaints **
Management Control Division Complaints **
EEO Complaints
Civil Suits
Tort Claims
On-Duty Traffic Accidents
Vehicle Pursuits

* As required by Department General Order 5.01

** Complaints determined to be “proper conduct” or “unfounded” are not to be included as indicators.

Source: SFPD Early Intervention System Data

These indicators represent a comprehensive list of measurable behaviors that can serve as an initial indication that an employee may be in need of assistance. To further supplement these factors, the San Francisco Police Department has identified 14 additional “associated factors” intended to recognize potential performance-related problems. The associated factors are reviewed only after a member of the department has surpassed certain thresholds for the 10 “indicators.”¹³ Review of these activities is intended to provide a more comprehensive analysis of an employee’s performance.

¹³ Thresholds are accumulated points assessed for each of the 10 EIS indicators associated with an officer during a specified timeframe. Thresholds are more clearly spelled out later in this section of the report.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Table 75: EIS Associated Factors

Citizen-Initiated Compliments and Commendations
Department Commendations and Awards
Arrests by Officers
Citations by Officers
Motor Vehicle Stops
Pedestrian Stops
Training History
Voluntary Overtime Worked
Discretionary Time Off
Sick Usage Not Protected by Federal, State or Local Laws
Principal Participant in a Critical Incident
Criminal Cases Dismissed or Not Filed Due to Documented Concerns by the DA's Office with the Police Employee's Conduct
Charges of Resisting, Obstructing, or Delaying a Police Officer
Charges of Assault on a Police Officer

Source: SFPD Early Intervention System Data

One significant challenge to initiating the Early Intervention System in San Francisco has been retrieval of reliable information relating to the 10 indicators and 14 associated factors. This is partly because the data are not centrally located, but rather are stored in various systems. Delays associated with some data systems, including the department's Records Management System, have had a direct impact on the Professional Standards Unit's ability to bring the EIS online. However, with the assistance of a Project Director hired by the Professional Standards Unit specifically to work on the EIS project, significant advances have been made in this area.

As of July 2008, the department now has the interim capability to capture information on all 10 indicator categories and 10 of the 14 associated factors. The four areas in which information is not yet retrievable are: principal participant in a critical incident; criminal cases dismissed or not filed due to documented concerns by the DA's Office with an employee's conduct; charges of resisting, obstructing or delaying a police officer; and charges of assault on a police officer. Furthermore, there are four other associated factors related to officer activity (arrests by officers, citations by officers, motor vehicle stops, and pedestrian stops) for which information is available, but the data are not yet thought to be reliable by the Professional Standards Unit. The PSU conducts weekly meetings to monitor and coordinate the impact of their work on the EIS.

Recommendation: The department should take steps to promptly implement the EIS System. The Professional Standards Unit has made great strides in developing its capability to retrieve information for all **10 primary indicators** and most of the associated factors captured by the Early

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

Intervention System. However, until the PSU has established confidence in the reliability of the information regarding the four “officer activity” associated factors listed above, they should not be used, even if that results in them not being considered during the initial implementation of the system. As the reliability of these factors’ data becomes acceptable, they may be integrated into the system. If it becomes apparent that reliable information will never become available and there is no other way to retrieve the information, those individual factors should be eliminated. The PSU should continue to communicate updates to the department on the accessibility of the remaining factors.

As in other jurisdictions throughout the nation, the implementation of the EIS in San Francisco has been received with skepticism and mistrust by some employees. Employee representatives along with some officers are fearful that such a system will be used for disciplinary purposes or will influence personnel decisions such as assignment selection and promotions. SFPD General Order 3.19 Early Intervention System was approved by the Police Commission in February 2008. The order clearly states that the EIS is intended to provide non-disciplinary intervention, whenever possible, to assist members of the department in their professional development and to provide the highest level of service and satisfaction to the public. Appropriate definitions are provided at the beginning of the order for clarification to the reader. The order also establishes safeguards that the system is not to be assessed or used for any other purpose other than to improve the performance of the department and its members.

The San Francisco Police Department has applied reasonable thresholds or “triggers” to initiate an evaluation to determine if an employee should be brought into the formal EIS process. Each of the 10 indicators is given the value of one point, and no more than a single point may be given for any one incident. For example: An officer initiates a vehicle pursuit that concludes in a traffic collision involving the officer; force is used to take the suspect into custody; and an OCC complaint is filed against the officer. While the cumulative number of points is four, because all four of the indicators stem from the same episode, only one point is assigned for the purpose of the Early Intervention System. The following point thresholds within a specific time period serve to initiate a review of behavior:

- Five or more EIS Indicator Points or three or more OCC citizen complaints within a six-month period.
- Six or more EIS Indicator Points or four citizen complaints within one year.

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Three or more documented use-of-force incidents within a three-month period.
- Involvement as a principal in an officer-involved shooting or discharge.

Based upon these criteria and the department's history, the Professional Standards Unit projects approximately 60 instances per year of employees reaching the EIS threshold level.

Recommendation: The board should meet annually to review the entire EIS process to determine if any technological or other advances in the department over the previous 12 months may warrant a change or addition to the EIS System. This will provide the opportunity to make changes to the system after enough time has gone by to allow for identification of trends. General Order 3.19, Section IV A. 4, states the current thresholds may be modified to make the best use of the analysis capabilities of the system. The review of this information on a quarterly basis is a sound strategy and one that enables the department to quickly adjust and adapt to change.

Once an employee attains the numerical threshold point total within the specified time period, a two-step process is initiated. The EIS Unit, along with the employee's supervisor, conducts an initial review of the employee. Supervisors may conclude that a pattern of at-risk behavior does not exist and forward that finding to the EIS Unit via their commanding officer. If the EIS Unit does not concur with the supervisor's conclusion, notification is made to the employee's commanding officer, and a second review is required, with the supervisor submitting a report of his or her action within 21 days.

Recommendation: The department should clarify and procedurally outline what occurs when there is honest disagreement between the EIS Unit and the employee's supervisor and commanding officer as to whether there is cause for further action or there is no need for intervention. Currently, Department General Order 3.19 provides that:

“... the EIS Unit may not concur that the supervisor's finding that a pattern of at-risk behavior does not exist; the EIS Unit will electronically return the name(s) of the member(s) to the respective commanding officer, who shall ensure that the member's supervisor engages in a

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

performance review and, if appropriate, initiate intervention with the member..."

But the General Order does not provide further guidance on how to resolve instances in which there is a continuing disagreement between the EIS Unit and an employee's supervisor and commanding officer about the employee's performance.

Recommendation: The department must be committed to enforce the 21-day deadline for response by the employee's supervisor via commanding officer to the EIS Unit as outlined in General Order 3.19. A delay in responding regarding an employee who has been identified by the organization as needing assistance is not in the best interest of the officer, the department, or the community. Safeguards must be put in place to provide assistance to members of the department in a timely manner, and this timeliness must be enforced by the Command Staff, Deputy Chiefs, as outlined in Section VIII A. of the General Order, *Oversight of the Early Intervention System*.

Recommendation: The currently vacant sergeant position in the EIS Unit should be filled. Without this position, it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to successfully implement the system. It is imperative that this position be filled by a well-respected sergeant as soon as possible, so that training and other administrative tasks related to initiating the EIS System, including completion of the procedural manual, may be completed. This position is also critical to such activities as the identification of employees exceeding the threshold point total; working with members' supervisors and commanders conducting initial reviews of behavior; ensuring that follow-up and appropriate paperwork are handled in a timely manner; and supervising the civilian project director and analysts who comprise the unit.

Recommendation: The department should review the workload for the EIS Unit on a quarterly basis to determine if the unit is adequately staffed. Based

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

upon the level of activity in the unit and the number of department members exceeding the EIS point threshold, more than one sergeant may be necessary to properly staff the EIS Unit. Statistical information for the unit is maintained on a quarterly basis as prescribed by DGO 3.19. With that level of detailed information on the workload of the unit, it should be quickly evident if one sergeant is sufficient or if additional positions are needed in the EIS Unit.

Recommendation: The department should update DGO 3.19 to reflect that the Assistant Chief of Police position has been reinstated in the San Francisco Police Department, and that the Assistant Chief, who oversees day-to-day operational issues of the department, is responsible for oversight of the EIS System.

Recommendation: One of the keys to implementing the Early Intervention System is providing adequate and timely training to all members of the department. Initial training was to have been completed throughout the department in 2007, but because of unforeseen delays personnel may no longer have current knowledge of EIS. The department should reinvest in education and training throughout the department when the system is fully operational. The department's initial roll-out strategy for the EIS included:

- Delivery of Chief's message
- Discussion and clarification with the Police Officers Association
- Distribution of departmental bulletin
- Distribution of Department General Order 3.19, *Early Intervention System*
- Asked for input (as of the last PERF site visit, none was received)
- Attend roll calls at all the stations and for all watches

**An Organizational Assessment of the
San Francisco Police Department: A Technical Report
Final Report December 2008**

- Identification of a contact person for each unit throughout the department for the EIS Unit
- “Train the Trainers” for sergeants

The department should repeat each element of this strategy with necessary updates and modifications. It will be important for supervisors to fully comprehend the system in order to be efficient and effective in implementing it and in answering the questions that officers will ask, including those outlined below in Recommendation 9. Supervisors must have a clear understanding of the difference between the EIS and disciplinary systems to ensure that the lawful rights and privileges afforded to officers are not violated. Finally, supervisors must become aware of the myriad of resources and options available to help their employees. San Francisco has a wide variety of intervention opportunities from which to choose, depending on the needs of the officer.

Recommendation: The department should publish on its Intranet a Frequently Asked Questions segment about the EIS. Based upon PERF’s work with departments across the country implementing early intervention systems, some of the most common questions that police employees have about EIS include:

- What kinds of data are included in the EIS and why are they included?
- What are the thresholds and why were they set at those levels?
- Who has access to the EIS data?
- Can officers challenge data they think are incorrect?
- When and where can the data be accessed?
- Is there a formal protocol that outlines supervisors’ responsibilities?
- What resources are available for supervisors to assist workers?

APPENDIX 1
ABOUT THE POLICE EXECUTIVE RESEARCH FORUM

The Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) is a source of expertise on the policies, practices, and operations of police departments. For more than 30 years, PERF has provided consulting services to law enforcement agencies, conducted research on the issues of greatest concern to police executives, educated up-and-coming police officials at its Senior Management Institute for Police, and stimulated debate about policing issues within the profession, in the news media, and among policy-makers and the public.

In short, when police officials need advice on almost any aspect of what they do, they turn to PERF.

PERF has achieved this unique status in part because it is a hybrid organization—a research and development “think tank,” a consulting firm, a source of higher education for police leaders, and a membership organization of more than 1,200 progressive police executives from city, county, and state law enforcement agencies. These functions cross-pollinate each other in countless ways, making each function stronger. For example, PERF’s national conferences and daily contacts with our members keep us informed about the issues and problems that police officials are facing, and we use that information in setting our research agenda. We obtain extremely high response rates on research surveys because we can survey our members, who are familiar with our work and trust us. We use our research findings about best practices in policing when departments ask us to review their policies, practices, and operations. And because our Senior Management Institute for Police has an interactive learning format, each year we learn from the 250 senior officials who discuss their police strategies, implementation issues, and operational and administrative practices as part of the learning process.

Day by day, year by year, PERF’s staff members synthesize the knowledge and experience from all of these functions, resulting in a level of expertise that is unparalleled in policing.

From its earliest days, PERF has been recognized as a leader in setting the standards for policing; PERF was one of the founding agencies of the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA), and is responsible for developing many of the benchmarks against which agencies are measured in order to obtain CALEA accreditation. Over the years, PERF staff members have served both as CALEA assessors and as accreditation managers. But PERF’s expertise has gone far beyond the limited CALEA standards. Through our experience in conducting management studies of more than 130 law enforcement agencies, as well as our daily contacts with police executives and other activities, PERF has gained a wider, deeper, more thorough knowledge base on everything from use of force, early intervention systems, racially biased policing, and crime reduction strategies to productivity analysis and technology assessments.

To provide a few examples of PERF projects:

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

- The U.S. government, private-sector entities such as Motorola, General Dynamics, Lockheed Martin, and the Carnegie Foundation, and academic institutions have reached out to PERF to identify trends in policing as well as solutions to serious law enforcement problems.
- With support from Motorola, PERF surveyed its members and convened a national summit on the immigration issue, and was able to produce a set of consensus recommendations despite the polarizing nature of that issue. Other PERF/Motorola summits and reports have focused on violent crime, use of force, suicide bomb threats, and other topics.
- In a project with the City of Minneapolis and the U.S. Congress, PERF currently is studying the role of local police agencies in National Security Special Events, including the 2008 Republican and Democratic National Conventions.
- In 2005, PERF recognized the serious implications of Conducted Energy Devices (e.g., Tasers™) and launched two studies, including a groundbreaking study of deaths following CED use, and produced a set of tightly written guidelines to prevent abuse of the new technology.
- Also in 2005, PERF's "finger on the pulse" of police chiefs nationwide detected a resurgence in violent crime long before FBI statistics could confirm it, and PERF focused the nation's attention on increasing crime rates, resulting in a White House meeting with police executives and a new grant proposal in the President's budget.
- PERF has helped Minneapolis, St. Louis, and Kingston, Jamaica reduce their levels of homicide and other violent crime.
- The Justice Department chose PERF to evaluate the implications of the "Beltway sniper" incident for complex, multi-jurisdiction investigations.
- PERF also has a growing international reputation for its involvement in the development of democratic policing in Northern Ireland and the Middle East, and for its role in the State Department's International Visitor Leadership Program, which brings police officials from around the world to PERF's headquarters to meet with PERF's staff, obtain training, and discuss policing issues. Recent participating countries include Ireland, Kosovo, and Ukraine.
- PERF's fellowship program brings police executives from around the country and the world to work at PERF for six months, sharing their knowledge with PERF's staff experts. Recent participants have come from New Zealand Police, the Metropolitan Police Service of London, and the Boston, MA Police Department.
- Many large and small cities interested in conducting a nationwide search for a new police chief, including Los Angeles, Chicago, Savannah, New Haven, and Cedar Rapids, have demonstrated their confidence in PERF's expertise by using our "Executive Search" services.
- PERF has been at the center of two of the most sweeping innovations in policing in recent decades: community policing and problem-oriented policing. In 1990,

Prof. Herman Goldstein wrote his seminal book, *Problem-Oriented Policing*, with support from PERF and the National Institute of Justice. That book defined problem-oriented policing (POP) and described early experiments, such as the author's work with the Madison, Wis. Police Department and PERF's collaboration with Baltimore County, Md. to use problem-oriented concepts in responding to homicides. For 14 years, PERF hosted the annual International Problem-Oriented Policing Conference in conjunction with the San Diego Police Department. And for nearly a decade PERF sponsored an annual competition to recognize innovative POP programs with its Herman Goldstein Award. PERF also played a similar role in developing the concept of community policing and in applying community policing principles to police agency programs. With support from the U.S. Justice Department, PERF and four other law enforcement organizations joined forces to create the Community Policing Consortium, which has provided research, training, and technical assistance to police agencies and helped to spread the concepts of community policing to thousands of police and sheriffs' departments across the nation.

PERF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

PERF is one of the nation's leading providers of management consulting services to police agencies, having conducted comprehensive studies of police departments and reviews of particular systems or issues in departments of all sizes across the nation.

PERF's management services are informed by its status as a membership organization of police executives and a research and development institution. As our research discovers, confirms, and documents best policing practices, our management services staff integrates these best practices in PERF's organizational reviews. Conversely, as our management studies uncover issues and practices that concern police agencies and citizens, these issues are addressed by PERF's Research Department.

The Management Services Division offers a full range of consulting services to member and non-member police organizations of all sizes, including:

- Comprehensive management surveys, performance audits, and organizational studies;
- Development of use-of-force policies and training and early intervention systems;
- Resource allocation studies, workload assessments, and beat planning;
- Human resource management reviews;
- Productivity analysis and recommendations for improvements;
- On-site assistance in implementing recommendations;
- Education and training development, delivery, and review;
- Technology and automation needs assessments, RFP development, and assistance with vendor selection;
- Organizational climate review and organizational development planning;

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

- Core process identification and process mapping; and
- Strategic planning assistance.

PERF has provided technical assistance in specialized areas such as records and information processing, budgeting, communications, crime prevention, management of criminal investigations, and police handling of special populations.

Our management services staff has conducted comprehensive management studies of law enforcement agencies across the United States. Through this work and PERF's close relationship with all levels of police practitioners, PERF enjoys an excellent reputation for being in touch with contemporary law enforcement leadership styles, effective organizational structures, operations, and tactics - and how they relate to individual agency missions, professional values, and expectations of the public.

Over the last 12 years, PERF has worked with the following agencies on projects focusing on addressing police management issues in order to improve organizational effectiveness and efficiency. These studies have covered both in-depth analyses of key elements of police operations as well as complete organizational reviews.

Comprehensive Management Studies – Including Resource Allocation	
Lakewood, CO Police Department	Oakland, CA Police Department
San Jose, CA Police Department	Medford, OR Police Department
Riverton, WY Police Department	Lake Park, FL Police Department
University Circle, OH Police Department	Grass Valley, CA Police Department
Killeen, TX Police Department	West Palm Beach, FL Police Dept.
North Carolina State Univ. Police Dept.	Raleigh, NC Police Department
Shelby County, TN Sheriff's Office	Clinton, CT Police Department
Wilmington, NC Police Department	Ashland, OR Police Department
Dayton, Ohio Police Department	Ocean City, MD Police Department
St. Louis, MO Police Department	Cape Girardeau, MO Police Department
Savannah Chatham, GA Metropolitan Police Department	Fort Lee, NJ Police Department

Management Planning and Information Systems	
Stamford, CT Police Department	Kansas City, MO Police Department

Information System Studies	
Greenbelt, MD Police Department	Temple, TX Police Department
Annapolis, MD Police Department	Milwaukee, WI Police Department
Bell County, TX Police Department and Sheriff's Office	

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Technology Implementation Evaluation	
Pasadena, CA Police Department	Arlington, TX Police Department
Lowell, MA Police Department	

Police Overtime Utilization	
U.S. Attorney's Office, Washington, DC	Milwaukee, WI Police Department

Resource Allocation Studies	
Kiawah Island, SC	Corvallis, OR Police Department
Wright County, MN Sheriff's Office	Prince George's County, MD Sheriff's Office
Overland Park, KS Police Department	The Federal Protective Service, DC
Maryland Transportation Authority Police Department	New Castle County, DE Police Department
Tuscaloosa County, AL Sheriff's Office	Yarmouth, MA Police Department
University Circle, OH Police Department	St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department
Fort Collins, CO Police Services	Kent County, MI Sheriff's Office
Cape May County, NJ Prosecutor's Office	Mesa, AZ Police Department

Training Review	
The Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas	The Minnesota State Patrol
Massachusetts Criminal Justice Training Council (Basic Curriculum Development)	The New Jersey State Police

Strategic Planning Assistance	
University of Illinois at Chicago Police Department	Denver, CO Police Department
Jamaica, West Indies Constabulary Force	Brown County, WI
Charlotte/Mecklenburg, NC Police Department	Washington, DC Metropolitan Police Department

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Disciplinary System and Internal Affairs Reviews	
Indianapolis, IN Police Department	St. Petersburg, FL Police Department
Metropolitan Nashville Police Department	Eugene, OR Police Department
New Haven, CT Police Department	Denver, CO Police Department
San Antonio, TX Police Department	Chicago, IL Police Department

Organizational Climate and Strategic Planning Assistance	
Tacoma, WA Police Department	Eugene, OR Police Department

Leadership Training and Development	
Nassau County, NY Police Department	Lakewood, CO Police Department
Broward County, FL Sheriff's Office	

DNA Evidence Utilization
National Commission on the Future of DNA Evidence

Process Studies of Investigations	
Arlington, TX Police Department	Lakewood, CO Police Department
Naperville, IL Police Department	West Palm Beach, FL Police Department
Chicago, IL Police Department	Phoenix, AZ Police Department
Thames Valley, United Kingdom Police Force	Charlotte-Mecklenburg, NC Police Department
Nashville, TN Police Department	New Haven, CT Police Department

Alternative Police Service (Contract Assessments)	
Destin, FL, City Council Police Service Alternative	Rockville, MD Police Department

PERF PUBLICATIONS

PERF has developed and published some of the leading literature in the law enforcement field, including landmark publications on use-of-force issues, police management, and community policing:

Police Management and Operations:

- Promoting Effective Homicide Investigations (2007)
- “Good to Great” Policing: Application of Business Management Principles in the Public Sector (2007)

- Strategies for Intervening with Officers through Early Intervention Systems: A Guide for Front-Line Supervisors (2006)
- Supervision and Intervention within Early Intervention Systems: A Guide for Law Enforcement Chief Executives (2005)
- Managing Multijurisdictional Cases: Identifying the Lessons Learned from the Sniper Investigation (2004)
- Recognizing Value in Policing: The Challenge of Measuring Police Performance (2002)
- Challenge to Change: The 21st Century Policing Project (1998)
- How to Recognize Good Policing: Problems and Issues (1998)
- Police Program Evaluation (1997)
- Quantifying Quality in Policing (1995)
- Police Management: Issues and Perspectives (1992)
- Beyond Command and Control: The Strategic Management of Police Departments (1991)

Information Management and Technology:

- Issues in IT: A Reader for the Busy Police Chief Executive (2005)
- Information Management and Crime Analysis: Practitioners' Recipes for Success (1997)

Police Use of Force:

- Chief Concerns: Strategies for Resolving Conflict and Minimizing Use of Force (2007)
- Conducted Energy Devices: Development of Standards for Consistency and Guidance (2006)
- Chief Concerns: Exploring the Challenges of Police Use of Force (2005)
- The Force Factor: Measuring Police Use of Force Relative to Suspect Resistance (1997)
- And Justice for All: Understanding and Controlling Police Abuse of Force (1995)
- Deadly Force: What We Know - A Practitioner's Desk Reference on Police-Involved Shootings (1992)

Community Policing and Problem Oriented Policing:

- Community Policing: The Past, Present and Future (2004)
- Citizen Involvement: How Community Factors Affect Progressive Policing (2000)

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

- **Problem-Oriented Policing: Crime-Specific Problems, Critical Issues and Making POP Work** (3 volumes, 1998-2000)
- **Neighborhood Team Policing: Organizational Opportunities and Obstacles** (1997)
- **Policing a Multicultural Community** (1997)
- **Problem-Oriented Policing** (1990)

Special Populations:

- **Law Enforcement Training on Elder Abuse: A Police Executive's Guide** (2007)
- **The Police Response to People with Speech and Hearing Disabilities: Trainers Guide** (1998)
- **The Police Response to People with Mental Illness: Trainers Guide/Training Video** (1997) (An updated curriculum, produced with support from the Justice Department's Office for Victims of Crime, will be forthcoming in 2008.)
- **Innovative Training Package for Detecting and Aiding Victims of Domestic Elder Abuse** (1993)
- **The Police Response to the Homeless: A Status Report** (1993)
- **Take Another Look: Police Response to People with Seizures and Epilepsy** (1993)
- **Miranda and the Deaf Suspect** (videotape, 1992)
- **A Time for Dignity: Police and Domestic Abuse of the Elderly** (1988)

Other titles of note:

- **Violent Crime in America: What We Know About Hot Spots Enforcement** (2008)
- **Police Chiefs and Sheriffs Speak Out on Local Immigration Enforcement** (2008)
- **Violent Crime in America: "A Tale of Two Cities"** (2007)
- **Police Planning for an Influenza Pandemic: Case Studies and Recommendations from the Field** (2007)
- **Patrol-Level Response to a Suicide Bomb Threat: Guidelines for Consideration** (2007)
- **A Gathering Storm: Violent Crime in America** (2006)
- **Chief Concerns: Police Management of Mass Demonstrations: Identifying Issues and Successful Approaches** (2006)
- **Patrol Training Officer (PTO) Program** (2004)
- **Racially Biased Policing: A Principled Response** (2001)
- **Selecting a Police Chief: A Handbook for Local Government** (1999)
- **Citizen Review Resource Manual** (1995)

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

- Using Research: A Primer for Law Enforcement Managers (1994)

In all of its activities, PERF adheres to its founding principles of improving police service by professionalizing police executive management; fostering growth and knowledge of police science and administration; and supporting the continuing development and implementation of standards to improve police performance.

APPENDIX 2
LIST OF EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW
AND FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS

APPENDICES

The following table presents the 161 participants in the “External Stakeholder” interviews and focus groups.

Name	Organization
Alvin Williams	Community Member
Ann Shord	Community Member
Anni Chung	Self-Help for the Elderly
Anthony Franklin	Community Member
Audrey Ward	Community Member
Ben Lee	Community Member
Bevan Dufty	Board of Supervisors
Brice Robinson	Community Member
Calvin Jones	Community Member
Carl Brown	Community Member
Carlos Garcia	San Francisco Unified School District
Carmen Chu	Board of Supervisors
Chris Lette	Community Member
Cindy Brandon	San Francisco SAFE - “SRC Member”
Cui Yan Xie	Community Member
Curtis Campbell	Community Member
Cynthia Williams	Community Member
Dale Jacobs	Community Member
Dan Semelsberger	Community Member
Daniel Hurtado	Community Member
Daniel Mancia	Community Member
David Campos	Police Commissioner
David Ebarle	Department of Emergency Management Support Services Manager
David Gutierrez	Community Member
David Hirtz	Community Member
Diane Thomas	Community Member
Diane Yip	Neighborhood Watch Group - Ingleside
Donald Bachner	Community Member
Donald Henderson	Community Member
Earl Moore	Community Member
Emily Moto Murase	San Francisco Department on the Status of Women
Father Paul	Community Member
Frances Hsieh	Office of Senator Carole Migden
Francisco Andrade	Community Member
Galen Gee	Community Member
Garth Collins	Community Member
Gavin Newsom	Mayor
George Jones	Community Member
Gerardo Sandoval	Board of Supervisors
Gilda Serrano	Community Member
Gillian Gillett	San Jose/Guerrero Coalition to Save our Streets
Gina Fromer	Community Member

APPENDICES

Gina Nibbi	Pacific Union Real Estate
Gracia Wiarda	Community Member
Helynna Brooke	Community Member
Herb Alston	Community Member
I. Fabular	Gartner Consulting
Jackie Wright	Community Member
Jacquelin Laurent	Community Member
Jakada Imani	Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Jake McGoldrick	Board of Supervisors
James Ellis	Community Member
Jamie Woo	Community Member
Jean Field	Office of Citizen Complaints
Jeanne Woodford	Adult Probation Department
Jed Lane	Community Member
Jeff Adachi	Office of the Public Defender
Jermain Collins	Community Member
Jerry Taylor	Community Member
Jesus Estrada	Community Member
Jodi Schwartz	Lyric
Joe Alioto Veronese	Police Commission
John Scott	Community Member
John Serrano	Community Member
John Torres	Department of Children, Youth, and Families
Johnican George	Community Member
Joseph Watkins	Community Member
Joyce Hicks	Office of Citizen Complaints
Juan Luis Loza	Community Member
Julio Escobar	Comunidad San Dimas - "SRC Member"
Justin Surber	Community Member
Karen Wong	Chinatown Resident
Kari Lee	Chinatown YMCA
Kay Tsenin	San Francisco Superior Court
Keith Wilson	Community Member
Ken Stein	Community Member
Kenneth Mayes	Community Member
Kevin Ryan	Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice
Kim Humphrey	Community Member
Kimberly Wicoff	Communities of Opportunity
Kinny Li	Community Member
Kitty Ha	Community Member
LaShawn Boston	Community Member
Laura Phillips	Department of Emergency Management Executive Director
Lawson Snipes Jr.	Community Member
Leela Gill	North of Panhandle Neighborhood Association
Leigh Ann Baughman	Community Member
Linda Ng	Community Member

APPENDICES

Lisa Hoffmann	Department of Emergency Management Deputy Director
Lisa Shell	PG&E
Liz Thornton	Community Member
Lonnie Holmes	Community Member
Lydia Vincent	Community Member
M. Hennessey	Sheriff's Department
Mai Ho	Asian Perinatal Advocates
Margaret Chiu	San Francisco Unified School District - "SRC Member"
Marianne Hampton	Community Member
Mark Adams	Community Member
Mark Sanchez	School Board
Mark Schlossberg	ACLU of Northern California
Marlene Tran	Community Member
Mary Harris	Ocean View-Merced Heights-Ingleside Neighbors in Action - "SRC Member"
Maya Dillard Smith	MOCJ Violence Prevention Director
Mesha Monge-Irizarry	Community Member
Michael Barrett	Community Member
Michael Jawitz	Community Member
Michael Messina	Community Member
Michael Minix	Community Member
Michael Peters	Community Member
Michela Alioto-Pier	Board of Supervisors
Niam Harrison	Community Member
Nikki Calma	SF Pride Board/Asian & Pacific Islander Wellness Center - "SRC Member"
Pat Knapp	Community Member
Paul Stewart	Community Member
Petra DeJesus	Police Commission
Po Yee Ung	Asian Pacific American Community Center (APACC)
Quintin Mecke	Safety Network Partnership
Quijuan Maloof	Community Member
R. Guintini	District Attorney's Office
Rachel Redondiez	Office of Supervisor Chris Daly
Raymond Ng	Community Member
Rebecca Rolfe	SF LGBT Center
Reed Fromer	Community Member
Rev. James McCray	Community Member
Richard Rendon	Community Member
Richard Smart	Community Member
Robert Montgomery	Community Member
Robert Yu	Bay Area Immigrants Rights Coalition
Roger Grant	Community Member
Ron Well	Community Member
Rose Chung	Office of Supervisor Aaron Peskin
Ross Mirkarimi	Board of Supervisors
Sandra Fewer	Community Member
Sean Elsbernd	Board of Supervisors

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Sharen Hewitt	Community Member
Shawn Brown	Community Member
Shirley Moore	Community Member
Shirley Smart	Community Member
Sonyja Blanson	Community Member
Sophie Maxwell	Board of Supervisors
Stephen La Plante	Community Member
Steve Falk	San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Steven Cornell	Brownies Hardware
Terry Lavern	Community Member
Thomas P. Mazzucco	Police Commission
Tina D'Elia	Communities United Against Violence - "SRC Member"
Tom Ammiano	Board of Supervisors
Tom Knapp	Community Member
Tomiquia Moss	Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation - "SRC Member"
Tommie Hannah	Community Member
Tony Kelly	Community Member
Troy Dangerfield	Community Member
Walter Simmons	Community Member
Walter Turner	Community Member
Wendy Dawson	Community Member
William Sifferman	Juvenile Probation Department
Willie B. Bender, Jr.	Community Member
Willie B. Kennedy	Community Member
Yvonne Y. Lee	Police Commission
Zoe Astrachan	Interstice Architects
Zoon Nguyen	Office of the Assessor-Recorder

The Internal Stakeholder interview participants were members of the San Francisco Police Department and are listed below. They totaled 90. *(SFPD focus group participants were allowed to remain anonymous in order to encourage openness and candor in their discussion and are not included in the following list).*

- | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| A. Brown | D. Mahoney | J. Chisholm | J. Williams |
| A. Casillas | D. McDonagh | J. Dudley | K. Brown |
| A. Fotinos | D. O'Leary | J. Ehrlich | K. Bukowski |
| A. Pardini | D. Schmitt | J. Feeney | K. Cashman |
| A. Sevilla | D. Shinn | J. Garrity | K. Sanford |
| A. Villagomez | E. Cota | J. Goldberg | L. Espinda |
| B. Chin | E. Ferrando | J. Grady | L. Millitello |
| B. Fong | G. Corrales | J. Hennessey | L. Ramian |
| B. Magee | G. Delagnes | J. Lindberg | M. Chacon |
| B. Topp | G. Jimenez | J. Lynch | M. Connelly |
| C. Casciato | G. Pohley | J. Lynch | M. Dunnigan |
| C. Orkes | G. Yee | J. McFadden | M. Gamble |
| C.J. Keohane | H. Fong | J. Murphy | M. Gonzales |
| C. Holt | H. Garcia | J. Reilly | M. Moore |
| D. Collins | I. Sequeira | J. Schlotz | M. Pengel |
| D. Lazar | J. Ballentine | J. Tidwell | M. Stasko |

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

M. Sullivan
M. Tabak
N. Gittens
N. Greely
N. Martinez
P. Chignell
P. Jackson

P. Johnson
P. Rames
R. Corriea
R. Kilshaw
R. Roth
S. Craig
S. Dehaven

S. Dillon
S. Harper
S. Ferrigno
S. Silverman
S. Tacchini
S. Titel
S. Tong

T. Hettrich
T. McCoy
T. O'Neill
T. Wearing
V. Rothenberg

APPENDIX 3
LIST OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED TO
EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS

External Stakeholders were asked the following questions during interviews and focus groups.

1. Tell us how long you have been a resident of San Francisco and how crime impacts your life.
2. What are your expectations of the San Francisco Police Department?
3. Are those expectations being met?
4. What do you think are the strengths of the San Francisco Police Department? What is that based on?
5. What are the weaknesses of the San Francisco Police Department? What is that based on?
6. What would the ideal San Francisco Police officer be like? Can you provide an example?
7. As a resident, do you want to be involved in policing in San Francisco? If you want to be involved, explain how.
8. Please sum up your vision for the ideal SFPD in one word or phrase.

Internal Stakeholders were asked the following questions during interviews and focus groups.

1. What are the most significant crime issues facing San Francisco?
 2. How do you think the police department could be more effective in addressing crime issues?
 3. Can you identify specific areas where the department performs exceptionally well?
 4. Can you identify specific areas the department could improve upon?
 5. What do you feel are the most important qualities for a San Francisco Police officer to have?
 6. Can you identify the specific steps that the department could take that would enhance career development for officers?
 7. If you had your way, 5 years from now what would the SFPD be like?
 8. Please sum up your vision for the SFPD in a word or one sentence.
-

APPENDIX 4 ABOUT THE VISION STATEMENT

The San Francisco Police Department Vision Statement is designed to present an image of what the San Francisco Police Department wants to develop into—an ideal yet achievable future. In a nutshell, it answers the question “What do we want this organization to become?” The Vision Statement has the quality of uniqueness; it fits the unique qualities of the City of San Francisco and reflects what San Franciscans have said they want from their Police Department.

The Vision Statement recognizes that the City of San Francisco is a world-class city, noted not only for its physical beauty but also for its community members’ commitment to a collective *humanity*—their compassion, diversity, and support for human rights and justice.

The Vision Statement also recognizes that in San Francisco, these values are not just words. San Franciscans take seriously the democratic process and demand that all agencies of the local government embrace these values in their decisions and actions.

Thus, the San Francisco community does not want its Police Department to be “separate.” Community members want a police department that shares their own ideals. That is why the vision statement begins with a commitment that the Police Department will embrace the city’s commitment to compassion, fairness, diversity, human rights and justice.

Developing a Workforce Reflective of the City - When the Police Department workforce reflects the diversity of the city’s community members, the police can best mirror the character of San Franciscans. As one owner of a small business put it when asked to describe an ideal SFPD, officers should be seen as “part of the community—one of us.” Many community members express a desire to be treated with respect by the police. They do not want a police department that feels like an external force, but rather as members of a family who treat those they serve as they would treat their own family members.

Moving from Reactive to Proactive Policing - The Vision Statement reflects that the Police Department’s core mission includes responding to crime and violence as well as undertaking large-scale proactive efforts to *prevent* crimes. Because the causes of crime are infinitely complex, the police cannot be successful in crime prevention without fully engaging communities in identifying the conditions that result in crime, neighborhood by neighborhood, and then eliminating or reducing those conditions. The Police Department must constantly form problem-solving partnerships through which community members help identify the problems of most concern to them, work with officers to gain as complete an understanding as possible of the dimensions of the problems, explore the responses most likely to solve the problems, determine the criteria for judging success, and implement solutions.

Leveraging Technology - The Vision Statement also reflects concerns that the Police Department needs to take full advantage of technologies that have proven successful in fighting crime and in helping to make administrative decisions. This includes current and emerging technologies, such as systems that provide accurate, reliable, up-to-the-minute information to the police about crime patterns, which they can then use to make timely and informed decisions about countermeasures. This also includes information and communication technologies that provide street-level information directly to officers by community members, as well as technologies that assist in analyzing resource allocations, deployment and use of time, and improving department efficiency. The Police Department must obtain and implement state-of-the-art technology, and must establish methods of obtaining information from its neighborhood partners, who often identify crime problems before even the best information technology can bring them to the attention of police.

Ensuring Accountability - The Vision Statement emphasizes that the Police Department must be accountable to its community members and leadership. Fundamentally, police actions must be authorized by the community. Police actions must be viewed as appropriate and legitimate. Society gives the police the legitimate authority to use force and to deprive people of their liberty when necessary; and therefore, the police must be held to the highest standards and must be accountable and open to review of their actions. The police must be judicious in using their power—and must act properly in all of their daily activities. The police must continually seek to gain and maintain community members' trust. One of the best ways for the police to obtain that trust is to establish strong systems of accountability that allow community members' complaints to be aired in a fair and expeditious manner.

Ensuring Transparency - To be accountable to the people, the Police Department must also strive to be open and transparent in its policies and procedures, its training, and in the processes it uses to review its own actions. The department must put into place methods to monitor and manage the behavior of its employees. The department must hold itself to the highest possible standards and invite questions and concerns when it seems to fall short of expectations.

Building Careers and Developing Personnel - The Vision Statement renews the San Francisco Police Department's commitment to providing the city with the best possible employees. San Francisco Police Department employees express satisfaction with many aspects of their jobs, but desire more concrete ways of achieving recognition and advancement within the organization. It is in everyone's best interest to have police employees who view their jobs as a lifelong career, not as a temporary position or a stepping stone to something else. The Police Department must engage in leadership development at all levels of the organization, beginning with those it chooses to bring into the department. Efforts must be made to develop an interest in the policing career path to encourage San Franciscans to become officers. Training must be of the highest possible quality, designed to equip new employees with the unique skill sets they need to be effective in San Francisco. The department must also provide ongoing training throughout its employees' careers. And the department must institutionalize systems to reward people for their hard work and creativity in solving problems.

Providing Leadership - The department also must provide strong direction and support for its officers, especially when they are called upon to handle difficult issues. Policing is an extremely difficult job and far more complex than the policing of past generations. Officers often are required to strike a fine balance on delicate issues. For example, a continuing policing issue is how to devote resources to focus on serious violent crime and also on “quality of life” offenses. Given the increasing number and complexity of such challenges, the City and Police Department must work to provide their employees with guidance and leadership on difficult issues and support them when they make honest mistakes. Such guidance and direction must be based on the Police Department’s knowledge of community members' views, developed through its tight connections with them. In this way, officers' street-level actions will be extensions of sound policy decisions, and officers can perform their duties to the best of their ability, secure in the knowledge that their actions have the support of San Francisco community members.

The Police Department must also exercise its leadership in working collaboratively with other city departments, especially other agencies in the criminal justice system. To ensure an effective and coordinated response to crime, the Police Department needs to build strong working relationships with prosecutors, public defenders, probation and parole officials, nonprofit organizations, and others.

Balancing Democratic Process and a Sense of Urgency - Finally, San Franciscans’ strong belief in the democratic *process* must not result in a failure to act simply because the process is allowed to be never-ending. Crime is always a serious problem in big cities, even when it is declining, so the status quo is never good enough. The San Francisco Police Department must reinforce its commitment to balancing the need for sound process with a sense of urgency in making the necessary decisions that will provide a world-class city with a world-class police department.

APPENDIX 5
SAMPLE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR POLICE OFFICERS

1. Yearly Program Revision and Update

In order to facilitate evaluation of the Professional Development Program, objectives for the program will be set annually by the department. Annually, an assessment and evaluation of the program shall be conducted by the Training and Education Division Captain. The resulting report shall identify any revisions that are recommended and shall be forwarded via the chain of command to the Chief of Police. Revisions approved by the Chief of Police will be incorporated into the program, and all affected personnel will be notified.

The Training and Education Division Commander's annual report will contain sections on:

1. Recommendations for the inclusion or deletion of skills, knowledge and/or abilities from the position description of police officer. Supporting documentation for any such modification must be included as well as a notation of the revisions to the current recruit, in-service, or specialty training course inventory.
2. The number of officers at each level of the Professional Development Plan, and the number and percent change from the previous year.
3. A listing of training resources that were utilized during the year by officers to meet program requirements.
4. The number of training hours attended by officers to meet program requirements.

2. Administration of the Program

- A. Administrator: The Deputy Chief of the Administrative Bureau is the primary administrator of the Professional Development Program.
- B. First Eligibility: Police officers are first eligible to enter the Professional Development Program when they have successfully completed academy training, field training, and their probationary period.
- C. Plan Levels and Salary: There are five levels in the Professional Development Plan for police officers. Each level requires an increased level of training, experience and education. There is an increase in salary when each new level is achieved.

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

- D. Advancement Approval: All requests for advancement will first be reviewed by the officer's chain of command. A recommendation for approval or disapproval will be directed from the officer's sergeant through the officer's Bureau chief. Before the Bureau chief approves a request for advancement, he/she will confer with the program administrator for concurrence that all requirements have been met.
1. If advancement to the next level is approved, the Program Administrator will notify the officer in writing, advising the effective date of the advancement.
 2. If advancement to the next level is not approved, the officer will be notified in writing by the Program Administrator of the requirements that the officer lacks for advancement.
 3. Whenever advancement is not approved, the officer and his/her immediate supervisor will be required to meet with the Training and Education Division Captain to review his/her Professional Development File to ensure deficiencies have been adequately addressed prior to a second request for advancement.
- E. General Policies Regarding Progress:
1. Each officer shall be given a copy of the procedures and qualifications for advancement under this program at the time of his/her appointment as a California POST certified police officer of the San Francisco Police Department.
 2. As departmental objectives and work priorities permit, shift assignment modifications or changes may be authorized to facilitate an officer's attendance of program-approved workshops, seminars, or college/university classes. Officers requesting such accommodation shall submit a letter of request for schedule adjustments through their chain of command to their division commander. If the request is denied, the officer will be notified of the reason. Approval of shift adjustments shall be based, first, on the availability of sufficient other personnel to meet safe minimum staffing requirements, and secondly, on the relevance of the content of the proposed course to the officer's position. Officers must understand that the needs of the department and officer and community safety come first.
 3. Officers seeking advancement may be assigned temporarily to investigative, service, or staff units and/or other specialty components of the department so they can gain career specialty experiences through performing the duties and responsibilities of the position. The department

is open to providing opportunities that allow officers to gain a wider breadth of experience through temporary assignments. Officers seeking a temporary assignment shall make the request through their chain of command to their division commander. Key factors in approving such assignments will be to ensure that appropriate shift levels are maintained and that opportunities for temporary assignments are utilized effectively. The division commander will coordinate with the Training and Education Commander who facilitates all such opportunities. The Training and Education unit commander's office will maintain a list of units in which "special-temporary" assignments are available. The Training and Education Commander will work with commanders who have posted "special-temporary" positions in matching them with interested officers.

4. A training requirement for a particular professional development level may be waived or temporarily suspended if that particular required training is unavailable.
5. In order for credit to be earned for professional development, approval of training courses, seminars, etc. must be secured in advance. Failure to do so may prevent that particular training course from being considered as meeting qualification standards.
6. Once final approval for an officer's advancement from one level to the next is given by the program administrator, the date of the Letter of Approval for Advancement is the beginning date for the time requirements for the next level.

F. Professional Development Records: Written records shall be maintained on all training received by participants in the program. It is the responsibility of officers to ensure that a record of training is provided to the Training and Education Division Commander. Training and Education Division personnel will maintain the department's training records. Each officer will have an individual professional development file maintained by the Training and Education Division.

3. Responsibilities of Supervisory Personnel

Admission Approval: Police officers who meet the eligibility requirements for entering the Professional Development Program must request admission to the program in writing through the chain of command to the program administrator. Officers will receive admission approval in writing which will also include an effective date and level placement in the Program. The program administrator will direct this letter to the officer with copies to the officer's chain of command and the Training and Education Division Commander.

Career Counseling: Career counseling shall be conducted and is an important

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

component of the Professional Development Program. Officers shall meet annually with their supervisor who will in advance of the meeting review the officer's professional development file. These meetings assist the officer with planning and coordinating individual training and educational goals in the context of the Professional Development Program. This also allows officers to review and update their professional development file.

4. Responsibilities of Officers

1. **Program Admission:** Each officer must submit a letter requesting admission to the program administrator via their chain of command.
2. **Meeting qualifications:** Each officer is responsible for meeting the qualifications for advancement.
3. **Qualifications proof:** Each officer must present proof of each qualification standard met to the Training and Education Division for documentation in the officer's Professional Development File. Proof of successful completion of training may be made by presentation of official certificate or transcript. Participation in activities without such certificate or transcript must be properly documented, dated and approved or verified by letter to the training division as necessary. Supervisor must review the file and confirm the presence of required standards prior to proceeding with a letter of recommendation for advancement.
4. **Advancement Request:** Once the officer has satisfied the requirements as listed in the Professional Development Plan for their next advancement level, the officer shall submit a letter through the chain of command advising that all requirements for advancement have been met and requesting advancement to the next level. This letter shall be endorsed by the commander of the Training and Education Division indicating that all requirements for the level being sought have been met and documented.

5. Responsibilities of Training and Education Division Commander

The primary responsibility of the Training and Education unit commander is to act as a focal point for the day-to-day management of the Professional Development Plan.

1. **Program Admission:** Upon receipt of an approved request for admission into the program from program administrator, the commander shall direct the creation of a professional development file for that officer.
2. **Advancement Request:** Upon request of an officer seeking advancement, the Training and Education Division commander shall evaluate the officer's program development file to determine that all necessary documents and evidence of

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

achievement of the requirements for the level being sought are compiled. Once this is complete and all requirements have been satisfactorily met and documented, the Training and Education Division commander shall endorse the officer's request for advancement.

3. Maintenance of Eligibility: The Training and Education Division commander shall conduct an annual review to determine that each officer is meeting all requirements to maintain their current professional development level. The commander shall submit via the chain of command to the program administrator a report that lists all officers in the professional development program and indicate which officers are no longer complying with the requirements of their level.
 - If the officer is determined not to be in compliance, the officer will be given six months to meet level requirements.
 - If at the end of the six month period, the officer is still not in compliance, an adjustment to the level the officer does meet may be made with appropriate downward salary adjustment.
 - Such non-compliance will result in the officer forfeiting any time accrued at the former level towards the next higher level. Officers reduced in level because of non-compliance will be considered to still have met all time requirements for their former, higher level.
 - The officer has the right to appeal this information to the chief of police. This must be in writing within five working days from notification. The officer must cite the areas of disagreement and provide proper documentation.
 - The Training and Education Division commander shall be apprised of all disciplinary decisions which may impact on maintenance of a professional development level. Such information will trigger an immediate review of an officer's continuing eligibility at a given level.

4. Training Course Inventory - An annual inventory of resources for professional development and training shall be conducted by the Training and Education Division commander. The inventory is used to ensure that adequate resources are available to officers in professional development activities.

Police Officer Professional Development Plan

Each of the five levels of police officer development in the San Francisco Police Department requires increased levels of training, experience, and education. Pay increases are set according to these levels in order to reward officers' attainment of new knowledge, skills, and abilities and to encourage officers to continue developing professionally within the system.

Lateral Entry

At Level I*

Applicants who have met California POST requirements for police officer and are currently certified by POST are eligible for lateral entry into Police Officer Level I, but they must complete the department’s selection process and meet all Level I criteria (see following section), including certification by POST.

Above Level I*

The chief of police may, after thorough evaluation, approve lateral entries above Police Officer Level I for applicants with the appropriate levels of law enforcement training, experience, and education.

** Applicants hired into lateral entry positions must complete the department’s probationary period during which they must complete the department’s field training officer (FTO) program.*

Criteria	Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV	Level V
<u>Experience and Initiative</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed the department’s probationary period. This period begins on the date an officer is sworn in. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serve at least one year at Police Officer Level I. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serve at least two years at Police Officer II. In the past 12 months provide 12 roll call training sessions of instruction to department members in subjects that include proper policing techniques, appropriate equipment use, sound driving techniques, and/or policies and procedures. Fulfill community relations function in the past 12 months by presenting 6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serve at least two years at Police Officer III. Provide 12 hours of instruction to department members in subjects that include proper policing techniques, appropriate equipment use, sound driving techniques, and/or firearms qualification. Fulfill community policing function in the past 12 months by presenting 12 hours of instruction in crime prevention, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serve at least three years at Police Officer IV. Serve as Field Training Officer (FTO) within the past four years. Fulfill community relations function in the past 12 months by presenting 18 hours of instruction in crime prevention, community policing, or another subject relevant to community members. Complete 18 hours of community service in the past 12 months. Maintain contact with community members to

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Criteria	Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV	Level V
			<p>hours of instruction in crime prevention, community policing, or another subject relevant to community members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiate contact with community members to address problems and cultivate positive relationships. • In the past 12 months complete 6 hours of community service. • Initiate a problem-solving project. 	<p>community policing, or another subject relevant to community members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete 12 hours of community service in the past 12 months. • Maintain contact with community members to address problems and cultivate positive relationships. • Participate in efforts to recruit high-quality police personnel. • Assist supervisor in the management of area problem-solving project. • Complete successful temporary assignments that included at least one of the following areas: investigations, narcotics/vice, K-9, mounted patrol, emergency response team, and or/staff services. 	<p>address problems and cultivate positive relationships and cultivated relationships with other law enforcement agencies to cooperatively address community problems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate ability to recruit and mentor high-quality police personnel. • Participate in the department's mentor program. • Complete successful temporary assignments that included at least two of the following: investigations, crime prevention, narcotics/vice, K-9, mounted patrol, and staff services.
<u>Performance and</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieved satisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve with good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve with good conduct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve with good conduct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve with good conduct in the

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Criteria	Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV	Level V
<u>Evaluation</u>	ratings or higher in all areas of a final probationary performance evaluation.	<p>conduct in the past year, with no disciplinary actions, as evidenced by no more than two verbal reprimands, one written reprimand, and no suspensions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receive satisfactory ratings or higher in all areas of most recent performance evaluation. • Maintain physical condition needed to perform assigned duties. • Initiate problem-solving in one documented situation where the officer's actions are shown to have resolved a serious or long-standing problem. 	<p>in the past year with no disciplinary actions, as evidenced by no more than three verbal reprimands in the past 2 years, none in the past 6 months; no more than two written reprimands in the past 2 years, none in the past 6 months; and no suspensions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain physical condition needed to perform assigned duties. 	<p>in the past year with no disciplinary actions, as evidenced by no more than three verbal reprimands in the past 3 years, none in the past 6 months; no more than three written reprimands in the past 3 years, none in the past 6 months; and no suspensions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain physical condition needed to perform assigned duties. 	<p>past year with no disciplinary actions, as evidenced by no more than three verbal reprimands in the past 3 years, none in the past 6 months; no more than one written reprimand in the past year, none in the past 6 months; and no suspensions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain physical condition needed to perform assigned duties.
<u>Training and Certification</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet the dept.'s basic police training requirements. • Pass the department's physical fitness test. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of required in-service training and receipt/comprehension of all training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete one course from the Category 2 training list and one from the Category 3 list. • Complete 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete two additional courses from the Category 2 training list (e.g., crime prevention, defensive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete POST's Advanced Certification. • Complete one additional course from the Category 2 list.

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Criteria	Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV	Level V
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receive proscribed POST officer certification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> bulletins and updates issued throughout the year. Complete two courses from the Category 2 training list 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> POST's Intermediate certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> tactics, basic narcotics investigation, handgun retention), four from the Category 3 list and two from the Category 4 list. Complete the department's field training officer (FTO) program. 	
<u>Education and Endorsements</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain an high school diploma or the equivalent as determined by the training and educational division commander. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete at least 15 semester hours of credit toward a college degree. Secure letters of recommendation for advancement from immediate supervisor and approved through the chain of command. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete at least 30 semester hours of college credit toward a college degree. Secure letters of recommendation for advancement from immediate supervisor and approved through the chain of command. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete at least 60 semester hours of college credit toward a college degree. Secure letters of recommendation for advancement from immediate supervisor and approved through chain of command. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Earn associate's degree or higher from an accredited college or university or at least 60 semester hours of college credit. Secure letters of recommendation for advancement from immediate supervisor and two other supervisors.

APPENDIX 6
PERF CED GUIDELINES FOR CONSIDERATION
AND GLOSSARY OF TERMS

These 52 CED guidelines for consideration are presented with the understanding that many use-of-force situations can change rapidly, and may require law enforcement officers to make quick decisions about force options. It is impossible to anticipate every possible use-of-force situation or circumstance that may occur, and in all cases officers need to rely on their training, judgment and instincts. However, the considerations noted below can help law enforcement officers make more informed judgments about CEDs and how and when to use CEDs to protect themselves and the public.

While every effort was made to consider the views of all contributors and the best thinking on the vast amount of information received, the resulting PERF guidelines do not necessarily reflect the individual views of every stakeholder involved in the development process, nor the views of the U.S. Department of Justice.

- CEDs should only be used against persons who are actively resisting or exhibiting active aggression, or to prevent individuals from harming themselves or others. CEDs should not be used against a passive suspect.
- No more than one officer should activate a CED against a person at a time.
- When activating a CED, law enforcement officers should use it for one standard cycle and stop to evaluate the situation (a standard cycle is five seconds). If subsequent cycles are necessary, agency policy should restrict the number and duration of those cycles to the minimum activations necessary to place the subject in custody.
- Training protocols should emphasize that multiple activations and continuous cycling of a CED appear to increase the risk of death or serious injury and should be avoided where practical.
- Training should include recognizing the limitations of CED activation and being prepared to transition to other force options as needed.
- That a subject is fleeing should not be the sole justification for police use of a CED. Severity of offense and other circumstances should be considered before officers' use of a CED on the fleeing subject.
- CEDs should not generally be used against pregnant women, elderly persons, young children, and visibly frail persons unless exigent circumstances exist.
- CEDs should not be used on handcuffed persons unless they are actively resisting or exhibiting active aggression, and/or to prevent individuals from harming themselves or others.
- CEDs should not generally be used when a subject is in a location where a fall may cause substantial injury or death.

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

- When a subject is armed with a CED and attacks or threatens to attack a police officer, the officer may defend him- or herself to avoid becoming incapacitated and risking the possibility that the subject could gain control of the officer's firearm. When possible, officers should attempt to move outside the device's range (approximately 21 feet) and seek cover, as well as request back-up officers to mitigate the danger.
- When possible, emergency medical personnel should be notified when officers respond to calls for service in which it is anticipated that a CED may be activated against a person.
- Officers should avoid firing darts at a subject's head, neck and genitalia.
- All persons who have been exposed to a CED activation should receive a medical evaluation. Agencies shall consult with local medical personnel to develop appropriate police-medical protocols.
- All persons who have been subjected to a CED activation should be monitored regularly while in police custody even if they received medical care.
- CED darts should be treated as a biohazard. Officers should not generally remove CED darts from a subject that have penetrated the skin unless they have been trained to do so. Agencies should coordinate with medical personnel to develop training for such removal. Only medical personnel should remove darts that have penetrated a person's sensitive areas.
- Following a CED activation, officers should use a restraint technique that does not impair respiration.
- CEDs should not be used in the known presence of combustible vapors and liquids or other flammable substances including but not limited to alcohol-based Oleoresin Capsicum (O.C.) Spray carriers. Agencies utilizing both CEDs and O.C. Spray should use a water-based spray.
- Agencies should create stand-alone policies and training curriculum for CEDs and all less-lethal weapons, and ensure that they are integrated with the department's overall use-of-force policy.
- Agencies should partner with adjacent jurisdictions and enter into a Memorandum of Understanding to develop joint CED policies and protocols. This should include addressing non-alcoholic O.C. Spray carriers. Agencies should also establish multijurisdictional CED training, collaboration and policy.
- If officers' privately owned CEDs are permitted to be used on duty, policy should dictate specifications, regulations, qualifications, etc. The devices should be registered with the department.
- The CED "Probe Mode" should be the primary setting option, with "Drive Stun Mode" generally used as a secondary option.
- CEDs should be regulated while officers are off duty under rules similar to service firearms (including storage, transportation, use, etc.).

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

- CEDs should not be used against suspects in physical control of a vehicle in motion to include automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, ATVs, bicycles and scooters unless exigent circumstances exist.
- The use of brightly colored CEDs (e.g., yellow) reduces the risk of escalating a force situation because they are plainly visible and thus decrease the possibility that a secondary unit mistakes the CED for a firearm (sympathetic fire). Note that specialized units (e.g., SWAT Units) may want dark-colored CEDs for tactical concealment purposes.
- CEDs should be maintained in a holster on an officer's weak (support) side to avoid the accidental drawing and/or firing of an officer's sidearm.
- Officers should be trained that the Taser CED's optimum range is 15 feet.¹⁴
- Auxiliary/Reserve officers can be armed with CEDs provided they receive all mandated training and maintain all requalification requirements. Training and local statutes may dictate policy.
- A warning should be given to a person prior to activating the CED unless to do so would place any other person at risk.
- When applicable, an announcement should be made to other officers on the scene that a CED is going to be activated.
- A supervisor should respond to all incident scenes where a CED was activated.
- A supervisor should conduct an initial review of a CED activation.
- Every instance of CED use, including an accidental discharge, should be accounted for in a use-of-force report.
- Agencies should consider initiating force investigations outside the chain of command when any of the following factors are involved:
 - A subject experiences death or serious injury;
 - A person experiences prolonged CED activation;
 - The CED appears to have been used in a punitive or abusive manner;
 - There appears to be a substantial deviation from training; and
 - A person in an at-risk category has been subjected to activation (e.g., young children; persons who are elderly/frail, pregnant women, and any other activation as determined by a supervisor).
- When possible, supervisors and back-up officers should anticipate on-scene officers' use of CEDs by responding to calls for service that have a high propensity for arrest and/or use of a CED.
- Every substantial investigation (and when possible every preliminary investigation) should include:

¹⁴ Association of Chief Police Officers, 2004. Independent Evaluation of the Operational Trial of TASER.™

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

- Location and interview of witnesses (including other officers);
- Photographs of subject and officer injuries;
- Photographs of cartridges/darts;
- Collection of CED cartridges, darts/prongs, data downloads, car video, confetti ID tags; and
- Copies of the device data download.
- Other information as indicated in guideline #45.
- Police leaders should be aware that CED download data may be unreliable. Police leaders and investigators should be able to articulate the difference between the actual duration of a CED activation on a person and the total time of discharge registered on a CED device.
- CED activations should be tracked in the department's early intervention system (EIS).
- The department should periodically conduct random audits of CED data downloads and reconcile use-of-force reports with recorded activations. Departments should take necessary action as appropriate when inconsistencies are detected.
- Audits should be conducted to ensure that all officers who carry CEDs have attended initial and recertification training.
- Departments should not solely rely on training curriculum provided by a CED manufacturer. Agencies should ensure that manufacturers' training does not contradict their use-of-force policies and values. Agencies should ensure that their CED curriculum is integrated into their overall use-of-force systems.
- CED recertification should occur at least annually and consist of physical competency and device retention, changes in agency policy, technology changes, and reviews of local and national trends in CED use.
- Exposure to CED activation in training should be voluntary; all officers agreeing to be subjected to a CED activation should be apprised of risks associated with exposure to a CED activation.
- Supervisors and command staff should receive CED awareness training so they can make educated decisions about the administrative investigations they review.
- Statistics should be maintained to identify CED trends and deployment concerns. Agencies may include display and arcing of weapons to measure prevention/deterrence effectiveness. CED statistics should be constantly analyzed and made publicly available.
- The following statistical information should be included when collecting information about CED use:

Date, time, location of incident;

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

The use of the laser dot or display of the CED that deterred a subject and gained compliance;
Identifying and descriptive information of the suspect (including membership in an at-risk population), all officers firing CEDs, all officer witnesses, and all other witnesses;
The type and brand of CED used;
The number of CED cycles, the duration of each cycle, the duration between cycles and the duration that the subject was actually activated;
Level of aggression encountered;
Any weapons possessed by the suspect;
The type of crime/incident the subject was involved in;
Determination of whether deadly force would have been justified;
The type of clothing worn by the subject;
The range at which the CED was used;
The type of mode used (probe or drive stun);
The point of impact of probes on a subject in probe mode;
The point of impact on a subject in drive stun mode;
Location of missed probe(s);
Terrain and weather conditions during CED use;
Lighting conditions;
The type of cartridge used;
Officer suspicion that subject was under the influence of drugs (specify if available);
Medical care provided to the subject; and
Any injuries incurred by an officer or subject.

- Law enforcement agencies should conduct neighborhood programs that focus on CED awareness training. CED training should be part of any citizen's training academy program.
- The agency's Public Information Officer should receive extensive training on CEDs in order to better inform the media and the public about the devices. Members of the media should be briefed on the department's policies and use of CEDs.
- CED awareness should extend to law enforcement partners such as local medical personnel, citizen review boards, medical examiners, mental health professionals, judges and local prosecutors.
- CEDs can be effective against aggressive animals. Policies should indicate whether use against animals is permitted.
- Officers should be aware that there is a higher risk of sudden death in people under the influence of drugs and/or symptoms associated with excited delirium.
- CED cartridges with longer barbs may be more effective in extremely cold climates.

- Agencies should be aware that CED cartridges have experienced firing problems an extremely cold weather.
-

PERF CED Glossary of Terms

One of the first issues that led to confusion about CEDs was the disparity of terms used to describe the device. Various organizations used an array of terms to describe the same apparatus (e.g. electronic control weapons, electromuscular incapacitation devices, conducted energy weapon, etc.). Police agencies also used varied definitions for similar behaviors subjects exhibited (e.g., the term *passive aggression* may have different meanings for different police agencies). To minimize the confusion in discussing CEDs, PERF staff developed a list of terms and definitions used in relation to CEDs.

PERF staff examined numerous research reports and agency policies to create this glossary of terms. This list was then vetted through the DOJ's Less Lethal Technology Working Group prior to review at PERF's National Summit in Houston, Texas, to ensure consensus. The goal of the creation of these terms is to encourage consistency and strengthen clarity in regards to the accompanying national CED guidelines for consideration.

Accidental Discharge

The unintentional firing of a conducted energy device (CED).

Activate

Depressing the trigger of a CED causing a CED to arc or to fire probes.

Active Aggression

A threat or overt act of an assault (through physical or verbal means), coupled with the present ability to carry out the threat or assault, which reasonably indicates that an assault or injury to any person is imminent.

Actively Resisting

Physically evasive movements to defeat an officer's attempt at control, including bracing, tensing, pushing, or verbally signaling an intention to avoid or prevent being taken into or retained in custody.

Aggravated Active Aggression

Deadly force encounter.

Air Cartridge

A replaceable cartridge which uses compressed gases to fire two probes on connecting wires, sending a high voltage/low current signal into a subject.

Applicable Response

Response determined appropriate for the given operational scenario.

Arcing/Arching

Activating a CED without a cartridge.

Automatic External Defibrillator (AED)

An apparatus that monitors the heart of the patient and then automatically administers a controlled electric shock to the chest to restore normal heart rhythm.

Basis Response

Generic responses that describe how people routinely behave as the result of the application of a weapon or technology [or tactic, or procedure] employed against them.

Bodily Injury

Injury to the human body that requires treatment by a doctor or other health professional.

CED Cycle

Duration of a CED electrical discharge following a CED activation.

Central Information Display (CID)

Display of data on the back of a conducted energy device.

Circular Situational Force Model

A circular force training model that promotes continuous critical assessment and evaluation of a force incident in which the level of response is based upon the situation encountered and level of resistance offered by a subject. The situational assessment helps officers determine the appropriate force option, ranging from physical presence to deadly force.

Coincidental Injury

Injuries received in the incident not directly related to CED use (such as baton use, self-inflicted wounds, and gunshot wounds).

Conducted Energy Device (CED)

A weapon primarily designed to disrupt a subject's central nervous system by means of deploying electrical energy sufficient to cause uncontrolled muscle contractions and override an individual's voluntary motor responses.¹⁵

¹⁵ Conducted Energy Device (CED) is the preferred terminology for the weapon. It has also been referred to as Electro-Muscular Disruption Technology (EMDT); Electro Muscular Incapacitation device (EMI); Electro Muscular Device (EMD); and Electronic Control Device (ECD).

Confetti Tags

Confetti-like tags expelled from a cartridge of a CED when fired to shoot probes. Each tag contains a serial number unique to the specific cartridge used.

Continuum of Force/Response to Resistance

A training model/philosophy that supports the progressive and reasonable escalation and de-escalation of officer-applied force in proportional response to the actions and level of resistance offered by a subject. The level of response is based upon the situation encountered at the scene and the actions of the subject in response to the officer's commands. Such response may progress from the officer's physical presence at the scene to the application of deadly force.

Crowd Control

The use of police action to stop the activities of persons assembled.

Crowd Management

Observing, monitoring, and facilitating the activities of persons assembled.

Darts

Projectiles that are fired from a CED and penetrate the skin; wires are attached to the probes leading back to the CED.

Dart Placement

Point of entry for a probe on a person's body.

Dart (Barb) Removal

The act of removing a probe from a person's body or clothing.

Defensive Resistance

Physical actions that attempt to prevent officer's control including flight or attempt to flee, but do not involve attempts to harm the officer.

Deployment

Sending CED devices into the field with law enforcement officers.

Deadly Force

Any tactic or use of force that has an intended, natural, and probable consequence of serious physical injury or death.

Discharge

Barbs fired at a subject.

Drive Stun

To stun a subject with a CED by making direct contact with the body after a CED cartridge has been expended or removed for pain compliance.

Duration

The aggregate period of time that CED shocks are activated.

Electrocardiogram Monitor (ECG/EKG)

The machine that measures and records the electrical activity of the heart.

Electromuscular Disruption/Incapacitation (EMD)(EMI)

Effect CED has on the body. Overrides the brain's communication with the body and prevents the voluntary control over the muscles.

Environmental Factors

Factors such as wind speed, temperature, humidity, lighting, precipitation, terrain, etc.

Excessive Force

The application of an unreasonable amount (or force too long applied) of force in a given incident based on the totality of the circumstances.

Excited Delirium

State of extreme mental and physiological excitement, characterized by extreme agitation, hyperthermia, euphoria, hostility, exceptional strength, and endurance without fatigue.

Exigent Circumstances

Circumstances that would cause a reasonable person to believe that prompt action is necessary to prevent physical harm to civilians and/or officers.

Firing

Discharging CED darts at a person.

Fleeing

An active attempt by a person to avoid apprehension by a law enforcement officer through evasive actions while attempting to leave the scene.

Group Cohesion

The ability to disrupt or control a group of individuals by either restricting or enhancing their organization, cooperation, and density.

Initial Basic Operator Training

The first basic CED training provided to officers prior to issuance of a CED.

Intentional Discharge Investigation

An investigation of the circumstances surrounding the firing or drive-stunning of a CED.

Intermediate Weapon

A weapon usage category situated between a *verbal command* and *lethal force* on a traditional force continuum.

Laser Pointing (Red Dot)

Unholstering and pointing a CED at a person and activating the device's laser dot.

Less Lethal

A concept of planning and force application that meets an operational or tactical objective, with less potential for causing death or serious injury than conventional more-lethal police tactics.

Less-Lethal Weapon

Any apprehension or restraint device that, when used as designed and intended, has less potential for causing death or serious injury than conventional police lethal weapons.

Measures of Effectiveness

Measures indicating the degree to which a target response satisfies a requirement within an operational context.

Measures of Response

Measures indicating how a target reacts to a system's effects.

Objective Reasonableness

Reasonableness of a particular use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene in light of the facts and circumstances confronting the officer.

Onset Time

(ideally equal to zero) The period between the deployment of a less-lethal weapon system [or tactic, technique, or procedure] and the point when the magnitude of the desired effect attains some particular threshold.

Operational Effectiveness

That level of force necessary to achieve compliance, safeguard persons and property, or prevent injury.

Operational Safety

That degree of risk determined to be acceptable in order to accomplish a mission without unduly endangering officers, bystanders, or suspects.

Passive Resistance

Physical actions that do not prevent the officer's attempt to control, for example, a person who remains in a limp, prone position, passive demonstrators, etc.

Pointing/Aiming

Unholstering and pointing a CED at a person.

Post-Activation Investigation

An investigation of the circumstances surrounding the intentional or unintentional firing of probes or drive-stunning of a CED.

**Primary Injury
(1st Order Effect)**

Immediate or delayed consequences of a CED resulting directly from an electrical current flow in the body.

Probe Spread

The amount of distance between probes fired from a CED (e.g., approximately one foot spread for every seven feet travel distance).

Proximity Death

The death of a person that occurred in proximity to the use of a conducted energy device (usually within 24 hours).

Psychological Intimidation

Non-verbal cues in attitude, appearance, demeanor, posture, or physical readiness that indicate an unwillingness to cooperate, pre-assaultive posturing, or a threat.

Physical Weapon Characteristics

The intrinsic qualities of a weapon including dimensional design values associated with a weapon (weight, caliber, size, power requirement, shelf life, etc.).

**Secondary Injury
(2nd Order Effect)**

Physical trauma indirectly associated with CED use (e.g., injuries from falls).

Sensitive Areas

A person's head, neck, genital area, and a female's breast areas.

Serious Bodily Injury

Bodily injury that, either at the time of the actual injury or at a later time, involves a substantial risk of death, a substantial risk of serious permanent disfigurement, a

substantial risk of protracted loss or impairment of the function of any part or organ of the body, or breaks, fractures, or burns of the second or third degree.

Spark Test

Non-contact testing of a CED by arcing it to ensure it is in proper working order.

Standard CED Cycle

A five second electrical discharge occurring when a CED trigger is pressed and released. The standard five-second cycle may be shortened by turning the CED off. (Note: If a CED trigger is pressed and held beyond five seconds, the CED will continue to deliver an electrical discharge until the trigger is released.)

Substantial Investigation

An extensive investigation into the use of a conducted energy device that is conducted by investigators outside the chain of command of the firing officer.

Target Recovery

(ideally full recovery immediately at the end of the desired duration) The period when the target response falls below a particular threshold and a full recovery of unimpaired functionality is desired in an operationally meaningful context.

Unintentional Discharge

The unintentional firing of a CED (includes discharges caused by involuntary muscle contraction and mechanical malfunction).

Ventricular Fibrillation (VF)

Ventricular fibrillation is a condition in which the heart's electrical activity becomes disordered.

Verbal Non-Compliance

Verbal responses indicating an unwillingness to comply with an officer's directions.

**APPENDIX 7
USE OF TASERS IN CONTROLLING HUMANS
TRAINING AND OTHER PREREQUISITES**

*BY GEOFFREY ALPERT, Ph.D.
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA*

The Taser is a less-lethal weapon that can be used to control suspects who are not cooperating with police. As noted, a Taser introduces electrical current into the body of the subject and causes muscle cells to contract and has the effect of immobilizing the suspect by not allowing him or her to make voluntary movements. Although TASER International, Inc. has designed weapons for personal protection (C2, M18), the main usage of Tasers remains in law enforcement. TASER International sells its home self-defense weapons to civilians and suggests that they train themselves on the use of such devices by reading the instructions and watching an included DVD or CD-ROM. While this level of exposure to such a powerful weapon is probably insufficient for civilians to fully understand its uses and abuses, it is also unreasonable to give a law enforcement officer access to a Taser without significant training and education.

The goal of training officers to use the Taser is to impart knowledge that enables the skillful application of the weapon in real-world situations, without creating over-reliance on the weapon. In other words, the desired outcome of the training process is that the officer understands the use and application of a Taser, and he or she can apply that information properly during stressful situations in the field. Unfortunately, the length and content of training that is necessary to provide officers with sufficient information and experience to be competent with the Taser is not known. In a 2005 report by the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), information on training in seven law enforcement agencies was reported. The agencies required training that lasted from four to eight hours, followed by a physical competency test. The GAO report was critical of the amount of Taser training provided by the agencies and noted the variation in the length of training among the agencies. Other criticisms included the lack of decision-making training, as opposed to the technical issues concerning the Taser. The report expressed concern that only three of the agencies required a written test that often included 10 “true or false” questions regarding their of use-of-force policy, the proper use of the Taser, and the use of safety measures.

As far the content of law enforcement training, the agencies emphasized the proper handling of the Taser, target acquisition, safety measures, function tests, overcoming malfunctions, and post-use deployment actions. Six of the seven agencies required yearly recertification in use of the Taser.

While the GAO report is limited in scope and content, it does provide a snapshot into Taser training issues in a limited number of departments.

As noted by the GAO, it is critical for the officer to understand that a Taser is not to be used in all situations that may require the use of deadly force, but rather is an option that

has its strengths and weaknesses. It is an important aspect of training to make sure that officers realize where and when a Taser is best utilized and when it is not appropriate to use a Taser.

To learn the use of a Taser, an officer needs to remember facts about the weapon and the proper ways and procedures to deploy it. Officers must understand the concerns and limitations of the weapon, reinforce that knowledge through exercises, and demonstrate the knowledge by testing. Officers must also be familiar with the dangers associated with the Taser so that they do not injure themselves or others. Unfortunately, there may be some inadvertent injuries and situations in which cartridges misfire or Taser prongs do not hit where they were intended. The better the quality of training, and the more exposure an officer receives in it, the less likely he or she will experience a problem with the use of a Taser.

In order to achieve those training goals, many police agencies have simply adopted the manufacturer's guidelines and certified officers to use Tasers after they complete their training session. TASER International, Inc. has created training courses for users, instructors, advanced instructors, as well as training on medical issues for doctors and first responders, tactical training, executive training, correctional environment training, and personal defense courses. While the training created by TASER International provides important information, it is necessary for law enforcement agencies and states to create their own standards and certification requirements based on their own policies and working environments. Some agencies have full deployment of Tasers for all officers, while other departments are more selective in issuing the devices to selected groups of officers. Many agencies base their decisions on crime rates, prior experience, and budget.

Police agencies need to go beyond the training offered by TASER International, Inc. and develop training standards and curricula that are specific to their own local policies and needs. TASER International, Inc. has developed a series of training requirements for the use of the M26 and X26. The company is in its 13th iteration of training and suggests the following for certification as a user:

1. An annual certification.
 - A four-hour minimum of training, with optional additional training left to the agency.
 - A certified instructor must teach the course.
 - Although not required, it is recommended that the user be subjected to a "hit" from the Taser in order to experience its effects.
 - Each user should fire a minimum of two cartridges.
 - Each user must also pass a written exam with a pass rate of 80 percent.
 - Each user must undergo an oral examination with a pass/fail grade at the discretion of the instructor.

Clearly, training in the use of a Taser or any electronic weapon is a serious matter and must be similar to any training involving a weapon, including a firearm. The training

suggested by TASER International, Inc. is a good start for an agency to review, but individual agencies must go beyond the manufacturer's guidelines and develop their own training and practical scenarios.

Develop Appropriate Department-Specific Training Materials

Training materials must provide clear directions to officers about when to use Tasers. In addition, Taser awareness information should be made available to the public, including the medical profession, first responders, mental health personnel, and community members. Professionals who interact with the officers or suspects need specialized training to perform their duties properly. Public awareness can take place in community meetings and in schools or through the news media.

Weapon Awareness

Officers need to be familiar with the mechanics of the Taser, its uses and impact on citizens as well as its limitations. While they do not need to become experts on the engineering of the device, they must know the basics on how the weapon works and the conditions that maximize and minimize its effectiveness. Specifically, officers will have to understand the impact of firing at a moving target or a subject who is trying to increase the distance between himself and the officer. Officers must know how to react if the weapon malfunctions or the wires land too close together. Additionally, officers must know how to insert and remove cartridges as well as download the data from the weapon.

Another related issue is where the Taser should be located on the officer's belt. Trainers will have to make sure officers place the Taser in a position where it will not be mistaken for a firearm. Departments are experimenting with different options, and the safest appears to be on the opposite side of the officer's body from the firearm.

When to Use a Taser – Implementation Considerations

As with any piece of equipment, officers need to know where the use of a Taser fits in the overall use-of-force policy for the department. Agencies with a traditional use-of-force continuum will have an easier time explaining the acceptable uses of a Taser than departments without a use-of-force continuum. Officers must know the issues associated with Taser use and vulnerable suspects. For example, special considerations must be given to subjects who are pregnant, young and/or small, or elderly and those who are operating vehicles and other machinery. Considerations must be based on the level of threat posed by the subject and the need to establish control over the subject.

Other issues, including the number of deployments, the total length of time for deployment, and use against suspects who are fleeing, must be part of a comprehensive training program. Practice in downloading use data, report writing, and other accountability matters must be part of a training package.

Videotapes of Taser Use

Officers should be shown several videotapes of Taser applications in real-life situations. In addition, tapes of training sessions demonstrating the effectiveness of the Taser compared to the effectiveness of other options, such as pepper spray, help the officers understand the uses and limitations of the Taser.

What to Do after Deployment

After the successful or unsuccessful deployment of a Taser, officers must know what to do. If the Taser works and the suspect complies with the officer's orders, officers must be trained as to when they can or cannot remove the darts, how to remove the darts, and what medical assistance is required. They also must know when it is necessary to photograph the areas where the darts entered the suspect's skin. If the Taser does not work as planned, officers need to know how to respond with an uncooperative suspect who may be a threat to the officer or others. Officers must be trained in the transition from an unsuccessful Taser deployment to other tactical attempts to control a suspect.

Experience and Practice

Officers should be required to deploy the Taser and to have experience with target acquisition. This sounds simple, but the deployment of the Taser barbs requires experience, because the top barb deploys straight, but the lower barb deploys on an eight-degree downward slope. This is designed to create distance between the barbs for maximum efficiency. However, it means that discharging a Taser is not the same as discharging a firearm. A Taser must be held and aimed with the understanding that both barbs must make contact. The X26 barbs require an approximate distance of 2 inches to effectively discharge the electricity. The greater the distance between the barbs, the more muscle groups will be disabled, making the deployment more effective. Unfortunately, this also means that the barbs may miss or contact the suspect's clothing, but not their skin. Officers need training to understand how to react if a barb misses or if it sticks in clothing, but does not contact the skin. If a barb sticks in a suspect's clothing, the officer must close the circuit with a drive-stun application, or maneuver the suspect to close the distance between his skin and the barb.

Mental Health Training

Mental health awareness should be a major component of Taser training requirements for all officers who are to be armed with a Taser. Identification of mental illness, excited delirium, and other conditions must be part of the training experience to show an officer what to expect from a suspect displaying certain symptoms. Most important is the understanding that the electrical shock may not have the desired effect that is hoped for or anticipated. Certain suspects may not be as susceptible to the electricity as other suspects. Officers must be trained to not rely solely on a Taser and to plan for alternatives should the Taser not work as expected. For example, officers must realize

that after a specific number of attempts with a Taser, other options to control or apprehend the suspect are necessary.

Testing

In order to be certified as a user, officers should be required to pass an examination. The examination can be written, experiential, or both. The purpose of the test is to demonstrate knowledge about the Taser and the departmental standards. Officers should be retested and recertified annually.

Time Requirements

Although TASER International, Inc. suggests a minimum four-hour block of training, it is likely to take at least eight hours to complete a comprehensive training program with both classroom and field instruction.

Reporting


Officers must be trained on how to report the use of a Taser. They also need to know the reporting requirements and forms used by the agency.

Statistical Data on Agency Use


Agency-specific data should be used to show whether Taser use increases or decreases the number and extent of injuries to officers or suspects. Data should articulate if the use of the Taser impacts the use of firearms and other weapons. Documenting data also ensures department and officer accountability.

APPENDIX 8
SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT
ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS, AUGUST 2007

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008



SF Police Department Organizational Chart
For complete breakdown, please see Organizational Charts per Bureaus.
Revised: 15 August 2007-Alves




**Administration Bureau
Organizational Chart**

Revised: 15 August 2007:Alves

Field Operations Bureau

Deputy Chief David Shinn
553-1527


Commander
S. Tacchini
553-1527




Field Operations Bureau
Organizational Chart

Revised: 15 August 2007:AVes

Investigations Bureau
Deputy Chief Morris Tabak
553-1484



Investigations Bureau
Organizational Chart



**Airport Bureau
Organizational Chart**

Revised: 15 August 2007:Alves

APPENDIX 9
COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS

In order to provide the community the opportunity to offer input into the recommendations of the Police Executive Research Forum's Organizational Review of the San Francisco Police Department, two community meetings were conducted. Several publicity methods were used to advertise the meetings, including public service announcements (PSA), notices in the media, use of the Mayor's Office and Board of Supervisors.

The first meeting was held at the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) on October 28, 2008 and the second at Visitacion Valley Middle School (VVMS) on October 29, 2008. A total of 58 members of the community participated in the break-out sessions in the two workshops. The sites were strategically selected to provide easy transportation and accessibility to the community. Staff was prepared to accommodate attendees with special needs, including non-English speaking members of the community as well as physically and visually challenged participants.

The structure of both meetings were identical; a presentation on the study and its finding by a member of the PERF team followed by dividing the attendees into five break-out groups facilitated by Barbary Coast Consulting staff along with city personnel and members of the the Safety network, SFSafe, and the study's Strategic Review Committee.

The first meeting at UCSF was attended by 30 members of the community who reported living in the following 17 neighborhoods:

- Balboa Terrace
- Bayview/Hunters Point
- Bernal Heights
- Chinatown
- Civic Center/Financial District/South of Market
- Diamond Heights
- Haight Ashbury
- Ingleside
- Ingleside Oceanview
- Inner Sunset
- Lakeshore Parkside
- Potrero Hill
- Richmond
- South San Francisco
- Sunnyside
- Sunset
- Western Addition

The second meeting at Visitacion Valley Middle School was attended by 28 members of the community who reported living in the following 17 neighborhoods:

Bayview Hunters Point
Bernal Heights
Crocker Amazon
Diamond Heights
Excelsior
Glen Park
Hayes Valley
Ingleside
Ingleside/Oceanview
Little Hollywood/-Ingleside
Marina
Mission/Upper Market
Portola
Sunnyside/Excelsior
Sunset
Visitacion Valley
Western Addition

Attendees were asked to provide input in the following seven areas: personal but not identifying information (their neighborhood and prior contact with the police); desired qualities of SFPD officers; community interaction with SFPD; community engagement versus responding to calls for service; staffing; use of force; and allocation of resources.

Tell Us About Yourself

Those in attendance self-reported representing 28 communities within the City of San Francisco. Sixty-two percent (36) reported knowing their district station captain and 67 percent (39) had interacted with the police department in the past three months. Twenty-nine percent (17) of the attendees had some involvement in the study of the police department and 24 percent (14) indicated this was their first attendance at a community meeting on public safety.

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

SFPD Organizational Assessment Workshop Small Group Discussion Summaries				
How many of you...				
Break Out Groups	Know your District Captain	Interacted w/ SFPD in last 3 months.	Been previously involved in PERF study	Attending community mtg. on public safety for first time
UCSF-1	3	4	3	0
UCSF-2	6	4	4	1
UCSF-3	2	3	1	2
UCSF-4	5	4	1	0
UCSF-5	4	5	0	4
VVMS-1	5	5	3	0
VVMS-2	1	2	0	2
VVMS-3	4	4	3	1
VVMS-4	6	6	2	0
VVMS-5	0	2	0	4
TOTAL	36	39	17	14

Key Qualities of SFPD Officers

When asked what characteristics they felt were the most important for an officer of the San Francisco Police Department to possess, the most frequent response was “representative of SF’s ethnic diversity” followed by “speak more than one language” and “live in San Francisco.” The least important characteristic identified by attendees was “representative of SF’s diverse gender identity” followed by “have a college degree.”

What characteristics are most important for SFPD officers to possess?								
Break Out Groups	Live in SF	Live within 1 hr. of SF	Speak more than 1 language	Have a college degree	Representative of SF's ethnic diversity	Representative of SF's diversity in gender identity	Creative/ Innovative	Other
UCSF-1	2	1	2	0	3	0	1	1
UCSF-2	0	4	3	1	1	0	2	1
UCSF-3	3	0	0	0	5	1	1	2
UCSF-4	4	1	2	2	2	2	1	0
UCSF-5	2	1	3	1	3	1	2	1
VVMS-1	0	0	4	2	0	1	3	0
VVMS-2	3	0	2	0	4	0	1	0
VVMS-3	4	2	1	0	3	0	1	1
VVMS-4	1	2	4	0	4	1	2	0
VVMS-5	0	2	0.5	1.5	0	0.5	1.5	2
TOTAL	19	13	21.5	7.5	25	6.5	15.5	8

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Some of the suggestions offered by participants from the community on how the department may recruit officers with the characteristics they value include:

- Incentives for police officers who live in the city
- Be culturally sensitive, have a hiring process that supports diversity
- Mentoring programs - residents in immediate district area; extend reach or programs
- Pay more money for languages
- Outreach in the community
- Effective community policing as a recruitment tool
- Recruit from public housing projects in San Francisco
- Provide subsidized housing allowances for officers living in the city
- Include civilian recruitment
- Provide incentives such as home loans

Working With the Community

Participants at the community meetings were asked what keeps members of the public from engaging with the police department in solving community problems. The most common response was “fear of retaliation” followed by a “lack of trust in the SFPD.” This is interesting because it indicates a perception that the community has a greater fear of criminals than trust in the police. The third reason participants indicated they are not engaged in partnerships with SFPD is “insufficient channels of communication.”

What keeps community members from engaging with the SFPD in solving community problems?					
Break Out Groups	Fear of retaliation	Lack of trust in the SFPD	Disinterest in reducing/solving crime	Insufficient channels of communication	Other
UCSF-1	5	4	0	1	0
UCSF-2	4	2	4	1	2
UCSF-3	1	3	1	4	1
UCSF-4	2	4	1	2	3
UCSF-5	4	3	2	4	1
VVMS-1	1	1	0	2	1
VVMS-2	3	2	2	1	3
VVMS-3	4	4	1	2	1
VVMS-4	6	2	0	2	4
VVMS-5	1	3.75	1.75	1.25	1.5
TOTAL	31	28.75	12.75	20.25	17.5

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Methods attendees thought would encourage the community to partner with the police include in descending order; “dedicated neighborhood problem solving officers,” “results sharing of problem solving efforts,” and “frequent neighborhood meeting.” Other suggestions included dedicated footbeat officers, empathy for victims of crime and better customer service.

What methods would encourage community members to partner with the SFPD in solving community problems?				
Break Out Groups	Frequent neighborhood meetings	Results sharing of problem solving efforts	Dedicated neighborhood problem solving officer	Other
UCSF-1	0	1	4	0
UCSF-2	2	1	2	2
UCSF-3	1	3	5	1
UCSF-4	0	4	2	1
UCSF-5	4	2	1	0
VVMS-1	4	4	1	1
VVMS-2	1	0	3	0
VVMS-3	1	3	2	0
VVMS-4	0	1	3	3
VVMS-5	1.25	0	3.5	2.25
TOTAL	14.25	19	26.5	10.25

Level of Community Engagement

Members of the community attending the workshops were asked where the primary focus of the department should be on a continuum between interacting with community members and responding to calls for service. A Likert scale was used with a variable range of -5 to +5. This same scale was replicated in all continuum questions throughout the workshop. Negative numbers reflect a focus on community engagement with the higher the negative number, the more emphasis on connecting with the community. Positive numbers indicate a preference for responding to calls for service with the higher the number the more prominence on call response.

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

"Where should the balance be struck?"	
Tables	Average
UCSF Table 1	-1.2
UCSF Table 2	0
UCSF Table 3	0.4
UCSF Table 4	0.4
UCSF Table 5	0.1
VV Table 1	-1.2
VV Table 2	-0.7
VV Table 3	-1.2
VV Table 4	-0.8
VV Table 5	0
Total Average	-0.42

The average score of those attending both workshops was -0.42, meaning those in attendance preferred the department focus on community engagement over simply responding to calls for service. The scores of the 10 break-out groups that made up both sessions ranged from a low of -1.2 (UCSF Group 1 and Vistacion Valley Middle School Groups 1 and 3) indicating the strongest desire for community engagement to a high of 0.4 (UCSF Groups 3 and 4) favoring an emphasis on responding to calls for service.

Participants would like to see the department employ the following strategies to be more engaging in the community:

- Introduce themselves to members of the community
- Business cards with their picture
- Access to individual officers through cell phones and e-mail
- Have officers designated to specific neighborhoods who maintain familiarity with the communities' specific issues
- Walking beat officers
- Increase contact and mentoring with youth (visiting schools, explorer scouts, junior PD training)
- Better understanding of communities' problems
- Officers having the ability to speak with all ethnic backgrounds
- Be open with the media
- Visit families of individuals arrested
- Daily e-mails and newsletters from each station

Staffing

The members attending the workshops were asked to identify the pros and cons of rotating police personnel at regular intervals versus having no such policy. Respondents offered the following comments on a mandatory rotation policy:

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Pro

Wider range of knowledge
Flexible/adaptable
Minimize corruption
Captains with increased experience
Diversity
Development of employees
Broader perspective

Con

Lose community knowledge and contacts
Transfer interpreted as punishment
Learning curve with new assignment
No new ideas
Stay in area of expertise
Lack of continuity

Attendees offered the following comments for a policy of no mandatory rotation:

Pro

Maintain relationships
Familiarity with neighborhoods
Better communication
Trust by the community

Con

No fresh viewpoints
Entrenched habits and attitudes
Corruption
Employee burnout
Calcification
Hurts connection with the community

Use of Force

Again using a continuum, participants were asked how many tactical options San Francisco officers should have to choose from and how much discretion an officer should have. In answering the first question, a negative number represents fewer options, and the larger the negative number the less options should be available. A positive number indicates more options, and the larger the number the more options participants would like officers to have.

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

"How many tactical options should officers have to choose from?"	
Tables	Average
UCSF Table 1	3.7
UCSF Table 2	3
UCSF Table 3	1.9
UCSF Table 4	4
UCSF Table 5	2.9
VV Table 1	-1.2
VV Table 2	2.4
VV Table 3	0.8
VV Table 4	0.6
VV Table 5	-0.5
Total Average	1.76

With the exception of two of the ten break-out groups attending the session at Vistacion Valley Middle School (Group 1, -1.2 and Group 5, -0.5), the vast majority of attendees thought the department should have more use of force options. The average score of those attending both workshops was 1.76, meaning those participating strongly preferred additional force options. The scores of the 10 break-out groups ranged from a low of -1.2 (Valley Middle School Groups 1 and 3) indicating the desire for less options to a high of 4.0 (UCSF Group 4) favoring additional use of force options.

"How much discretion should an officer have?"	
Tables	Average
UCSF Table 1	-1
UCSF Table 2	-2.5
UCSF Table 3	1.5
UCSF Table 4	0.3
UCSF Table 5	-1.6
VV Table 1	0
VV Table 2	0.1
VV Table 3	0.3
VV Table 4	-0.1
VV Table 5	3.2
Total Average	0.02

When asked how much discretion officers should have in using force, a small majority of participating groups thought more restrictive policies should be adopted. Using a continuum ranging from less restrictive policies to more restrictive policies, with a negative response indicating less restrictive and a positive reply meaning more restrictive, five of the ten groups felt more restrictive policies are needed, three favored less restrictive policies and one indicated no change. Three of the five groups attending the

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

session at UCSF felt less restrictive policies are needed while only one attending at Valley Middle School shared that view. The average of all the groups' scores was 0.02, indicating a slight movement toward more restrictive policies. Those scores of groups that favored less restrictive policies ranged from a high of -2.5 (UCSF Group 2) to -0.1 (Valley Middle School Group 4). The scores of groups feeling more restrictive policies are needed ranged from 3.2 (Valley Middle School Group 5) to 0.1 (Valley Middle School Group 2)

Allocation of Resources

Participants were asked where they thought financial resources should be targeted. The most frequent response, 39 percent (23) answered, "officer skill development" followed closely with 38 percent (22) for "investment in technology." The least answered response of 13 percent (8) was "hiring additional officers."

Where financial resources should be targeted?				
Break Out Groups	Investment in technology	Hiring additional officers	Officer skill development	Other
UCSF-1	3	1	1	0
UCSF-2	2	2	1	2
UCSF-3	3	0	4	2
UCSF-4	3	0	3	0
UCSF-5	5	0	2	0
VVMS-1	0	3	1	0
VVMS-2	0	1	4	0
VVMS-3	4	1	1	0
VVMS-4	2	0	2	2
VVMS-5	0	0	4	1
TOTAL	22	8	23	7

When questioned where personnel resources should be targeted, the greatest response, 52 percent (30), was "neighborhood crime and quality of life problem solving" followed by 39 percent (23) wanting "foot patrols" and 34 percent (20) identifying "crime investigation." The communities represented at the two workshops clearly expressed their priority for the deployment of resources that are highly visible to the community, impact neighborhoods and assist crime victims.

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Where personnel resources should be targeted?							
Break Out Groups	Crime investigation	Calls for service	Neighborhood crime & quality of life problem solving	Crime pattern analysis	Increasing supervision of officers	Foot Patrols	Other
UCSF-1	1	0	5	0	0	4	0
UCSF-2	2	2	2	0	1	5	0
UCSF-3	1	3	3	2	0	4	0
UCSF-4	1	0	0	1	1	0	3
UCSF-5	3	1	3	3	0	4	0
VVMS-1	4	0	1	1	0	3	0
VVMS-2	2	2	4	2	0	0	0
VVMS-3	2	1	3	0	0	3	1
VVMS-4	4	2	6	2	0	0	0
VVMS-5	0	0	3	0	0	0	2
TOTAL	20	11	30	11	2	23	6

**APPENDIX 10
CITY COMPARISON**

The City of San Francisco Controller's Office identified seven cities they thought were comparable to San Francisco based upon the size of the departments as well as regional considerations. These cities are: Baltimore, Boston, Oakland, Portland, San Diego, San Jose and Seattle. PERF performed a benchmarking survey on various organizational, personnel and policy issues. For those topics in which the other cities did not report, those locations were not included in the specific tables.

Comparing the number of full-time personnel certified as bilingual among selected cities indicated that departments vary significantly. The highest percentage of sworn certified officers is in San Diego, which has 20 percent, or 385 officers, followed by Oakland with 18 percent (128). The lowest percentages are in Seattle, which reported no officers certified, and Baltimore with 2 percent, or 60. San Diego has the highest percentage of full-time civilian personnel that are certified as bilingual with 15 percent, or 121 total civilians. San Francisco has the second highest with 15 percent, or 48.

Number of full-time personnel certified as bilingual

Department	Sworn	Percentage	Civilian	Percentage
Baltimore	60	2%	27	4%
Boston	184	8%	45	7%
Oakland	128	18%	34	10%
San Diego	385	20%	121	16%
San Francisco	162	7%	48	15%
Seattle	0	0	0	0

The percentages of full-time sworn personnel based on gender were similar among the cities that were compared. The highest percentages of male officers are in San Jose, (90%) and Oakland (88%). San Jose has the lowest percentage of female officers, with 10%, while Baltimore, Portland and San Francisco have the highest percentage (16%).

Percentages of full-time sworn personnel by gender

Department	% male	% female	Total
Baltimore	84%	16%	2,952
Boston	86%	14%	2,169
Oakland	88%	12%	725
Portland	84%	16%	957
San Diego	85%	15%	1,922
San Francisco	84%	16%	2,303
San Jose	90%	10%	1,386
Seattle	86%	14%	1,277

Among the comparison departments, Portland has the highest percentage of White officers with 87% and the lowest percentage of Black and Hispanic officers with 4% and 3% respectively. Baltimore has one of the lowest percentages of White officers (48%), and 44% of the agencies' officers are Black. San Jose has the greatest percentage of

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Hispanic officers, while San Francisco has the highest percentage of officers who are Asian and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. Oakland is the only department which reported officers of two or more races.

Percentages Of Full-Time Personnel By Race

Department	White	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Two or more races	No information available	Total
Baltimore	48%	44%	7%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	2,952
Boston	65%	25%	8%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	2,169
Oakland	44%	21%	18%	0%	12%	0%	4%	0%	725
Portland	87%	4%	3%	1%	6%	---	---	---	957
San Diego	66%	8%	18%	1%	4%	3%	0%	0%	1,922
San Francisco	54%	9%	15%	0%	16%	4%	0%	0%	2,303
San Jose	58%	5%	25%	0%	9%	0%	0%	3%	1,386
Seattle	76%	9%	5%	2%	8%	0%	0%	0%	1,277

Most of the comparison agencies have policies for the high-risk topics listed below. Baltimore and San Jose were the only agencies that do not employ an Early Warning System. There are also no policies on maximum work hours allowed in the Portland and San Diego police departments. Additionally, pursuit policies in Boston, Oakland, San Jose, Seattle and San Francisco restrict pursuits, while the policies in Portland and San Diego mandate that the officers use their discretion. Baltimore's policy prohibits pursuits, and San Francisco acknowledges they are mandated by state vehicle code provisions. All the agencies have Deadly Force, Less Lethal Force, Code of Conduct, Off-Duty Employment, Media policies as well as an Employee Assistance Program.

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Agency Written Policies And Procedures

Policy	Baltimore	Boston	Oakland	Portland	San Diego	San Francisco	San Jose	Seattle
Early Warning System (EWS)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Conditions for use of deadly force	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Guidelines for use of less lethal force	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Code of conduct/appearance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Restrictions on off-duty employment	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maximum work hours allowed	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Off-duty conduct	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Interacting with the media	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Employee counseling assistance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Type of pursuit policy	Prohibits pursuits	Restricts pursuits	Restricts pursuits	Officer's discretion	Officer's discretion	* Restricts pursuits	Restricts pursuits	Restricts pursuits

* San Francisco's pursuit policy is mandated by state vehicle code provisions regarding civil immunity issues

San Francisco has the largest operating budget of the cities compared with followed by San Diego and Baltimore. When computing the operating budget per employee, Oakland has the largest figure followed by San Francisco, San Jose and San Diego. Interestingly, all these cities are in California.

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Department Operating Budget And Dollar Per Employee

Department	Operating budget	\$ per employee
Baltimore	\$346,792,872	\$97,277.10
Boston	\$270,693,353	\$96,229.42
Oakland	\$192,000,000	\$178,604.65
Portland	\$144,000,000	\$111,888.11
San Diego	\$373,721,574	\$139,604.62
San Francisco	\$406,970,908	\$155,036.54
San Jose	\$258,288,796	\$141,064.33
Seattle	\$208,000,000	\$117,713.64

In terms of sworn, full-time personnel, Baltimore has the highest staffing level at 2,952 officers, and Oakland having the lowest at 725. This pattern also held true for total full-time staffing levels, with Baltimore having the highest number of employees at 3,565, and Oakland the lowest at 1,075. San Francisco utilizes civilian, full-time personnel the least among agencies sampled (322 employees), while San Diego uses such personnel the most (755 employees).

Regarding the use of reserve officers, only San Diego made use of full-time reservists (24 officers). Five of the eight agencies sampled made use of part-time reserve officers, with a low of 10 in Oakland) to a high of 111 in San Jose.

Personnel classification

Personnel classification	Baltimore	Boston	Oakland	Portland	San Diego	San Francisco	San Jose	Seattle
Sworn full-time personnel	2,952	2,169	725	945	1,922	2,303	1,386	1,277
Civilian full-time personnel	613	644	350	342	755	322	445	490
Total full-time personnel	3,565	2,813	1,075	1,287	2,677	2,625	1,831	1,767
Sworn full-time reserve officers	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0
Sworn part-time reserve	0	0	10	25	0	20	111	15
Uniformed officers with regularly assigned duties that include responding to citizen requests for service	1,054	1,509	300	380	948	1,403	591	625
Community Policing Officers	39	44	66	25	2	0	7	36
Number of sworn, full-time personnel performing patrol duties	1,644	1,099	300	380	866	1,403	591	759
Number of sworn, full-time personnel performing investigative duties	765	419	115	88	313	370	226	226

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Staffing levels of uniformed officers that respond to calls for service varied considerably, with a low of 300 in Oakland) to a high of 1,509 in Boston. Only three of the agencies surveyed had more than 1,000 officers who performed these responsibilities.

Baltimore had the highest number of sworn, full-time personnel performing patrol functions at 1,644 officers. Oakland had the lowest number of such officers at 300. Regarding full-time personnel performing investigative duties, Baltimore again had the highest staffing level at 765 employees. Portland had the fewest at 88 and was also the only agency sampled who employed less than 100 investigators.

Percentages of sworn, full-time personnel performing patrol or investigative duties

Department	% of sworn full-time personnel to uniformed patrol who perform patrol duties	% of sworn full-time personnel who perform investigative duties
Baltimore	56%	26%
Boston	51%	19%
Oakland	41%	16%
Portland	40%	9%
San Diego	45%	16%
San Francisco	61%	16%
San Jose	43%	16%
Seattle	59%	18%

Regarding staffing levels of officers who perform patrol duties, most agencies are close to the 50 percent mark. San Francisco has the highest percentage of officers performing patrol duties at 61 percent. Portland has the lowest percentage at 40%.

In terms of staffing levels of personnel who perform investigative duties, over one-quarter (26%) of Baltimore's sworn, full-time staff perform this function. Conversely, only nine percent of Portland's staff as assigned investigative functions.

The number of hours of academy training for new recruits is similar among the departments. Seattle has the lowest with 840 hours, while Portland and San Francisco require the highest amount with 1,280 and 1,240 respectively. Baltimore mandates the lowest number of field training hours (400), while Boston requires the highest amount (2,080). For most of the cities, the total annual hours of in-service training for non-probationary patrol officers is 40. However, San Jose requires 20 and Baltimore only 18. Recruits in most of the comparison cities receive at least eight hours of community policing training. The proportion for Oakland is less than half, while San Diego has half or more. Only Portland and San Jose require in-service, sworn personnel to receive at least eight hours of community policing training. Less than half of officers in Baltimore, Boston and Oakland, half or more in San Francisco and none in San Diego receive this type of training.

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Training

Department	Total hours of academy training for new recruits	Total hours of field training for new recruits	Total combined hours of academy and field training for new recruits	Total annual in-service training hours for non-probationary patrol officers	Proportion of new recruits receiving at least 8 hrs. community policing training	Proportion of in-service, sworn personnel receiving at least 8 hrs. community policing training
Baltimore	1,100	400	1,500	18	All	Less than half
Boston	1,040	2,080	3,120	40	All	Less than half
Oakland	1,047	1,600	2,647	40	Less than half	Less than half
Portland	1,280	1,100	2,380	40	All	All
San Diego	920	640	1,560	40	Half or more	None
San Francisco	1,240	680	1,920	40	All	Half or more
San Jose	960	640	1,600	20	All	All
Seattle	840	560	1,400	40	All	None

The minimum education requirement for new officers in most of the comparison departments is a high school diploma or the equivalent. The only exceptions are Portland, which requires a two-year college degree and San Jose, which mandates some college be completed. San Jose also has the highest minimum annual salary for entry-level officers at \$75,172 as well as maximum annual salary (\$107,856). The lowest entry-level salary is in Portland, which is \$37,794 while Seattle reported the lowest maximum annual salary at \$50,933.

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Education requirements and salary ranges

	Baltimore	Boston	Oakland	Portland	San Diego	San Francisco	San Jose	Seattle
Minimum education requirements for new officers*	High school diploma/ equivalent	High school diploma/ equivalent	High school diploma/ equivalent	Two-year college degree	High school diploma/ equivalent	High school diploma/ equivalent	Some college, but no degree required	High school diploma/ equivalent
Entry-level officer minimum annual salary (base)	41,058	59,041	70,000	37,794	57,108	71,526	75,172	48,941
Entry-level officer maximum annual salary (base)	68,132	---	75,000	61,922	82,624	90,298	107,856	50,933

* at hiring or within two years of hiring

Comparing the number of authorized weapons used by departments, Boston has the least number of weapons used with two, while the cities in California (San Diego, San Francisco and San Jose) each use seven. None of the agencies use the blackjack, rubber bullet or other chemical agent besides OC spray, which is used by all of the agencies as well as the collapsible baton. San Francisco is the only department reporting to use the Yawara stick and an extended range impact weapon. Boston and San Francisco are the only cities that do not use the less lethal weapon of CED's.

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

Authorized weapons

Weapon	Baltimore	Boston	Oakland	Portland	San Diego	San Francisco	San Jose	Seattle
Traditional baton	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PR-24 Baton	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Collapsible baton	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Soft projectile	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Rubber bullet	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Other impact device	No	No	No	No	No	Yawara stick	No	No
OC spray	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Other chemical agent	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Conducted energy device (e.g., Taser)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Carotid restraint	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Other weapon/action	No	Defensive tactics/ Verbal commands	No	No	No	Extended range impact weapon beanbag shotgun	No	No

Centralized vs. Decentralized Crime Analysis Units

Department	Classification
Baltimore	Decentralized, but also has centralized Crime Analysis Unit
Boston	Centralized
Oakland	Centralized
Portland	Decentralized
San Diego	Centralized
San Francisco	Centralized
San Jose	Centralized
Seattle	Decentralized – in both Patrol Division and Investigation Bureau

APPENDIX 11
SAMPLE: USE OF FORCE REPORTING FORMS
LOS ANGELES, CA, POLICE DEPARTMENT
SAN ANTONIO, TX, POLICE DEPARTMENT
LAKEWOOD, WA, POLICE DEPARTMENT

APPENDICES



Final Report December 2008

01.67.2 (R. 1/88)

ID 74

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT USE OF FORCE REPORT

DR

DATE		TIME	LOCATION OF OCCURRENCE			RD	
SUSPECT'S NAME (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)					BOOKING NO.	CHARGE	
SEX	DESCENT	HEIGHT	WEIGHT	DOB	AGE	CONNECTING REPORTS	
SOURCE OF ACTIVITY <input type="checkbox"/> OBSERVED <input type="checkbox"/> RADIO CALL <input type="checkbox"/> CITIZEN CALL <input type="checkbox"/> STATION CALL <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER							
CONDITIONS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY) <input type="checkbox"/> PCP <input type="checkbox"/> MENTAL <input type="checkbox"/> FOOT PURSUIT <input type="checkbox"/> FAMILY DISPUTE <input type="checkbox"/> ASSAULT ON OFFICER <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER DRUG <input type="checkbox"/> DUJ <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER TRAF. VIOL. <input type="checkbox"/> BUSINESS DISPUTE <input type="checkbox"/> ASSAULT ON CITIZEN <input type="checkbox"/> ALCOHOL <input type="checkbox"/> VEH. PURSUIT <input type="checkbox"/> 415 <input type="checkbox"/> NEIGHBOR DISPUTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER							
TYPE FORCE (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)							
PHYSICAL FORCE		CHEMICAL SPRAY		TASER		VIEW FROM	
BATON/SAP <input type="checkbox"/> STRAIGHT <input type="checkbox"/> MONADNCK <input type="checkbox"/> KUBATON <input type="checkbox"/> SAP (MOTION USED): <input type="checkbox"/> STRIKE <input type="checkbox"/> BLOCK <input type="checkbox"/> CONTROL <input type="checkbox"/> KICKS <input type="checkbox"/> PUNCH <input type="checkbox"/> MARTIAL ART TECHNIQUE <input type="checkbox"/> MISCELLANEOUS PHYSICAL FORCE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER: (SPECIFY)		PAIN COMPLIANCE <input type="checkbox"/> TWIST LOCK <input type="checkbox"/> WRIST LOCK <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER: (SPECIFY) UPPER BODY <input type="checkbox"/> CAROTID <input type="checkbox"/> MODIFIED CAROTID <input type="checkbox"/> LOCKED CAROTID <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER		NO. TIMES SPRAYED _____ TYPE SPRAY USED (BRAND): _____ (MODEL NO.): _____ (EXPIR. DATE) _____ DISTANCE FROM SUSPECT 1 _____ FT. 2 _____ FT. 3 _____ FT. DURATION OF SPRAY 1 _____ SECS. 2 _____ SECS. 3 _____ SECS. WAS SPRAY EFFECTIVE: _____ YES _____ NO IF NO, REASON (STATE IF UNK.) _____  SHADE AREA(S) SPRAYED		TASER SERIAL NO. _____ NO. OF CASSETTES FIRED _____ DISTANCE TO SUSPECT 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ DID DARTS PENETRATE SKIN? _____ YES _____ NO WAITING TIME FOR TASER TO ARRIVE _____ MINUTES WAS IT EFFECTIVE? _____ YES _____ NO IF NO, REASON (STATE IF UNK.) _____  FRONT _____ BACK _____ SHOW DART CONTACT (1, 2, 3)	
ENTER THE ONE LAST TYPE OF FORCE THAT FINALLY CONTROLLED THE SUSPECT.							
EFFECTS (Check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> NONE APPARENT <input type="checkbox"/> CHOKING <input type="checkbox"/> FELL TO GROUND <input type="checkbox"/> CONT. SOME RESISTANCE <input type="checkbox"/> STOPPED RESISTANCE <input type="checkbox"/> EYE CLOSURE <input type="checkbox"/> COUGHING <input type="checkbox"/> ATTACKED OFCR. <input type="checkbox"/> INCREASED RESISTANCE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER: _____ TIME REQUIRED TO INCAPACITATE SUSPECT: _____ SECONDS							
RESIDUAL EFFECTS ON OFFICERS: <input type="checkbox"/> NONE <input type="checkbox"/> CHEMICAL <input type="checkbox"/> ELECTRIC SHOCK							
INJURIES (RESULTING FROM TYPES: A - MAJOR (USUALLY HOSPITALIZED) B - VISIBLE (NOT HOSPITALIZED) C - COMPLAINED OF ONLY N - NONE)							
LAST NAME	TYPE INJURY	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF INJURY	HOSPITALIZED	OFF IOD	LIGHT DUTY		
			YES NO	YES NO	YES NO		
OFCR							
OFCR							
SUSP.							
ADDITIONAL (USE OF OTHER DEVICE; I.E., FIELD TEST, ADDITIONAL OFFICER INJURED; SUSP. INJURIES UNRELATED TO USE OF FORCE; ANY OTHER PERTINENT INFO.)							
INVOLVED OFFICERS							
SERIAL NO.	SEX	DESCENT	DIVISION/DETAIL	ON DUTY?	IN UNIFORM?		
				YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		
				YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		
DATE AND TIME REPRODUCED	DIVISION	CLERK	INVESTIGATING SUPERVISOR	SERIAL NO.	DIV./DETAIL	WIC OR OIC APPROVING SERIAL NO.	

DISTRIBUTION: 1 - ORIGINAL COMMANDING OFFICER, PERSONNEL & TRAINING BUREAU; 1 - EMPLOYEE'S COMMANDING OFFICER;
 1 - EMPLOYEE'S BUREAU COMMANDING OFFICER; 1 - COMMANDING OFFICER, TRAINING DIVISION
 (ATTACH A COPY OF ALL RELATED REPORTS)

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

NOV-06-2006 13:15 From: INFORMATION SYSTEMS 210 207 7592

To: 2024667826

P. 28/28

SAN ANTONIO POLICE DEPARTMENT				893
USE OF FORCE REPORT				
This form is to be used in accordance with Procedure 501.09A		DISTRIBUTION: INTERNAL AFFAIRS ONLY		
INCIDENT AND OFFICER INVOLVED				
<input type="checkbox"/> Handling Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Assisting Officer	Case Number:	Date:	Time:
Location of Incident:		Offense Classification:		
Officer's Name: <small>Last First MI</small>		Officer's Signature:		
Badge Number:	District of Occurrence:	Reason for encounter: <input type="checkbox"/> Dispatched <input type="checkbox"/> Self-initiated		
If Self-Initiated:	<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic stop <input type="checkbox"/> Off duty	<input type="checkbox"/> Warrant execution <input type="checkbox"/> Crime in progress	<input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian stop <input type="checkbox"/> Other	
SUSPECT				
Name of person: <small>Last First MI</small>		Race: <input type="checkbox"/> White <input type="checkbox"/> Black <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic <input type="checkbox"/> Asian <input type="checkbox"/> Indian <input type="checkbox"/> Middle Eastern	DOB: Sex:	
Observed impairment: <input type="checkbox"/> Alcohol <input type="checkbox"/> Toxic Vapors <input type="checkbox"/> Narcotics <input type="checkbox"/> Mental Illness <input type="checkbox"/> Other				
Type weapon used by suspect: <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Hands/Arm <input type="checkbox"/> Feet/Legs <input type="checkbox"/> Fist/Punch <input type="checkbox"/> Blunt Instr. <input type="checkbox"/> Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> Cutting Instr. <input type="checkbox"/> Teeth <input type="checkbox"/> Handgun <input type="checkbox"/> Rifle/Shotgun <input type="checkbox"/> Other:				
Check all that apply: <input type="checkbox"/> Has warrants <input type="checkbox"/> In possession of narcotics <input type="checkbox"/> Has prior criminal history				
Type of resistance given by suspect (Staple copy of report to this form): <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Verbal threat <input type="checkbox"/> Passive <input type="checkbox"/> Physical				
Level of injury observed: (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Injured prior to contact <input type="checkbox"/> Injury not related to use of force <input type="checkbox"/> Laceration <input type="checkbox"/> Sprain <input type="checkbox"/> Bruise/Abrasion <input type="checkbox"/> Puncture <input type="checkbox"/> Broken bone <input type="checkbox"/> Bite <input type="checkbox"/> Gunshot <input type="checkbox"/> Internal injury <input type="checkbox"/> Death <input type="checkbox"/> Other				
Suspect involved in violent conflict prior to officer contact?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Was an arrest made? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
OFFICER				
Did the Officer believe the suspect had a weapon: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No				
Type of force(s) used: (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Verbal <input type="checkbox"/> Hands/Arm <input type="checkbox"/> Fist/Punch <input type="checkbox"/> Feet/Legs <input type="checkbox"/> Asp <input type="checkbox"/> Baton <input type="checkbox"/> K-9 <input type="checkbox"/> OC <input type="checkbox"/> Bean bag <input type="checkbox"/> Pepper ball <input type="checkbox"/> Sage <input type="checkbox"/> Firearm <input type="checkbox"/> Other				
If injured, describe Officer's injury: (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Injured prior to contact <input type="checkbox"/> Injury not related to use of force <input type="checkbox"/> Laceration <input type="checkbox"/> Sprain <input type="checkbox"/> Bruise/Abrasion <input type="checkbox"/> Puncture <input type="checkbox"/> Broken bone <input type="checkbox"/> Bite <input type="checkbox"/> Gunshot <input type="checkbox"/> Internal injury <input type="checkbox"/> Death <input type="checkbox"/> Other				
COMPLETE THIS PORTION ONLY IF OC WAS USED				
Distance from person:		Reaction to spray: <input type="checkbox"/> Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat effective <input type="checkbox"/> Not effective		
Method of decontamination:				
Decontamination began: _____ minutes after application. Did person receive medical attention? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No				
Was person observed for 45 minutes after application?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Observed from _____ to _____	
Observing Officer: <small>Last First MI</small>		Badge Number		
SUPERVISORY APPROVAL				
Did the supervisor make the scene?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Did the supervisor become aware of any procedural violations? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
I have reviewed this "Use of Force Report" to ensure it is complete and to ensure departmental policies and procedures were followed. Procedural violations identified by the supervisor will be forwarded through the Chain of Command in accordance with Procedure 303. Any training recommendations will be sent through the Chain of Command to the Training Academy for review and implementation.				
Supervisor's Signature:		Badge Number:		

SAPD Form 62-UOF Rev. (03-04)

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

ID 259

LAKWOOD POLICE DEPARTMENT
FORCE RESPONSE REVIEW

Officer Involved	Years LE Exp.	Date of Incident	Time of Incident	Case #
Location of Incident		Street	City	State Zip
Location Type: <input type="checkbox"/> Single family residence <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-family complex <input type="checkbox"/> Business <input type="checkbox"/> Parking Lot <input type="checkbox"/> Roadway <input type="checkbox"/> Park <input type="checkbox"/> School <input type="checkbox"/> Other				

SUBJECT INFORMATION				
Name	Sex: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	Age: <input type="checkbox"/> 10-13 YOA <input type="checkbox"/> 14-17 YOA <input type="checkbox"/> 18-24 YOA <input type="checkbox"/> 25-35 YOA <input type="checkbox"/> 36-45 YOA <input type="checkbox"/> Older.	Physicals	Height: Weight:

FORCE FACTORS
(Check all boxes that apply)

Conduct of Subject <input type="checkbox"/> refusing to comply with verbal orders <input type="checkbox"/> passively resisting arrest <input type="checkbox"/> actively resisting arrest / not physically combative <input type="checkbox"/> verbally combative/challenging an officer <input type="checkbox"/> aggressive stance <input type="checkbox"/> charging an officer or another <input type="checkbox"/> attempting to strike an officer or another <input type="checkbox"/> active shooter Other Options <input type="checkbox"/> no Taser available <input type="checkbox"/> no 40mm available <input type="checkbox"/> no additional officers on-scene <input type="checkbox"/> physical force ineffective <input type="checkbox"/> OC spray ineffective <input type="checkbox"/> Taser ineffective <input type="checkbox"/> baton ineffective	Potential Danger <input type="checkbox"/> subject has / or has been reported to have harmed property <input type="checkbox"/> subject has / or has been reported to have harmed person(s) <input type="checkbox"/> subject has / or is reported to have knowledge of a fighting art/skill <input type="checkbox"/> subject has known history of violence Officer / Subject <input type="checkbox"/> officer outnumbered by subjects that are potential threat <input type="checkbox"/> officer has sustained injury / exhaustion <input type="checkbox"/> officer is out-sized by subject <input type="checkbox"/> subject has muscular build	Mental Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> subject appears to be under the influence of drugs and/ or alcohol <input type="checkbox"/> subject has known previous history of mental illness <input type="checkbox"/> subject appears to be mentally ill Language Barrier <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	Proximity of Weapons Subject Armed with: <input type="checkbox"/> firearm <input type="checkbox"/> sharp/stabbing instrument <input type="checkbox"/> club / impact weapon <input type="checkbox"/> other: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> immediate access to weapon <input type="checkbox"/> access to weapon if he/she escapes officer control and/or presence	Suspected Offense <input type="checkbox"/> property crime <input type="checkbox"/> violent crime / no weapons known to be involved <input type="checkbox"/> violent crime / weapons involved <input type="checkbox"/> violent crime / known injuries <input type="checkbox"/> other: _____
		Risk of Escape <input type="checkbox"/> attempting to flee on foot <input type="checkbox"/> attempting to flee in a vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> subject has lead police on a foot pursuit <input type="checkbox"/> subject has lead police in a vehicle pursuit	Other Exigent Circumstances (Describe)	

FORCE USED TO CONTROL

Physical Control ▶ Type of physical control used: <input type="checkbox"/> physical strength <input type="checkbox"/> counter-joint control hold <input type="checkbox"/> arm bar take-down <input type="checkbox"/> other take-down (describe below) <input type="checkbox"/> strike / punch <input type="checkbox"/> kick	OC Spray ▶ Type of OC: <input type="checkbox"/> stream <input type="checkbox"/> fog ▶ Distance from subject: <input type="checkbox"/> 1-3ft <input type="checkbox"/> 3-6ft <input type="checkbox"/> 6+ ft ▶ Number of times sprayed: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no ▶ Was spray effective: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no Other Force <input type="checkbox"/> Describe: _____	Taser ▶ Deployment: <input type="checkbox"/> contact <input type="checkbox"/> air cartridge ▶ Distance from subject: <input type="checkbox"/> 1-8ft <input type="checkbox"/> 8-15ft <input type="checkbox"/> 15-21ft ▶ Did both hooks contact subject: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no ▶ Full 5 second cycle: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no ▶ Was Taser effective: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no ▶ Number of times Taser activated: _____ ▶ Serial number of Taser: _____	Impact Weapon ▶ Type of impact weapon: <input type="checkbox"/> ASP <input type="checkbox"/> Wooden baton <input type="checkbox"/> Shotgun <input type="checkbox"/> Bean Bag <input type="checkbox"/> Rocket <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) Serial Number: _____ ▶ Approximate number of times struck: _____ ▶ Was impact weapon effective: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	LVNR (Lateral Vascular Neck Restraint) <input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 compression <input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 compression <input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 compression <input type="checkbox"/> K-9 contact ▶ Handler On-view <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no ▶ Dog bite/hold <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no ▶ Approximate times bitten: _____ ▶ Subject struck dog <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no ▶ Photos taken? <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	Lethal ▶ Firearm discharged: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no ▶ Approximate times fired: _____ ▶ Subject struck: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no ▶ Type of firearm: <input type="checkbox"/> 9mm sidearm <input type="checkbox"/> 40cal sidearm <input type="checkbox"/> 45cal. sidearm <input type="checkbox"/> rifle <input type="checkbox"/> shotgun <input type="checkbox"/> buckshot <input type="checkbox"/> slug <input type="checkbox"/> other lethal force: (describe) _____
---	--	---	---	--	--

Force Response revised 11/14/05

APPENDICES
Final Report December 2008

INJURIES

<p align="center">Diagrams</p> <p>▶ Use a dot to indicate part of body struck with strike/punch. (●)</p> <p>▶ Use an arrow to indicate part of body struck with Taser. (→)</p> <p>▶ Use an x to indicate part of body struck with impact weapon. (x)</p> <p>▶ Use a circle to indicate part of body struck with other less lethal force. (○)</p>	
---	--

▶ Types of injuries resulting from force: S=Serious Injury / V=Visible Injury / C=Complaint of Injury
 ▶ Photographs are MANDATORY for all visible injury sites and for all sites where subject makes complaint of injury or pain.

Name of Injured <i>(Employee and/or Subject)</i>	Type of Injury	Injury Description	Medical Care			
			Offered	Requested	Refused	Obtained
	Select One		<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
	Select One		<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
	Select One		<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no

Please fully describe techniques used, results, and any medical care provided
(use the incident report narrative to fully describe the reasons for use, escalation or de-escalation of force used)

 Attach Copy of Report Narrative and Medical Screening Form

SUPERVISOR REVIEW

Scene: On-scene during force: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	Date of Review	Add'l Review Recommended <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	Reviewing Supervisor
Photographs Taken: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no			

COMMAND REVIEW

Lieutenant:	Date	Assistant Chief:	Date
Chief of Police:	Date	Professional Standards Section:	Date

Comments: _____

Force Response revised 11/14/05

