

OCTOBER 12, 2005

REGULAR MEETING

The Police Commission of the City and County of San Francisco met in Room 400, City Hall, #1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, at 5:35 p.m., in a Regular Meeting.

PRESENT: Commissioners Renne, Chan, Keane, Marshall, Sparks, Veronese
ABSENT: Commissioner Orr-Smith

PUBLIC COMMENT

Lea Militello, Pride Alliance, discussed concerns regarding the termination of Officer Nelson.

Daniel Paez discussed concerns regarding salary of the head of the police union.

Kevin Martin, Vice President POA, thanked Commissioners Keane and Chan and discussed concerns regarding the termination of Officer Nelson.

Martin Halloran, Treasurer POA, discussed concerns regarding comments by a commissioner to the Chronicle in regards to the POA President.

Michael Nevin, POA Representative Co. B, discussed concerns regarding the termination of Officer Nelson.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO TAKE OFF CALENDAR INDEFINITELY THE DISCIPLINARY CHARGES FILED AGAINST RETIRED OFFICER RICKY E. SHADDOX (FILE NOS. C04-097 JWA, C05-054 JCT, AND C05-055 JCT). SAID DISCIPLINARY CHARGES WILL BE PLACED BACK ON CALENDAR SHOULD THE OFFICER BE WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE POLICE COMMISSION IN THE FUTURE

Motion by Commissioner Marshall, second by Commissioner Keane. Approved 6-0.

RESOLUTION NO. 67-05

HEARING OF OFFICER RICKY E. SHADDOX, STAR NO. 2212

WHEREAS, on June 10, 2004 and on May 17, 2005, Chief of Police Heather J. Fong made and served disciplinary charges against Officer Ricky E. Shaddox, Star No. 2212, Medical Liaison, as follows:

(File No. C04-097 JWA)

SPECIFICATION NO. 1

Driving a motor vehicle while intoxicated, conduct which undermines the good order, efficiency and discipline of the Department and which brings discredit on the Department (violation of Rule 9 of Department General Order 2.01 of the San Francisco Police Department).

- (1) At all times herein mentioned Ricky E. Shaddox, Star No. 2212, (referred to as "the accused") was a police officer, employed by the San Francisco Police Department, assigned to the Medical Liaison Unit of the Staff Services Division.
- (2) As a member of the department, the accused was and is responsible for knowing and obeying the rules, orders and procedures of the San Francisco Police Department.
- (3) On June 2, 2004, at approximately 2300 hours, the accused was off duty driving his personal vehicle, a Hyundai Accent passenger automobile, northbound on Browns Valley Road near Waterford Drive, Vacaville, California. The accused drove his automobile over the curb of a raised center divide island in the roadway, causing extensive damage to the tires and mechanical parts of his automobile.
- (4) After striking the center divide the accused veered across the roadway barely missing a PG&E crew sitting in their trucks, near the curb on Browns Valley Road. The trucks

were equipped with flashing yellow lights which were operating. The accused then turned onto Waterford Drive.

- (5) A Vacaville Police Officer (VPD Officer One) was dispatched to the scene of the accident. He noticed a fresh oil trail starting at the raised curb on the island. He followed the trail of fresh oil northbound on Browns Valley Road onto east bound Waterford Drive and then left on northbound Tipperary Drive. VPD Officer One saw the accused driving his Hyundai Accent automobile very slowly northbound on Tipperary Drive. The vehicle stopped on Tipperary Drive near Mayo Court and a pedestrian commenced a conversation with the accused. The oil trail he was following lead directly to the accused's Hyundai automobile.
- (6) VPD Officer One stopped his vehicle behind the accused and exited his patrol vehicle. When he approached the accused's automobile he noticed that the right front tire was flat and there was a large amount of fluids leaking from the engine compartment onto the ground. Both air bags of the accused's automobile were deployed.
- (7) VPD Officer One began a conversation with the accused. The accused denied that he had been involved in a collision and denied knowing what VPD Officer One was talking about. VPD Officer One detected a strong odor of alcoholic beverage coming from the vehicle and observed that the accused had bloodshot watery eyes and that his speech was slow and slurred. The accused told VPD Officer One that he had a 40 oz. beer earlier in the evening.
- (8) VPD Officer One asked the accused to exit his vehicle to determine whether or not the accused could perform field sobriety tests. As the accused exited the vehicle he was unsteady on his feet and had a strong odor of alcoholic beverage about his body. When the accused attempted to produce his California Drivers License, the accused dropped a large portion of the contents of his wallet on the ground. VPD Officer One asked the accused to sit on the curb at the side of the road while awaiting a backup officer. The accused told VPD Officer One that he was not going to sit on the curb and that he was going to leave and go home. VPD Officer One repeated his request and the accused again refused to cooperate and began yelling that he was going to go home. The accused then tensed up his body and took up a fighting stance. VPD Officer One took the accused to the ground and handcuffed him.
- (9) Based on his observations VPD Officer One arrested the accused for violating California Vehicle Code §23152(a). A second Vacaville Police Officer (CHP Officer Two) arrived on the scene and took over the investigation of the DUI while VPD Officer One continued his investigation of the collision. VPD Officer Two placed the accused in his patrol car and informed the accused of the requirement for testing under the implied consent law.
- (10) The accused at first agreed to take what ever test he needed to take. Later, as they drove to the Vacaville Police Department office the accused requested that he be given a break and then became outraged, told VPD Officer Two that he would not take any test and demanded to be let go. At the booking area the accused refused to cooperate and shouted over VPD Officer Two's attempt to read the Administrative Per Se form to him. The accused then refused to take any test and VPD Officer Two, in consultation with VPD Sergeant, determined that they would have to do a forced blood draw. The accused was driven to the Vacaville Hospital where a blood sample was forcibly taken from the accused. Based on obvious signs and symptoms of alcohol intoxication, the accused was booked at the Solano County Jail on below charge. The accused exhibited mood swings and was alternately abusive, cursing the medical personnel and apologetic for his conduct.
- (11) California Vehicle Code §§23152(a) states:

“§23152. DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE.

(a) It is unlawful for any person while under the influence of any alcoholic beverage or drug, or under the combined influence of any alcoholic beverage and drug, to drive a vehicle.”

- (12) The accused engaged in conduct which, in a criminal context, violates the California Vehicle Code by driving a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcoholic beverages or drug which violates §23152(a); any reasonable police officer must know that such conduct violates the standards of the department and is cause for discipline or dismissal from employment; such conduct violates Rule 9 of Department General Order 2.01, which states:

“MISCONDUCT. Any breach of the peace, neglect of duty, misconduct or any conduct by an officer either within or without the state that tends to undermine the order, efficiency or discipline of the Department, or reflects discredit upon the Department or any member, or is prejudicial to the efficiency and discipline of the Department, although not specifically defined or set forth in Department policies and procedures, shall be considered unofficer-like conduct subject to disciplinary action.”

(File No. C05-054 JCT)

SPECIFICATION NO. 1

Driving a motor vehicle while intoxicated, conduct which undermines the good order, efficiency and discipline of the Department and which brings discredit on the Department (violation of Rule 9 of Department General Order 2.01 of the San Francisco Police Department).

- (1) At all times herein mentioned Ricky E. Shaddox, Star Number 2212, (referred to as “the accused”) was a police officer, employed by the San Francisco Police Department, assigned to the Medical Liaison Unit of the Staff Services Division.
- (2) As a member of the Department, the accused was and is responsible for knowing and obeying the rules, orders and procedures of the San Francisco Police Department.
- (3) On November 29, 2003, at approximately 1320 hours, the accused was off duty driving his personal vehicle, a 2001 Hyundai Accent passenger automobile, eastbound on Interstate Highway 80 near Kidwell Road, in an unincorporated area of Solana County, California. The accused drove his automobile erratically and several citizens who observed him driving reported to the California Highway Patrol (CHP) that they believed the accused was driving under the influence. The CHP dispatcher advised a patrol unit of the accused’s location and the observations of the citizens. One citizen followed the accused with his emergency flashers on to alert the patrol unit of the whereabouts of the accused.
- (4) The CHP unit driver (the officer) pulled in behind the accused’s vehicle and followed him. The officer observed the accused weave erratically from side to side in his lane on Interstate Highway 80. The officer observed that the accused almost sideswiped two other automobiles driving on the highway, so the officer stopped the accused for safety reasons.
- (5) The CHP officer contacted the accused while the accused was seated in the vehicle and requested the accused’s driver’s license, registration, and insurance information. The accused reacted to this request by presenting his San Francisco Police Department identification card. The CHP officer again requested license, registration, and insurance information. Initially, the accused reacted to this second requests with a blank stare; he then retrieved his wallet and presented his license. The accused presented a blank stare, appeared very lethargic, and had a slow and slurred tone of voice. In addition, the accused’s eyes were extremely glossy.
- (6) The accused was asked if he had been drinking. The accused responded that he had not. The accused was then asked if he had been taking any medications. The accused said that he had. The accused was directed out of the car by the CHP officer in order

for field sobriety tests to be conducted. The accused failed to comply while still looking for his registration and insurance information. After a second direction to exit the vehicle, the accused did so. As he did so, he was extremely unsteady and he used the entire length of his vehicle to maintain his balance to walk to where the CHP officer directed him.

- (7) Before administering a series of field sobriety tests, the CHP officer asked the accused several questions, including whether or not the accused had used any drugs recently. The accused stated that he had ingested the following drugs under the care of a doctor or dentist: Ambien, xanax, oxycodone, and oxycontin. The CHP officer explained and demonstrated to the accused a series of four field sobriety tests. The officer noted the accused was wearing a brace on his right leg, and excluded tests requiring the accused to walk and turn. The accused's performance of these tests indicated that he was impaired and since there was no indication of the presence of alcohol on his breath, the officer concluded that the accused was operating his vehicle under the influence of drugs.
- (8) Based on all of the above observations, the CHP officer arrested the accused for violating California Vehicle Code §23152(a) and informed the accused of the requirement for testing under the implied consent law and gave him the drug admonition. The accused chose to submit to a drug evaluation and a blood chemical test. The accused was transported to the Solano County CHP office where a drug evaluation was conducted by another ChP officer (officer two). During the drug evaluation, officer two administered a Preliminary Alcohol Sensor (PAS) test which detected no alcohol in the accused's breath sample. The accused was then transported to North Bay Medical Center where a blood sample was taken. The sample later tested positive for the presence of prescription drugs. The accused was then booked into the Solano County Jail.
- (9) California Vehicle Code §§23152(a) states:
“§23152. DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE
(a) It is unlawful for any person while under the influence of any alcoholic beverage or drug, or under the combined influence of any alcoholic beverage and drug, to drive a vehicle.”
- (10) The accused engaged in conduct which, in a criminal context, violates the California Vehicle Code: by driving a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcoholic beverages or drug which violates §23152(a); any reasonable police officer must know that such conduct violates the standards of the department and is cause for discipline or dismissal from employment; such conduct violates Rule 9 of Department General Order 2.01, which states:

“MISCONDUCT. Any breach of the peace, neglect of duty, misconduct or any conduct by an officer either within or without the state that tends to undermine the order, efficiency or discipline of the Department, or reflects discredit upon the Department or any member, or is prejudicial to the efficiency and discipline of the Department, although not specifically defined or set forth in Department policies and procedures, shall be considered unofficer-like conduct subject to disciplinary action.”

SPECIFICATION NO. 2

Carrying a handgun while under the influence of drugs, conduct which undermines the good order, efficiency and discipline of the department and which brings discredit on the department (violation of Rule 9 of Department General Order 2.01 of the San Francisco Police Department).

- (11) Paragraphs 1 through 9 of Specification No. 1 are incorporated in this charge by reference and realleged as though set forth in full.
- (12) At the time the accused was arrested as described above, the accused had in his possession a Sig Sauer .380 caliber, Model P230 handgun, with eight (8) rounds of ammunition.

- (13) The accused had a handgun with him on November 29, 2003, at 1355 hours while he was driving his automobile under the influence of controlled substances.
- (14) The accused by having a handgun in his possession while under the influence of controlled substances, engaged in conduct which, violates Rule 3 of Department General Order 2.01, which states:

“3. MAINTAINING FIT CONDITION. Officers shall, while carrying a firearm off-duty or while acting in the capacity of a peace officer, maintain themselves in a fit condition to perform police duties.”

- (15) The accused by carrying a handgun while under the influence of controlled substances, engaged in conduct which any reasonable police officer must know that such conduct violates the standards of the department and is cause for discipline or dismissal from employment; such conduct violates Rule 9 of Department General Order 2.01, which states:

“MISCONDUCT. Any breach of the peace, neglect of duty, misconduct or any conduct by an officer either within or without the state that tends to undermine the order, efficiency or discipline of the Department, or reflects discredit upon the Department or any member, or is prejudicial to the efficiency and discipline of the Department, although not specifically defined or set forth in Department policies and procedures, shall be considered unofficer-like conduct subject to disciplinary action.”

(File No. C05-055 JCT)

SPECIFICATION NO. 1

Being under the influence in a public place, conduct which undermines the good order, efficiency and discipline of the department and which brings discredit on the department (violation of Rule 9 of Department General Order 2.01 of the San Francisco Police Department).

- (1) At all times herein mentioned Ricky E. Shaddox, Star Number 2212, (referred to as “the accused”) was a police officer, employed by the San Francisco Police Department, assigned to the Medical Liaison Unit of the Staff Services Division.
- (2) As a member of the Department, the accused was and is responsible for knowing and obeying the rules, orders and procedures of the San Francisco Police Department.
- (3) On October 1, 2004, at approximately 1509 hours, the attention of a San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) patrol officer was directed by several citizens to a “914” (man down) at 42 Golden Gate Avenue. At this location, the officer found an individual, later identified as the accused, lying on the sidewalk apparently unconscious. The accused was in such a physical state that the patrol officer called for an ambulance. One of the citizens who had alerted the patrol officer to the accused handed the patrol officer a wallet that they stated that they had found down the block. The wallet contained SFPD Star #2212 and a SFPD identification card, both belonging to the accused.
- (4) The patrol officer was finally able to rouse the accused into a sitting position. The accused stated that he did not want any medical treatment. The patrol officer requested a supervisor to come to 42 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco. A sergeant responded (sergeant one) to the scene and was advised of the facts by the patrol officer. The accused was then transported to the Tenderloin Station. Management Control Division (MCD) investigators were notified and responded to the Tenderloin Station. The accused was subsequently transported to MCD. There he was evaluated and a urine sample was obtained. Based upon the observations of the Tenderloin Station officers, the accused was then booked at the San Francisco County Jail for a violation of California Penal Code Section 647(f).
- (5) The accused, when interviewed at MCD on February 7, 2005, stated that on October 1, 2004, he had missed a medical appointment, became upset, and started drinking

heavily sometime around 9:00 a.m. at a bar near the corner of Powell and Geary Streets. The accused stated that he remembered drinking significant amounts of various alcoholic beverages. Beyond that, he could not remember how long he was in the bar, where else he may have been, or how he ended up on the sidewalk at 42 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco.

- (6) California Penal Code §647(f) states:

“§647. Disorderly Conduct.

Every person who commits any of the following acts is guilty of disorderly conduct, a misdemeanor:

...

(f) Who is found in any public place under the influence of intoxicating liquor, any drug, controlled substance, toluene, or any combination of any intoxicating liquor, drug, controlled substance, or toluene, in a condition that he or she is unable to exercise care for his or her own safety or the safety of others, or by reasons of his or her being under the influence of intoxicating liquor, any drug, controlled substance, toluene, or any combination of any intoxicating liquor, drug, or toluene, interferes with or obstructs or prevents the free use of any street, sidewalk, or other public way.”

- (7) The accused also violated Rule 2 of Department General Order 2.01, which states:

“OFF DUTY RESPONSIBILITY. While off duty, officers shall take all reasonable steps to prevent crime, detect and arrest offenders, and protect life and property, consistent with their ability to take proper action.”

- (8) The accused engaged in conduct which, in a criminal context, violates the California Penal Code: by being under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs in a public place and also violates Rule 2 of Department General Order 2.01 by failing to prevent crime, any reasonable police officer must know that such conduct violates Rule 9 of Department General Order 2.01, which states:

“MISCONDUCT. Any breach of the peace, neglect of duty, misconduct or any conduct by an officer either within or without the state that tends to undermine the order, efficiency or discipline of the Department, or reflects discredit upon the Department or any member, or is prejudicial to the efficiency and discipline of the Department, although not specifically defined or set forth in Department policies and procedures, shall be considered unofficer-like conduct subject to disciplinary action.”

SPECIFICATION NO. 2

- (9) Paragraphs 1 through 7 of Specification No. 1 are incorporated in this charge by reference and realleged as though set forth in full.
- (10) On June 4, 2004, the Chief of Police suspended the accused from his duties as a member of the San Francisco Police Department. The order of suspension also ordered, “You are not to carry any San Francisco Police Department Star Identification Card or any handgun until further order from the Chief of Police.
- (11) On October 1, 2004, when the accused was picked up on Golden Gate Avenue, a citizen found the accused’s Star and Identification Card near the accused and delivered them to the custody of the responding patrol officer. During the accused’s MCD interview of February 7, 2005, the accused admitted having the Star and the Identification Card in his possession but not knowing when or where he lost them that day.
- (12) The accused violated Rule 10 of Department General Order 2.01, which states:

“WRITTEN ORDERS. Members shall obey all written orders, policies and procedures of the Department, and promptly obey all lawful written or verbal directives of superiors ...”

- (13) The accused engaged in conduct which violates Rule 10 of Department General Order 2.01 by violating the Chief’s order, any reasonable police officer must know that such conduct violates the standards of the department and is cause for discipline or dismissal from employment; such conduct violates Rule 9 of Department General Order 2.01, which states:

“MISCONDUCT. Any breach of the peace, neglect of duty, misconduct or any conduct by an officer either within or without the state that tends to undermine the order, efficiency or discipline of the Department, or reflects discredit upon the Department or any member, or is prejudicial to the efficiency and discipline of the Department, although not specifically defined or set forth in Department policies and procedures, shall be considered unofficer-like conduct subject to disciplinary action.”

WHEREAS, Officer Ricky E. Shaddox, Star No. 2212, has retired from the San Francisco Police Department with said retirement effective close of business on July 9, 2005; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that said charges of violating the Rules and Procedures of the San Francisco Police Department filed against Officer Ricky E. Shaddox, Star No. 2212, be, and the same are hereby continued off calendar with the condition that said disciplinary charges be placed back on the Police Commission calendar should Officer Shaddox be within the jurisdiction of the Police Commission in the future.

AYES: Commissioners Renne, Chan, Keane, Marshall, Sparks, Veronese
ABSENT: Commissioner Orr-Smith

CHIEF’S REPORT

- a. **Update on significant policing efforts by Department members**
- b. **Report on the Department’s Arson Unit**

Chief Fong introduced Lt. Fatooh, SRO Unit, and Inspectors Lavin and Keller, Arson Unit.

Lt. Fatooh, SRO Unit, reported on youth activities that the San Francisco Police Department is participating in and presented Certificate of Appreciation to Ms. Peggy Dorman, Lowes Theaters, in appreciation to all that she has done for the Department and youths of San Francisco. Lt. Fatooh also showed a video regarding activities of the SRO Unit.

Commissioner Veronese thanked former Commissioner Angelo Quaranta for attending the meeting.

Inspectors Lavin and Keller, Arson Unit, described the duties and responsibilities of the Arson Task Force.

Commissioner Sparks asked if there had been an arson hate crimes in San Francisco. Inspector Keller stated that there have been attempted arsons at synagogues.

Chief Fong notified the Commissioners that the Department participated at a training exercise put together by the Office of Emergency Services.

(Commissioner Renne excused at 6:30 p.m.)

Commissioner Veronese asked how training is passed on to patrol officers. Chief Fong stated that lessons learned are incorporated into the training of patrol officers and into future exercises.

Commissioner Keane asked about a comment made by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld in regards to police departments being infiltrated by terrorists. Chief Fong stated that before officers are hired they go through a very intense background check and stated that if there is something very clear and overt, the investigators would find it.

Commissioner Chan asked about communications in the city in case of a disaster. Chief Fong explained that the City does have an 800 megahertz that supported through the radio shop and through the Emergency Communications Division.

OCC DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- a. **Review of Recent Activities**
- b. **Status Report on current OCC cases and OCC investigators' caseload**
- c. **Presentation regarding 3304 cases from year 2000 to 2005**

Director Allen reported on 3304 cases from year 2000 to 2005.

Commissioner Veronese asked if the OCC has a Chief Investigator at this point. Director Allen stated that it's a provisional because he is not allowed to hire permanently until DHR have their exams.

Commissioner Chan asked about the "inappropriate" charge as written in Director Allen's report and asked for some specificity.

Commissioner Veronese asked why the specific general order alleged to have been violated not included when the officer is first notified. Director Allen stated that his office is working on what is the best practice on noticing officers.

Commissioner Sparks asked about the 3304 cases that went over the time period but survived due to exceptions. Director Allen stated that he will figure out a way on how to track that.

Commissioner Veronese asked Chief Fong regarding disciplinary report to the officers. Chief Fong stated that she is not familiar with the report. However, there are reports on the website, not identifying officers specifically, but identifying the situations and dispositions.

Director Allen also gave a status report on current OCC cases and OCC investigators' caseload.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Steve Johnson, POA, stated the Commission should not apologize for asking to many questions of the OCC. Mr. Johnson also discussed concerns regarding 3304 cases and unwarranted action allegations.

PRESENTATION OF THE QUARTERLY REPORT - PROVISION OF DOCUMENTS TO THE OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS (APRIL - JUNE 2005)

Lieutenant Groshong, Legal Office, presented the quarterly report - Provision of Documents to the Office of Citizen Complaints (April - June 2005).

Commissioner Veronese thanked Lt. Groshong for his report.

Commissioner Sparks thanked Lt. Groshong for his report.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

DISCUSSION REGARDING REVISED DEPARTMENT GENERAL ORDER 3.19, "COMPLAINT EARLY WARNING & EARLY INTERVENTION SYSTEM"

Captain Keohane, Risk Management, updated the Commission regarding revised Department General Order 3.19, "Complaint Early Warning & Early Intervention System."

Captain Keohane stated that the modifications to the Early Warning System were made to provide timely identifications for all the officers who fall under this order. This is done by utilizing the weekly morning reports from OCC. This also creates more accountability to the first line supervisor. They will have the responsibility to insure that those complaints are listed and put into the member's PIP file or Unit Log and that appropriate action is taken immediately. Captain Keohane stated that he has sent this order to the OCC and have not received any comments back. It was also sent to the ACLU and Captain Keohane stated that he got one comment back from the ACLU. Captain Keohane stated that he will present this to the Command Staff for their discussion and that hopefully in two weeks it can be presented back to the Commission.

_____ Captain Keohane stated that it is the intention of the Department to have a valid EIS System that works within 12 to 18 months. Captain Keohane introduced Ms. Anita Sevilla to do a presentation on what is being done on the Information Technology side.

_____ Commissioner Veronese asked what better indicator is there than the reaction of the public to an officer. Captain Keohane explained that one of the indicators is citizen complaints.

Commissioner Chan asked about civil suits. Captain Keohane stated that one incident can have a lot of indicators and the Department agreed that it should not count different indicators for one incident, therefore, through the software being developed, it should be incident based rather than an indicator.

Commissioner Keane asked about alcohol problems and if there is anything in place that can be put in place to help with the problem before it affects the job. Captain Keohane stated that there are protocols in place for the person that wants help but there is nothing in place to force that person to have help.

Commissioner Sparks asked about in-custody deaths. Captain Keohane explained that if a person is arrested and transported to Central Station by the wagon. The person is placed under the Central Station and comes under the authority of the Station Keeper and the person sitting in a chair and dies, who would be listed as the in-custody death.

Commissioner Sparks asked about criminal arrests of and charges against. Captain Keohane stated that any criminal arrest of an SFPD member is automatically an MCD complaint.

Captain Keohane stated that the goal of the department is to have this completed and operational between 12 and 18 months.

Commissioner Sparks thanked Captain Keohane for his detailed report.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Steve Johnson, POA, discussed civil suits as indicators and discussed concerns regarding OCC.

Dennis McNally, ACLU, thanked Captain Keohane for his report and asked the Commission to press to have this system happen sooner than later.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO ADOPT REVISED DEPARTMENT GENERAL ORDER 5.09, "ABSENTIA BOOKING AND PRISONER SECURITY"

Item put over for a future date.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 18, 2005

Motion by Commissioner Marshall, second by Commissioner Veronese. Approved 5-0.

COMMISSION ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Chan asked to amend hearing rules of the Commission.

Commissioner Sparks asked that the hearing rules be distributed to the Commission and placed as an agenda item in the next couple of weeks so that the full Commission can discuss it.

Deputy City Attorney Molly Stump will work with Commissioner Chan on this item.

Commissioner Keane announced that he is submitting his resignation to the Commission with deep regret. Commissioner Keane commended his colleagues for their commitment to the citizens of San Francisco. Commissioner Keane also commended Chief Fong and the members of the Command Staff for their professionalism, dedication, courage, and commitment to the integrity of the Police Department. Commissioner Keane also commended the men and women of the San Francisco Police Department.

Commissioner Sparks thanked Commissioner Keane for his service to the Commission.

Commissioner Veronese thanked Commissioner Keane.

Commissioner Marshall thanked Commissioner Keane.

Commissioner Chan thanked Commissioner Keane for the great service he has rendered to the Commission and the people of San Francisco.

SCHEDULING OF ITEMS IDENTIFIED FOR CONSIDERATION AT FUTURE COMMISSION MEETINGS

Commissioner Chan would like an update on the use of collapsible batons. Commissioner Chan also asked about the Department's strategic plan as a whole that would include staffing. Commissioner Chan asked for an update regarding bonfires and fireworks at Ocean Beach.

Commissioner Chan asked about video technology and how well street cameras work. Commissioner Chan also asked about video cameras in patrol cars.

Commissioner Chan also asked if the Department is prepared for a strike at the SF Unified School District and what the Department is planning, if any.

Motion by Commissioner Veronese, second by Commissioner Sparks to adjourn the meeting in honor of Commissioner Keane's service to the Commission and to the City of San Francisco. Approved 5-0.

Thereafter, the meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

Sergeant Joseph Reilly
Secretary
San Francisco Police Commission