

OCTOBER 5, 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 5:36 p.m., in a Regular Meeting.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Unidentified discussed concerns regarding trusting the police.

Francisco DeCosta discussed concerns regarding shooting incident.

Arthur Tims, father of shooting victim, discussed concerns regarding not being able to see his son.

Leroy Moore discussed concerns regarding officer-involved shootings.

Dennis McNally, ACLU, discussed concerns regarding decision made about the Firearm Discharge Review Board.

Lorraine Altamirano discussed concerns regarding salary of Gary Delagnes.

Gary Delagnes, POA President, discussed concerns regarding the allegations of Commissioner Veronese.

Sandra Bennington discussed concerns regarding her OCC complaint.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO IMPOSE DISCIPLINE ON SUSTAINED DISCIPLINARY CHARGE FILED AGAINST OFFICER ANTHONY D. NELSON; ADOPTION OF FINDINGS (FILE NO. C04-074 EGF FILED 5/11/04)

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

HEARING OF OFFICER ANTHONY D. NELSON, SOUTHERN (FILE NO. C04-074 EGF)

The hearing of Officer Anthony D. Nelson, Star No. 2039, was called it having been set for this date. Officer Nelson was charged, in a properly verified complaint by Heather J. Fong, Chief of Police of the San Francisco Police Department, with violating the Rules and Procedures, as follows:

CHARGE NO. 1

Unnecessary Force (striking a civilian with his baton, in violation of Department General Order 5.01)

CHARGE NO. 2

Neglect of Duty (writing an incomplete and inaccurate incident report, in violation of Department General order 2.01)

CHARGE NO. 3

Neglect of Duty (making/reporting an inaccurate log entry, in violation of Department General Order 5.01)

Ms. Susan Leff, Attorney at Law, appeared on behalf of the Office of Citizen Complaints and the San Francisco Police Department.

Officer Anthony D. Nelson appeared in person and was represented by Mr. Leland Davis, III, Attorney at Law.

On August 17, 2005, the Commission took the matter under submission and found Charge Nos. 1 and 3 not sustained and Charge No. 2 sustained.

On October 5, 2005, the Commission adopted the findings of fact in this matter.

Based on those findings, the Commission requested a recommendation from Chief of Police Heather J. Fong. It is the recommendation of the Chief of Police that Officer Anthony D. Nelson be terminated.

The Commission again took the matter under submission and the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. 55-05

DECISION - HEARING OF OFFICER ANTHONY D. NELSON, SOUTHERN (FILE NO. C04-074 EGF)

____ WHEREAS, on May 5, 2004, Heather J. Fong, Chief of Police of the San Francisco Police Department, made and served charges against Officer Anthony D. Nelson, Star No. 2039, as follows:

CHARGE NO. 1

Unnecessary Force (striking a civilian with his baton, in violation of Department General Order 5.01)

- (1) At all times herein mentioned, Anthony Nelson, Star Number 2039, (hereinafter referred to as "the Accused Officer") was and is a police officer, holding the rank of officer, employed by the San Francisco Police Department.
- (2) As a police officer, the Accused Officer was and is responsible for knowing and obeying the rules, orders, and procedures of the San Francisco Police Department.
- (3) On or around March 20, 2003, at approximately 11:00 a.m., the Accused Officer was part of a platoon of officers forming a building-to- building skirmish line across Market Street in response to Iraqi War demonstrators.
- (4) One demonstrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Victim") carried a hand-held poster board sign with no wooden post affixed, stating, "Don't buy corporate lies! Free Speech Radio." The Victim was joined in the middle of Market and 4th Streets by at least twenty to thirty other protestors.
- (5) Police Officers formed a skirmish line to get the protestors to disperse and not block traffic. The line, which contained the Accused Officer, began to advance on the protestors.
- (6) When the officers struck one of the demonstrators with a baton, the Victim ran up and grabbed the demonstrator's jacket with her right arm. With her left arm holding her sign at about waist level, she complained about the officers' treatment of the other demonstrator.
- (7) At that point, the Accused Officer used an overhead baton strike and forcefully struck the Victim on the left arm.
- (8) The Victim collapsed to the ground and dropped the sign in her left hand. She felt a "hot searing pain" and repeatedly yelled that her arm was broken as she looked at the Accused Officer. Demonstrators called out the Accused Officer's name as the Victim made her way to an adjacent sidewalk between ten to twenty feet away.
- (9) Witnesses both saw and heard the baton's impact on the Victim's arm and heard her complain of injury while on the sidewalk. They observed the Victim hunched-over, shaken and crying. Witnesses observed the Victim's arm turn purple and swell.
- (10) The Victim took a taxi to Kaiser Permanente Hospital, where she was diagnosed with a fractured forearm.
- (11) The Accused Officer stated that the Victim rushed out of the crowd and charged at him with a wood-backed sign held aloft. Given his limited room on the

skirmish line, the Accused Officer said he delivered a 45-degree, single-armed strike with his baton to protect himself and other officers from harm. However, most of the witnesses and film footage of the incident do not support the Accused Officer's interpretation of the baton swing or the threat posed by the Victim. Rather, the evidence shows that the Victim was not acting aggressively and that the Accused Officer's baton swing started from an overhead position.

- (12) Section I.A. of Department General Order 5.01 provides:

It is the policy of the San Francisco Police Department to accomplish the police mission as effectively as possible with the highest regard for the dignity of all persons and with minimal reliance upon the use of physical force. The use of physical force shall be restricted to circumstances authorized by law and to the degree minimally necessary to accomplish a lawful police task.

- (13) Section I.C. of Department General Order 5.01 provides, in pertinent part:

"Officers are permitted to use whatever force is reasonable and necessary to protect others or themselves, but no more."

- (14) Section I.K. of Department General Order 5.01 describes how an officer is to use a baton to accomplish custody in order to avoid unnecessary injury. It states in pertinent part: "To properly control and therefore maximize its effectiveness, the baton should normally never be raised above the head to strike a blow. The use of the baton as a club is generally prohibited."

- (15) Section I.M. of Department General Order 5.01 defines unnecessary force as follows:

a. Unnecessary force occurs when it is apparent that the type of degree of force employed was neither necessary, nor appropriate. When any degree of force is utilized as summary punishment or for vengeance, it is clearly improper and unlawful.

- (16) The San Francisco Police Department Crowd Control Manual, Section IV(III)(B)©), sets forth the amount of force to exercise when a crowd fails to obey a dispersal order as follows: "The amount of force employed shall be only in proportion to violence or resistance encountered and limited to the degree minimally necessary to accomplish the dispersal."

- (17) The Crowd Control Manual, Section VIII, entitled, "Baton Use," states as follows, in pertinent part:

The baton is a dangerous weapon. Almost any effective strike, jab, or thrust can break bone and/or cause permanent disabling injury to any part of the body. Officers must bear in mind that the baton is capable of delivering lethal blows. Officers are instructed that during crowd control situations, extreme caution must be taken and considered judgment exercised before using the baton.

Baton Positions

1. Officers shall use the Port Arms position when attempting to move non-violent demonstrators.

Warning Announcement

1. Batons shall not be utilized until after an announcement or warning is made of their use against demonstrators who refuse to comply with lawful directions to move on or leave the area.

- (18) By his willful, unreasonable and unjustified use of force against the Victim, the Accused Officer violated the foregoing Department General Orders and policies. Any reasonable police officer must know that such conduct likewise violates the standards of the Department and is cause for discipline or

dismissal from employment; therefore, such conduct violates Rule 9 of Department General Order No. 2.01, which states:

MISCONDUCT. Any breach of peace, neglect of duty, misconduct or any conduct by an officer either within or without the State that tends to subvert 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.

CHARGE NO. 2

Neglect of Duty (writing an incomplete and inaccurate incident report, in violation of Department General order 2.01)

- (19) Paragraphs (1) through (18) of Charge No. 1 are incorporated in this paragraph by reference and realleged as though set forth in full.
- (20) The Accused Officer attached a statement to the Incident Report about the demonstration authored by another officer.
- (21) In that statement, the Accused Officer stated the Victim rushed at him, screaming and holding a sign with a solid wooden post over her head. The Accused Officer justified his baton strike to avert the possible threat the Victim posed to his safety.
- (22) However, the film footage of the baton strike and the overwhelming majority of witnesses demonstrate that the Victim did not rush at the Accused Officer, did not possess a wood-backed sign, and did not hold that sign over her head. To the contrary, the evidence shows that the Victim held a poster board sign with no wood backing at about waist level as she pulled on the jacket of a fellow demonstrator in an apparent attempt to retreat or to protect him from the officers.
- (23) In failing to write an accurate account of this incident, the Accused Officer violated Department General Order 2.01, Rule 9, and the Department's report writing policies.
- (24) The San Francisco Police Department's Report Writing Manual's Introduction, states in pertinent part:

The San Francisco Police Department is committed to the basic police mission of serving the public of San Francisco by enforcing the law. Part of this function requires that officers prepare incident reports to document completed, incompleting (sic), or attempted offenses, and suspicious occurrences both of a criminal and non-criminal nature. Preparing factual and thorough incident reports is one of the most important duties of a professional police officer.

Incident reports are among the most important documents used within the Criminal Justice System. An accurate and objective account of an incident, and a clear description of the officer's preliminary investigation are key to a complete incident report, which is the foundation on which investigators and the District Attorney must base their prosecution.

CHARGE NO. 3

Neglect of Duty (making/reporting an inaccurate log entry, in violation of Department General Order 5.01)

- (25) Paragraphs (1) through (18) of Charge No. 1, and Paragraphs (19) through (24) of Charge No. 2 are incorporated in this paragraph by reference and realleged as though set forth in full.

- (26) The Accused Officer reported his use of force to the sergeant writing the incident report. However, the Accused Officer did not report that the Victim was injured or complained of injury in his narrative describing the baton strike. Accordingly, the sergeant did not note any injury or complaint of injury when the sergeant completed the Use of Force Log entry into this incident.
- (27) Both the Victim and other witnesses stated that the Victim complained of pain soon after being struck with the baton and observed her arm become purple and swollen. Witnesses believed that the officers, including the Accused Officer, standing about twenty feet away could hear her complaints of pain and/or injury. Moreover, another officer in the vicinity stated that he overheard a white female complaining of injury to her arm from the Accused Officer's baton. Film footage also shows that the Accused Officer swung his arm with great impact, causing the Victim to drop her sign.
- (28) The Accused Officer reasonably knew or should have known that his baton strike injured the Victim and that she complained of pain, and the Accused Officer was required to accurately report those facts, in violation of Department General Order 5.01 and Rule 9 of Department General Order 2.01.
- (29) Section I.N(b) of Department General Order 5.01 states in pertinent part:
- a. In the event that the officer using the force is not the officer preparing the incident report, the officer using the force shall:
 - (1) Ensure that he/she is clearly identified in the incident report.
 - (2) Ensure that the incident report includes
 - A. The type of force used
 - B. Reason for the use of force
 - C. The supervisor's name, rank, star number, and time notified
 - (3) Or prepare a supplemental report or a statement form with the above information.

WHEREAS, a hearing on said charges were held before the Police Commission pursuant to section 8.343 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco on January 11th, February 14th, February 15th, February 28th, March 8th, March 14th, March 23rd, March 24th, and March 25th; and on August 17th, the matter was submitted to the Police Commission for decision; and on August 24th, the findings of fact were discussed; and on September 14th, the Commission discussed the admission of evidence; and on October 5, 2005, the Commission adopted the findings of fact and imposed discipline; and

WHEREAS, the Commission finds that the allegations contained in Charge Nos. 1 and 3 as preferred by the Chief of Police against Officer Anthony D. Nelson are not sustained; and

WHEREAS, the Commission finds that the allegations contained in Charge No. 2 as preferred by the Chief of Police against Officer Anthony D. Nelson are sustained; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that based on the findings of fact adopted by the Commission on October 5, 2005, consistent with the Commission's duty to protect the health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of the City and County of San Francisco and the public in general, and in order to promote efficiency and discipline in the San Francisco Police Department, the Police Commission orders the following discipline be imposed:

CHARGE NO. 2

Sustained - Termination

FURTHER RESOLVED, that said termination, effectively immediately, be, and the same is hereby affirmed and approved.

If this decision is subject to review under Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, then the time and within which judicial review must be sought is governed by California Code of Civil Procedure, Section 1094.6.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 64-05

**ADOPTION OF FINDINGS OF FACT IN THE DISCIPLINARY CHARGES FILED AGAINST OFFICER ANTHONY D. NELSON
(FILE NO. C04-074 EGF)**

RESOLVED, that the Police Commission adopts the findings of fact in the disciplinary charges filed against Officer Anthony D. Nelson, Star No. 2039, (File No. C04-074 EGF), which states as follows:

“Upon considering the testimony and evidence offered by the San Francisco Police Department, through the Office of Citizen Complaints, and Police Officer Anthony Nelson, the San Francisco Police Commission makes the following Findings. The Police Commission incorporates into these Findings the findings, sustained charge and discipline read into the record at the Police Commission meetings of August 17 and 24, 2005, and October 5, 2005.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Officer Anthony Nelson, Star Number 2039, is a Q2 Police Officer with the San Francisco Police Department. Officer Nelson is responsible for knowing and obeying the rules, orders and procedures of the San Francisco Police Department.

On March 20, 2003, at approximately 11:00 am, Officer Nelson was part of a platoon of officers that responded to Market Street, where a group of people were demonstrating against the Iraq War.

Linda Vaccarezza was present at the scene. She carried a poster board sign. The sign was not attached to a wooden post. Vaccarezza was in the midst of 20 to 30 other protestors, at about Market and 4th Streets.

Police officers formed a skirmish line across Market Street, in order to disperse the demonstrators and unblock traffic on the street. The line, including Officer Nelson, began to advance on the demonstrators.

Physical contact occurred between one of the demonstrators and the officer immediately to the left of Officer Nelson. Vaccarezza grabbed that demonstrator's jacket with her right arm. In her left arm, she held her sign at about waist level. At that point, Officer Nelson used an overhead baton strike and forcefully struck Vaccarezza on the left arm.

Officer Nelson provided a statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that was appended to the Incident Report on the demonstration that was prepared by another officer. In that statement, Officer Nelson wrote:

An unknown WFA rushed towards me. The woman was screaming and also carrying a sign attached to a solid wooden pole. The woman was holding the pole above her head. I feared the woman would strike me. I delivered one baton strike towards zone one. The strike hit the woman possibly on her left arm/hand area.

The evidence, including video footage of the incident and the testimony of Vaccarezza and other witnesses, demonstrates that the events immediately preceding the baton strike did not occur as Officer Nelson described in his statement. Contrary to Officer Nelson's statement, the evidence shows that Vaccarezza did not rush towards Officer Nelson, did not have a wood-backed sign, did not hold the sign over her head, and did not raise either arm over her head. The evidence shows that Vaccarezza held a large sign made of floppy poster board-type material, with no wooden backing or pole. Vaccarezza held the sign at waist level as she pulled on the jacket of another demonstrator.

Officer Nelson's statement clearly is inaccurate, in that it deviates sharply from video footage of the events that it describes. Further, based on all the evidence submitted in this matter, the Commission finds that Officer Nelson intentionally wrote and submitted a false description of the incident.

Police Department policy requires that force be restricted to that "minimally necessary to accomplish a lawful police task." (Dept. General Order 5.10.) Police Department crowd control policy provides that, when using the baton, "the degree of force must be justified and only to the minimum degree necessary or appropriate." (*Crowd Control Manual*, p. 30.) The crowd control policy also provides that baton strikes are only to be used "in response to an overt, aggressive act on the part of a hostile or violent demonstrator." (*Crowd Control Manual*, p. 30.) The evidence demonstrates that Officer Nelson was trained in and aware of these requirements. The Commission finds that Officer Nelson described Vaccarezza as engaging in certain threatening behavior, which he knew did not occur, in an attempt to create an after-the-fact justification for a baton strike that Officer Nelson knew could be subject to scrutiny under the Department's standards.

Officer Nelson presented expert testimony that highly stressful circumstances can cause distortions in perception and memory, and that the brain can innocently make up details in order to make sense of events. In addition, Officer Nelson testified that on March 20, 2003, when he prepared the statement at issue here, he subjectively believed it to be truthful, accurate and complete. The Commission finds the testimony of Officer Nelson and the expert witness not credible or persuasive in light of the whole of the record in this case.

DEPARTMENT RULES AND POLICIES

Departmental General Order 2.01, Rule 9 states:

MISCONDUCT. Any breach of peace, neglect of duty, misconduct or any conduct by an officer either within or without the State that tends to subvert 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. (DGO 2.01, p. 2.)

The San Francisco Police Department's Report Writing Manual states:

The San Francisco Police Department is committed to the basic police mission of serving the public of San Francisco by enforcing the law. Part of this function requires that officers prepare incident reports to document completed, incompletd, or attempted offenses, and suspicious occurrences both of a criminal and a non-criminal nature. Preparing factual and thorough incident reports is one of the most important duties of a professional police officer.

Incident reports are among the most important documents used with the Criminal Justice System. An accurate and objective account of an incident, and a clear description of the officer's preliminary investigation are key to a complete incident report, which is the foundation on which investigators and the District Attorney must based their prosecution. (*San Francisco Police Department Report Writing Manual*, Introduction.)

THE CHARGE

The Police Department charged Officer Nelson with Neglect of Duty (writing an incomplete and inaccurate incident report in violation of Departmental General Order 2.01).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, and based upon all the testimony and evidence taken in this matter, the Police Commission finds that Officer Nelson wrote, signed under penalty of perjury, and submitted to his superiors an incomplete and inaccurate incident report regarding the incident on March 20, 2003, and that the report was intentionally inaccurate. Accordingly, the Commission hereby sustains the charge of Neglect of Duty (writing an incomplete and inaccurate incident report in violation of Departmental General Order 2.01).

PENALTY

Based on all of the facts, arguments, testimony and evidence presented in this matter, including at the Commission meetings on August 17, September 14, and October 5, 2005, the Commission makes the following findings regarding the appropriate penalty.

Filing truthful and accurate incident reports is a core duty that all police officers must be able to fulfill without doubt or question. The Commission finds that intentionally filing an inaccurate report is an intolerable breach of duty, and of the public trust. This is particularly the case here, where the officer's behavior indicates an attempt to divert scrutiny from his own use-of- force against a member of the public. The officer's conduct in this matter threatens to undermine the mission and effectiveness of the Police Department and its many hard working officers. Moreover, the Commission finds that this rule violation cannot be explained by ignorance of an officer's duty, and that no amount of retraining can rehabilitate the officer's effectiveness or ensure that such conduct will not recur.

For these reasons, at its meeting on October 5, 2005, the Commission finds that the violation merits the penalty of termination from employment. That penalty is hereby adopted and shall be effective immediately.”

Motion by Commissioner Marshall, second by Commissioner Orr- Smith to accept the findings as prepared.

Motion by Commissioner Chan to amend the motion to reflect that the findings to be issued by the Commission reflect concurrence part and the dissenting part by Commissioners Keane and Chan.

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

VOTE ON WHETHER TO DISCLOSE ANY OR ALL OF THE DISCUSSIONS HELD IN CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SECTION 67.12(a)

_____ Motion by Commissioner Orr-Smith for non disclosure, second by Commissioner Veronese. Approved 7-0.

HEARING AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE DEPARTMENT’S MOTION FOR ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY IN THE DISCIPLINARY CHARGES FILED AGAINST LIEUTENANT JERRY LANKFORD (FILE NO. C04-105 JWA)

Continued to a future date.

Commissioner Veronese stated that there’s a Writ that was filed in this case.

Ms. Eileen Burke, Attorney for Lieutenant Lankford, stated that the Writ was filed and was informed that the Writ should go directly to the presiding judge. Ms. Burke stated that she will refile tomorrow.

Commissioner Veronese stated that the break on testimony in this matter is for the Motion to Dismiss that going to be filed and then heard by this Commission at a future date. The Commission is waiting for transcripts so that the motion can be written. Motion as due on the 26th.

CHIEF’S REPORT

- a. **Update on significant policing efforts by Department members**
- b. **Quarterly report on Officer-Involved Discharges**

Commissioner Fong deferred to Deputy Chief Parra to report on Officer-Involved Discharges.

Deputy Chief Parra report on Officer-Involved Discharges for 2005. Chief Parra gave a brief synopsis of OID cases 001-05, 002-05, and 003-05.

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**
Put over to next week.

APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR

- a. **Request for approval to accept a donation of \$100.00 from Ms. Rosemary M. Peters to the San Francisco Police Department**

Motion by Commissioner Veronese, second by Commissioner Orr- Smith. Approved 7-0.

RESOLUTION NO. 65-05

APPROVAL OF THE REQUEST OF THE CHIEF OF POLICE TO ACCEPT A DONATION OF \$100.00 FROM MS. ROSEMARY M. PETERS TO THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

RESOLVED, that the Police Commission approves the request of the Chief of Police to accept a donation of \$100.00 from Ms. Rosemary M. Peters to the San Francisco Police Department.

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

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

Continued to next week.

APPROVAL OF THE REQUEST OF THE CHIEF OF POLICE TO APPLY FOR, ACCEPT, AND EXPEND FUNDS FROM THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF BOATING AND WATERWAYS TO IMPLEMENT THE BOATING SAFETY AND ENFORCEMENT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM

Motion by Commissioner Veronese, second by Commissioner Orr- Smith. Approved 7-0.

RESOLUTION NO. 66-05

APPROVAL TO AUTHORIZE THE CHIEF OF POLICE TO APPLY FOR, AND TO ACCEPT AND EXPEND FUNDS FROM THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF BOATING AND WATERWAYS TO IMPLEMENT THE BOATING SAFETY AND ENFORCEMENT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM

RESOLVED, that the Police Commission hereby approves to authorize the Chief of Police to apply for and to accept and expend funds from the California Department of Boating and Waterways to implement the "Boating and Safety and Enforcement Equipment Program" including any augmentations, extensions, and modifications.

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

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

_____ Continued to next week.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETINGS OF APRIL 27, 2005, MAY 4, 2005, AND MAY 11, 2005

Marylon Boyd commented on May 4th minutes and stated that comments by Camilla be reflected in the minutes that she was referring to Gary Delagnes.

Commissioner Renne asked Sgt. Reilly to check.

Motion by Commissioner Keane, second by Commissioner Orr-Smith. Approved 7-0.

COMMISSION ANNOUNCEMENTS

_____ Richmond District Meeting will be moved to the end of November.

SCHEDULING OF ITEMS IDENTIFIED FOR CONSIDERATION AT FUTURE COMMISSION MEETINGS

Commissioner Orr-Smith asked to have discussion on decision process relative to DGO 8.11 and 3.10.

_____ Commissioner Chan talked about an incident on September 30th regarding assault on students and asked that the Command Staff report on statistics on assault rate on children in the public schools and also a report from Lt. Fatooh regarding transit on students on their way home. Commissioner Chan also asked if there is an anonymous tip line for students who have been set upon by their peers or others so that information can be reported to the appropriate school resource officers.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Marylon Boyd asked on when hearings regarding Cammerin Boyd will take place and asked for a status report as to when the matter will be calendared.

Motion by Commissioner Chan, second by Commissioner Keane to adjourn the meeting. Approved 7-0.

Thereafter, the meeting was adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

Sergeant Joseph Reilly
Secretary
San Francisco Police Commission

1497/rct