5.20 Community Meetings per Resolution 26-13	**San Francisco Police Department**	
	Meeting Transcript	

Time	1700-1900
Date	2/26/26
Venue	City Hall & Online

Attendees	*Attendance*: Manager Asja Steeves (PDD), Officer Dan McLaughlin (PDD), Emily Queliza (PDD), Inspector Mark Lee (PDD), Gabrielle Cota (PDD), Officer Lorena Prasadi (LEP), Sergeant Stacy Youngblood (Police Commission), Stephen Lopez (Government Affairs), Sharon Woo (DPA), Former Commissioner Jesus Yanez (Community Member), Anisha Hingorani (LANSF), Janice Li (CAA), Ana de Carolis (OCEIA), Milli Atkinson (SF Bar), Silvia Ramos (Carecen)

Topics:

1. **DGO 5.20 Language Access Services Community Meeting (Resolution 26-13)**

Asja: I'll start. My name is Asja Steeves and I am the Manager of the Policy Development Division at SFPD and we are responsible for updating the policies that go to the Commission and are issued to members.

Dan: Hello, I'm Officer Dan McLaughlin. I am a policy writer for the Police Department.

Lorena: I am Officer Lorena Prasadi and I am the Language Access Liaison for the San Francisco Police Department.

Ana: Hello, my name is Ana de Carolis and I am the Language Access and Policy Manager with the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs.

Janice: I'm Janice Li. I work for the Chinese for Affirmative Action, but my role there is the Coalition Director for community safety and justice including CAA, CYC, CCDC, and CPA.

Sharon: I'm Sharon Woo. I'm with the DPA and I was not part of the original Working Group, that was Jermain Jones.

Anisha: Hi, my name is Anisha Hingorani. My pronouns are she/her and I am a Policy Manager at Chinese for Affirmative Action and I work with the Language Access Network.

Milli: Good evening. My name's Milli Atkinson. I am the Program Director for the Immigrant Legal Defense Program at the Justice and Diversity Center of the Bar Association of San Francisco. I'm also

the legal lead for the San Francisco Immigrant Legal Defense Collaborative, which is a city funded collaborative providing removal defense services to San Francisco residents and I was a member of the original Working Group.

Yanez: This is Jesus. I'm a retired Commissioner who was assigned to the original Working Group and I'm happy to be here.

Stacy: Hi, this is Sergeant Stacy Youngblood. I am the Secretary of the Police Commission.

Silvia: I'm Silvia Ramos. I'm the Social Services Manager for Carecen which is part of the Language Access Network.

Asja: Thank you. Now we are closing item 2 and moving to item 3. Again, these are SFPD presentations. Just some housekeeping. This is a passive meeting. This is not an open meeting so there's no public comment but what I'm saying is there's no timed comment. So, the goal of this is really to have open discussion. You won't be timed. Your mic won't be turned off. This is for all of us to have you know time to come together right. This is also not a Working Group, so this is not the DGO 5.20 Working Group. This is just an opportunity to hear Language Access Network out. They came to a Commission meeting in February and we're on timed public comments, so maybe they didn't have a full opportunity to have a robust discussion. Public comment and open meetings aren't really set up for discussion either. It's for members of the public to speak and while Commissioners can answer questions. they're not required to. So, again, this is an opportunity to follow up on that meeting but this is not a Working Group. There will not be meeting minutes and hopefully we can just have a discussion as we go. For this agenda item I'm just providing some basic information about what a policy is how we already have language access in place, etc. I am the Manager of the Policy Development Division for SFPD and we have 3 units. Under our division, we have one that does handles the Working Group, we have one that is our policy writing team, and then we have one that is Written Directives, which is in charge of like the quality assurance, the issuing, and the tracking. All of the policy development happens under our Division. When I say DGO that's a Department General Order which is a policy that is the most authoritative written directive that we have that applies to the entire Department. The DGO is goes to the Police Commission and then may be subject to Meet and Confer, which means the labor unions get an opportunity to opine, and then it is issued to members once the Police Commission adopts. So today we are talking about DGOs and how it is developed. We have several policy types, but we are discussing DGOs tonight. right. I just want to briefly tell you why it's called a General Order. A General Order is general and it's a paramilitary and a military document. It's called a General Order because it's supposed to remain general so that our newest or most junior Officer coming in understands everything that they are required to do. It is not necessarily where very specific step by step instructions go, but it's where the person in the field understands their direction. Why it's called a General Order again is because the more specific, the more detailed an Order is, the higher the chances for mistakes. Mistakes in law enforcement can result in people getting hurt or ultimately dying. My mistakes would be from behind a computer where I have more room to make a mistake on a spreadsheet or in an e-mail communication with more time to fix it. People in courtrooms can spend time deliberating and discussing and going back and forth, but officers in the field really need to understand very quickly what's expected of them. So that is just a basic description of what the Department General Order is. Really the thing that my team must worry about is the balancing act. We can't make the policy so short that it cuts out really important critical pieces that are important to communities that we serve, but it can't be so convoluted that now officers can't understand it. So that's the balancing act that my team does on a daily basis. In terms of DGO 5.20 Language Access Services, the last time that was updated was in 2007 which means we've had a policy in place for almost 20 years. I know we have been providing language access before that as well, but the last policy in place has been in place for almost 20 years. We have officers provide

2

language access currently. However, we are beholden to the Language Access Ordinance, which is also the mechanism to make sure that City agencies comply with state law and with federal law. As most of you know, the Language Access Ordinance was updated in 2024 and we took on this endeavor to ensure that 5.20 captures all of the updates that are in the Ordinance because it does change our policy. Just for basic information about our language access for SFPD and what we provide, I'll turn to Lorena in a moment. We have a flyer that's up which unfortunately we don't have it ready to share. We thought more people were going to come in person, but right now we have 1537 full duty sworn officers citywide and of that number, we have 24% of them are certified bilingual. The top 5 languages spoken by SFPD certified officers are Spanish, Cantonese, Tagalog, Mandarin, and Russian. But in SFPD, all of our officers, and this includes our civilian staff as well, we have 38 languages that are spoken terms of what services we can provide. Lorena is the Language Access Liaison and she's the one that's designated by the Department to ensure that our that we comply with the Ordinance. She deals with the signage and with ensuring training that everyone has access to the Language LINE app or the Insight app, a tool that's available on all of our officers' Department issued phones and that's a tool that gives our officers access to interpreters in over 200 languages. On that tool is where officers can identify the language spoken by the person they are addressing and the tool itself shows the language in English and also in the language that is represented so that the person can choose it and then that will link them to an interpreter. The tool is also available at the station level.

Lorena: These are just some of the tools that are available to our officers at the station level and on the field. I have gone out to all 10 districts and given them the Language Identification Guide. It has all the languages in English and in their language as well. It says that the notification services are free to them. Officers just open it up showing the languages on there that are available for interpretation services.

Asja: Right now, there's regular training for officers, but it's primarily at the recruit level. So when recruits are coming in, it's a training to ensure that they have the Language LINE app on their Department issued phones and know how to navigate it. All new officers are given that training before they enter. The DGO itself needed updating right because it's 20 years old and things change. The Ordinance itself is specific to all public facing employees, which includes non-sworn members of the Department. Right now, the policy is focused on sworn members, so if I was public facing at a public facing desk, I wouldn't necessarily be required to provide language access under the currently active policy. It's critical that we open it up so that all of our employees are aware of this requirement by the City. We have some the biggest changes I'm going to go over between the 2007 version and the proposed version. Again, like I mentioned, the 2007 applies to sworn members while the proposed applies to all public facing employees. The 2007 limits to only certified members and interpreters to speak with limited English proficient individuals and the proposed expands to use non certified employees during non-criminal encounters. This is a this is actually a big win in that we have several officers who are comfortable speaking another language, but aren't certified. Their proficiency isn't maybe at the certified level, but conversationally they're able to speak. There are these fears that officers have conversations with LEP individuals when they're not certified. We've made it clear in this policy that, let's say a tourist asks you for directions in Russian and you conversationally are comfortable speaking Russian, now you can actually give them directions in Russian. So that's an expansion of this policy. The 2007 version only applies to the primary language while the proposed applies to primary and or preferred language of the LEP individual. The Miranda admonition in the 2007 DGO shall be provided in the primary language only when available and in this current one, it shall be provided in the primary or preferred language that's required to be provided. The 2007

version has training only required for sworn and recruits, and now we're expanding it out to all public facing employees including PSAs. This might account for some of the clumsier communications now that they are aware of the requirements. Their training might not be as involved as sworn members, so this will improve our level of services at the district station level. I'll say one more thing and then we can either move on to the next one for just open community feedback or you can ask questions specific to the things that I'm discussing now. The way a DGO is updated now, as SFPD employee, I am beholden to SFPD DGOs that people who don't work at SFPD are not beholden to. Like Sharon with DPA, while we do our best to make sure that we can work together under the confines of a DGO, the DGO can't direct DPA employee activities; it only can direct mine and does. In order to create a policy and develop, it we have to go through very specific steps and there is no real carve out to skip steps. There's an early draft, there's a draft that the informs the Department based on community feedback, then there's a public review draft, then there's a leadership draft, and then there's a Commission draft that can change. There's a draft that comes out of the labor negotiations with the bargaining units. So a draft is alive until it's finally adopted by Commission and it's only adopted by Commission after the close of Meet and Confer. The document stays living until it's adopted and then, once it's adopted especially if it's gone through Meet and Confer, it's essentially a legally binding document and then it's issued to all members. Our core goal today is really just to say and for me to hopefully convey clearly that my mission and my policy team 's mission is to have an updated policy that allows officers to provide language access. That's the goal. What we're trying to figure out based on the feedback that we received at the last meeting, and I do admit I don't understand the gaps, I'm really hoping that we can have a robust discussion to figure out what those gaps are and hopefully find a shared understanding. I'm opening it up really to anybody online if you can if you want to discuss anything that I talked about or we can just move on to the next item and just have a free open discussion.

Sharon: Can I ask the question where are we right now in the process? Are we after public comment? This has not yet hasn't gone to Meet and Confer yet, so it's still draft form only to the Commission?

Asja: The Commission can adopt it but it still needs to go to Meet and Confer with the unions correct. Senior.

Sharon: I'm just trying to make sure. The only step left is Commission sending it to Meet and Confer?

Asja: Yes correct.

Sharon: What happens if Commission gets it and Commission make changes because they can make changes?

Asja: They can make amendments before sending it to Meet and Confer. They cannot make amendments after Meet and Confer. They haven't accepted it to even review for Meet and Confer, so we're at step of we've already sent it to Commission where Commission will hear it at a public meeting which they did hear it already. So our marching orders were to have these meetings and then go back with an update so then they can decide when they want a calendar it again for review.

Sharon: If Commission wants to make amendments, they can do that on their own, based on all of this discussion?

Asja: The Commission can make amendments as a group Right you can make it as a group as a body because they need at least a quorum to agree on those amendments. Then they vote for that those amendments and then those amendments go to Meet and Confer.

Sharon: What happens if the amendments are things that so far in the process have been eliminated from the DGO? Do they just get included on its own?

Asja: They'll get included in the draft that goes to the labor unions. Depending on what the labor unions say, it could stay in but then the labor unions could take issue with the language.

Sharon: What if what comes out of Meet and Confer does not conform with what the Commission wants; does the Commission then just not vote it in?

Asja: In order for Meet and Confer to conclude, it means that the Commission has reached an agreement with the labor units. There's a labor negotiator that's either a Department member or DHR employee that is negotiating between the bargaining units and the Commission. Board members don't actually do the negotiations or direct the guidelines of what the negotiator does but then they either accept or not accept.

Janice: I think it would be on the SFPD Department negotiator if it was wildly off base where it ends up after Meet and Confer, then they'd probably go into closed session with the Police Commission. But it sounds like that doesn't happen. Has that happened in the past with Meet and Confer where it was just so wildly different than what the Commission had before? I feel like that would be rare to never.

Asja: It's pretty rare. Once it goes to Commission, because Commission 's aware that it's been through all of these steps, I've never seen a Commission wildly change the policy before it goes to Meet and Confer and I don't know if that would be considered a bad thing.

Janice: I meant afterwards though; has it ever happened where like Commission is cool and good with the DGO and sends it to Meet and Confer and then Meet and Confer happens with labor negotiators and the POA and comes out of Meet and Confer very different than what the Commission liked? I feel like that would be rare or has never happened.

Asja: I've never seen that and because we can't close Meet and Confer if the Commission doesn't agree with anything and we have to keep going until they get to a happy place. So either they reject the changes like if the Commission rejected the POA edits, it might come out with other changes. So then there's another closed session where the Commission might reject more. It'll just keep going until POA feels comfortable essentially. But the only way forward is to conclude when the Commission has accepted edits from the POA and the POA feels comfortable (potentially with SEIU for PSAs too).

Janice: I did have a question about process. Thank you so much for laying this out. I don't want to speak on behalf of everyone else here, but I'll just say from where I sit, I really appreciate this opportunity for you to move forward with setting up these meetings so quickly and I think what you laid out makes a lot of sense. Just having a chance for us to ask a lot of questions, to be able to understand that Commission meetings are not set up in a way that's good for public comment, and it's probably a little bit tricky to have the Commissioners there too for us to have an open discussion. So just really appreciate the space regarding this process. How are you all going to be reporting back to both the Commissioners and the rest of Department about what comes out of these meetings and how do you see these next 3 meeting going?

Asja: Well, in this meeting, I think we see how it's going to go, but what do the next 2 meetings look like, that's a great question. Our hope really when we get into. The next agenda item is just really have a feedback session. I think like you noted with the Commission public comment, you hear these things but there's no ability to unpack it, so our hope is to hear from you. We can gather what those primary concerns are and then really find out how the current proposal isn't meeting or addressing those concerns. That's what we really need to understand first. We have a proposal that was operationalized and I think captures the intent of the community but also works in the world we're in with law enforcement. But obviously if we've missed the mark and we need to understand and also we can ask you guys questions too. It's not just a statement, but it gives us an opportunity to maybe dig deeper, which is what's supposed to happen in the Working Groups. In our Working Groups that Emily and I have done together for Deaf and Hard of Hearing and for Domestic Violence, there are these strong statements that come on, but then it lets us be curious and say, "Well, what does that mean and how does that work?" Maybe their concern doesn't actually fit in policy and it fits in something else. So that's our job, to figure out what the solution is from the policy lens. That's really the goal. We're hoping to first capture what those concerns and figure out how this proposal isn't meeting those concerns and then then we can look into solutions which is why we carved out 3 meetings. So we have the space to have a substantive conversation and maybe we won't need a 3rd meeting and maybe we do. We need to come back with some findings for the report out to the Commission.

Janice: So the thinking is you'll sum this all up and put it in a memo that goes to the Commission and then they can deter when they like if they're satisfied?

Asja: Right, they will determine when they want to calendar it and they might determine that maybe we weren't able to figure out what the concerns were or we weren't able to figure out how to be most impactful with those concerns and maybe they ask us to come back to the table or they feel confident that we were able to come together as a group to find the best ways to be impactful to address those concerns. That's the goal and the hope. Let's go online. This is about SFPD and not specifically about feedback about the DGO.

Yanez: This is Jesus, retired Commissioner. Thanks for the overview and for clarifying. I know that this is not a Working Group and if it is a discussion, I hope that we can all be candid and that whatever is summarized from this will convey the points that have come up and that were concerning to some of us Working Group members. We saw a drastically different draft being presented to the Commission from what was generated by the Working Group. The Working Group had a number of detailed conversations about wordsmithing included in the document which was approved and overseen by both Chief Scott and Attorney Betz. So it was really shocking for us to see such a dramatic difference in what was presented to the Commission. If I remember correctly, one of the responses that was written by the policy team to the Working Group or to the Language Access Network to the Commission was that the policy was too long and too detailed, that we needed to reduce it and the DGO has the intent still there, even though we very strongly and I strongly believe that the intent has been completely diluted and that the policy that is being presented is so general, that it will be ineffective for the Commission to actually utilize in DPA hearings and for hold people to account when they do not offer the service. I'd like to reference the fact that during my time on the Commission, we authorized the Use of Force policy that if I remember correctly was over 40 pages long. The 23 page 5.01 Use of Force document is very detailed. To take a document that we generated after countless hundreds of hours to make detailed and respond that officers who are beginning to work on the force may not be able to grasp the draft that was provided is offensive to staff. The Working Group draft was generated by experts in the field and by a sitting Commissioner at

the time. So we would like to know what it is about the initial draft that was not manageable or not palatable to the policy team and the leadership, returning to a draft that was completely different.

Asja: So we can unpack that for sure, but that is not the goal of today. As this is not the Working Group as you know former Commissioner per DGO 3.01 which you adopted when you were active, the DGO has several development steps. This is not a tit for tat at all; it's about the proposed policy. There are some strong concerns that the policy we proposed does not meet the community's needs and will somehow get in the way of officers providing language access services. That was the premise of all those concerns and that worries us if you are seeing something, and by you, I mean all community members and the people participating in today's conversation; that's unacceptable. It's not acceptable to have a policy that stops officers from providing language access to members of the communities we serve. So that's what we are trying to get to the bottom of. I think as we just talked about earlier with the Commission being the body in the middle, it makes it really challenging to get to the bottom of the issue and if the bottom of the issue is something that we are talking past via letter or even public comment at the Commission, why would we go back there? We are here today to have an opportunity to talk when all of us here about the proposal that the Department put out and to figure out how that doesn't meet the requirement and the community needs? That is what we are trying to get enlightenment on as the Department for the proposal.

Yanez: As this is an opportunity for us to have a discussion, then it would be advisable for us to go if we need section by section to compare and contrast and then maybe advise what should be revised. That's my recommendation.

Asja: I appreciate that.

Milli: So this doesn't address the initial ask of what specific things we have issue with. I just wanted to raise briefly that the timing of these meetings after hours in the evenings is difficult for me and some other people that I've talked to in the Working Group. I'm just wondering if any consideration can be made to have the next two meetings during normal business hours or if there is a reason why the evenings were chosen? It's just been difficult for some of us to attend.

Asja: Thank you. So the Commission themselves advised that their concern was because the Working Group meetings were held during the day or at PHQ that that may be a deterrent for many community members. They actually suggested that we have the meetings in the evenings. But, if generally it's more challenging, yes, we can definitely consider a different time for the next 2 meetings. So maybe we'll pull the group at the end to figure out what time is best because it does not do us any good if no one is at the table having these discussions, but the Commission had this concern. Their assumption was that if we had daytime meetings, it was actually not workable either, so we will figure something out, but thank you for that. That is really good feedback. We will pull the group on the best time to meet for the next one.

Milli: Thank you.

Asja: So I am going to close the SF agenda item because it does not seem that there are any more SFPD or presentation specific comments. Anisha, do you have a question?

Anisha: So I understand that the Commission is going to bring the DGO back onto their agenda on April 8th. Can you explain what this means? Is it going to be a vote or a chance for the Department to share out a summary of what happened in these meetings and then they will consider further action?

Asja: That is a good question. So my understanding is that they will actually be meeting on April 1st now, but it will just be a report out. I do not believe they are bringing the DGO back on April 1st for a

vote as they will want to hear a report out to determine what the next steps will be. That's my understanding.

Janice: I have a more generic DGO question, but that might start the next agenda item so you can figure out if you want to answer it now or later. What you said was helpful to hear about the explanation of DGOs as not giving specific step by step procedures but some amount of protocol. Can you explain what level of specificity makes sense in a DGO and how that is differentiated with specific Unit Orders and how those work in tandem?

Asja: We have a ton of policies that were created before this Division's existence and this Division is relatively new as we were established in 2023. Before that, policy was really created all over the Department without unified structures or standards as there were different authors with different protocols. Different Command Staff members reported to different chains of command and so there were vast differences between many of the policies, becoming specific orders. So our team was given the directive by leadership to start getting back to General Orders. So that is relatively new and that is the balancing act I was talking about where there are some specific procedures in DGOs but only the ones that are really necessary while other procedures are more appropriate for a Unit Order. I'll get more into the details later, but really the General Orders' primary function is to give operational functional requirements in the field. There are some procedures that will be necessary in terms of Unit Orders that that do not raise to the level of Commission or Command Staff, but rather the Commanding Officer of that particular unit. So let's say a DGO mentions a specific unit like the Property Control Division. The Property Control Division now has to tag certain pieces of evidence and then put them in an envelope; that would not be appropriate for a DGO. What's appropriate for the DGO is for everyone to know that there's a responsibility that PCD but not specifically the PCD procedures. The specific PCD procedures would go in a Unit Order that is more flexible because things may change like leadership or the unit itself might move or be dissolved or whatever procedure may change like using red envelopes instead of green can be more easily changed in a Unit Order. Unit Orders can get quite involved because it also depends on the Commanding Officer, so the Commanding Officer may want a lot of details but the next Commanding Officer might want fewer responsibilities. The Policy Development Division is involved in the writing of Unit Orders but not as heavily as we are with DGOs, because we are not always going to be the Subject Matter Expert for Unit Orders. We think specific procedural requirements should be determined by each unit and each unit's Commanding Officer. We provide review to make sure the Unit Order makes sense or to check if any information is missing. Some Unit Orders that have been written will try to direct people outside of the unit, so it is our job to make sure it does not say things outside of the confines of the unit. As we get into the more line by line and the details of 5.20 there's a world where it is helpful to understand where your patrol officer is and your Command Staff reviews in understanding that specific things may be too specific for a DGO and perhaps belongs more in a Unit Order. Maybe it's the Community Engagement Division or the Academy with training which would be helpful for us to understand when we get into the specifics. I can do my best but sometimes we do not anticipate the feedback so when we have concurrence meetings with leadership, we can say what we think we would like, but ultimately all of those people outrank me and have experience that I do not have as they have been with the Department for 20 or 30 years and have operational expertise that informs them of things that I have never thought of. They also have management experience where they are managing 150 people or they understand what the Investigations Bureau does in a what that is not capture in the proposal that we send to them. So I will not be able to answer all of those questions, but certainly we can write them down and then, before the next meeting, we can see if we can get some answers if get them.

Janice: I have a question. First of all, thanks for the presentation. Thank you for describing the DGO level of generality, but if not in the DGO, where do the procedural requirements for language access provisions reside?

Asja: One argument might be in training documents because there are best practices that would better belong in a training document or training video or something that happens at the Academy in terms of language access, in which case we would not need a Unit Order. Does CED have a Unit Order?

Lorena: I do not think so.

Asja: A lot of it is captured in another area if there's procedural requirements, but the procedural requirements in the DGO are to ensure that language access is provided. But if we are talking about things we would like or hope officers to know that are not requirements, but are helpful, those could be put into a training document or in a FAQ or something easy for officers to be training on a regular basis. But it is really determined once we get through this process.

Janice: So there isn't a Unit Order or any other kind of notice or bulletin that maybe delineates or we're just going into the next agenda item?

Asja: We are going to talk about it now.

Sharon: For my purpose, it feels like the heart of the DGO was taken out and a lot of texture, that does exist in other DGOs, has been removed and I think that is something that the Working Group really wanted to maintain in there as it shows a level of care, responsibility, and accountability that the Department has towards the LEP community. I think, and I wasn't part of the Working Group, that it feels like a lot of that texture was taken out, for example, like identifying an LEP person, the list of all of those individual characteristics were removed. It basically says identify an LEP person and find out if they are language access and then you just know, but it doesn't talk about how someone should do that and the different steps a person should do to ensure that they are asking the right questions and making the right referrals. I felt that that was missing as I went through the two different versions in a lot of different areas. For me, could we do a redline between the Working Group copy and the copy that went to the Commission, because for me, what happened is it looks like it was just rearranged rather than just no longer there? I do not know why it was rearranged, but I think that is helpful to understand too or maybe that is just something that Written Directives is trying to be consistent with in how you are creating all the DGOs. I worked on that crazy 17 page Domestic Violence DGO and we reduced it to 6 pages, but all of that other information was put into a Manual. All of the texture that I was worried about that wasn't in the DGO anymore wound up in the Manual where members are equally as accountable. So I think the question is accountability and when a DGO is super general, you lack accountability. When you have more specificity, people are more accountable. I think that for me putting back in some of the texture and heart of the DGO is important.

Asja: Let's unpack that a little before we move on and get into the meat of the discussion. All of our written directives members are accountable for, every written directive that is issued. So Department Notices, yes. Unit Orders, yes. Manuals, yes. DGOs, yes. Accountability does not go away if it is coming out of PDD, as officers are accountable right now. If it is a memo and there are discussions or a Word document, then I see the fear of escaping accountability. But, if it is issued to members through our Division, they are held accountable to it and there are audits that fall under Deputy Chief responsibilities to ensure this. For those who do not work here, I understand those fears and if you are not the Department, how would you know the insurance and ins and outs of officer accountability? But I think for every member that works here, they are acutely aware of how accountable they need to be.

Sharon: That's why when you moved everything into the Manual, I was fine because it's in the Manual. But I worry that the things taken out of DGO 5.20 aren't living anywhere else. So if they are living somewhere else, it'd be really good to know where they are.

Lorena: I think with the example you gave, the identifying an LEP person, would be something to throw into training because I am currently in the process of joining the Lieutenant that teaches that right now by making a PowerPoint based off the new DGO that would suggest things officers should do.

Sharon: But that does not come out of PDD, so then are they not accountable to those identification elements that an officer should go through to identify if someone is LEP?

Asja: The goal here and the core of a DGO is to outline what officers are required to do in the field. If it is a best practice, a consideration, a helpful tip or hint, that is not necessarily a DGO component. I hear your concern and we can funnel it into a more appropriate area and make sure it lands there. That is really the goal of today's discussion.

Sharon: Just as an example, identification - where would that live, how would people be training on it, and to what extent are they accountable when they don't do what they are trained on? That is what the current DGO lacks versus the DGO that came out of the Working Group that was too specific, but some of those too specific parts are important and that was why it was in the DGO.

Janice: If something is too specific, which is a bit of a subjective call, but subjective in that it will come from years of experience of a patrol officer, I think understanding what is too specific or what belongs in a Manual would be really helpful for us people to understand. For example, we think it should be in the General Order because of XYZ reasons. I think that would be really helpful.

Asja: I'm closing item 3 and we're moving into community feedback sessions so we can start documenting where the concerns are. But what I do want to say is that I don't want us to get hung up on the too specific versus too general. I wanted to definitely describe what a General Order is and I think the real discussion is, and I'm hoping that this group understands this with language access, there is language that works with sworn members. There's language that they can read and understand in written documents that makes it easier for them to understand and implement. I hope that we're not getting caught up in this idea of we took out the procedure because it was too specific. It's probably still in the DGO, we just wrote it in a way that is more applicable to the audience that we're speaking to. Like I said to you in the hallway right after the last meeting, a medical journal is written a certain way. Certain books are written in a certain way. There's a rhetorical analysis that has to happen so that you're making sure whatever document you're writing, it works for its primary audience, and these DGO's' primary audience are sworn members. We get a lot of consistent feedback that while Commissioners may think a 23 page DGO is a wonderful thing, the members that have to implement it find it really challenging to implement and mistakes can be made and the mistakes that can be made can impact their livelihood essentially and/or the lives of someone that they are interacting with. With all of that in mind, there are so many factors that I am beholden to and that my team is beholden to that the general public isn't so it's not about making sure that the general audience understands what's specific and what's general as much as our job is to take all of this information and then write it in a way that is most impactful to our audience. You want to address the red line that to me is a diagnosis. That's what we do once we've diagnosed the problem and where there's a gap here is that the Commission and or at least the Commission Members that I've talked to and our unit, aren't understanding the gap.

If my goal is to issue a policy so that SFPD members can provide language access to comply with the LAO, comply with state law, comply with Title VI, ensure that victims and members of the public get access to their rights, arrestees get access to their rights, if we have that in the proposal, can you help

us understand how in the proposed version, how is it not there? Let us know. Educate us on how the version that went to Commission doesn't let SFPD do those things, and then once we diagnose it, then we can figure out what the resolution is. Maybe the resolution is to do a comparison between those two, but we don't do red lines for that so we'd have to create it. We'd have to create that for this purpose, but we're not sure if that's the exercise that's needed. We have to hear it first. That's our responsibility on this side of the table to figure out, and I can't imagine that we don't all share the same goal. The goal is for SFPD to be able to provide language access to people that visit and live in San Francisco when they interact with SFPD. That's our goal. I believe we share that goal. If I just if that's wrong, we need to hear it and also what we really need to find out through this agenda item is how does the proposal not get us there? Before we do that, can you write down what I heard is there's a concern about accountability? There's a concern you said about texture or the heart.

Sharon: To answer your question, I think much of the Commission proposed DGO does do in a very literal sense, what you wanted to do. But what it doesn't do is provide all of the information that the Working Group put together that explains how they should do that.

Asja: Right. That's good to understand, because maybe that's supposed to live somewhere else and that's your concern. That's our concern too. Is where does that live? Because, maybe the DGO isn't the most appropriate place for that. For deaf and hard of hearing, we are working on a video so it lives somewhere. Not only does it live somewhere, those community members are participating in the creation of the video that their lived experience is what we're capturing. Those best practices didn't go in that policy, and that too is about language access. Ensuring that best practices live somewhere.

Sharon: If not the DGO.

Asja: If not in the DGO, where do the best practices live? We need to hear from you guys. We just want to hear from anyone who's online and in the room for the proposal that went in front of the Commission, where is the thing that gets in the way of us offering language access?

Anisha: Hi, thank you. Thank you so much for this discussion. It's really illuminating and helpful for, I think, all of us in the room. I am wondering where Departmental Notices fall under in terms of whether those are considered as the right level of detail for DGOs? Because I understand they are policy, but then they have expiration dates and so they need to be renewed. Why I'm mentioning this, is that there's a really helpful Departmental Notice that discusses really great information that I don't feel like are best practices. I feel it's actually operational language and so I wanted to know how the Policy Division reconciled the Department Notice's contents with the changes that they made to the current proposed version?

Asja: With specificity, I'm not sure I can tell. I know that we incorporated the active DNs that were related as much as possible in clearer language in this, the ones that were active. If it was expired, it might have just remained expired. There were a number of DNs that have been issued over the years that have been expired that may not have been reissued. The balancing act again, that my Division tries to successfully do here is to make sure that if the DN itself was a specific procedure that's required, our goal was to put it in the DGO. If it was a DN that maybe had helpful hints, our goal is to put that in training materials or put that in, if it's too specific, maybe a Unit Order. Maybe it's not a Unit Order for CED, maybe it's a Unit Order for the Academy. But without having the specific DNs in front of me, I don't know that I can answer that question. What I can do is come back to the next meeting with a little bit more.

Sharon: May I ask Anisha are you talking about DN 21-072?

Anisha: Yes, I have saved that in my files because I feel it's a really great example of the type of policy language that the Department produced that answers a lot of our concerns. I just wanted to see

what the Policy Division thought about the DN, and it seems it was useful for officers because it kept getting renewed. To me, that signals that it's useful and important enough to include in the current proposed draft.

Asja: OK. So, we wrote it down as we're keeping note of 21-072, at least for that. It looks like Sharon had the Notice. I just can't answer the question without having looked at it and telling you exactly the balancing act, but I can at least be prepared with 21-072 for the next one, or to provide an answer in between this meeting in the next is that OK?

Anisha: Yes, that works for me. Then I just wanted to also like set like understand again going back to the expectations for this space because as I understand it, the Commission really asked and directed the Department to meet with the LANSF and community and also consider restoring versions from the February 2025 Public Review, restoring portions from that version into the current proposed draft. It feels from the Department's end, and correct me if I'm wrong, you are trying to keep this current version as is, and then find other ways to acknowledge or incorporate portions of the February 2025 version. Is that the case? Are you actually considering restoring portions of that version, or is that off the table?

Asja: The intention is for us to understand I can't tell you what needs to be restored or even our ability to truly understand what needs to be restored without having this discussion first. I think the intention of this, at least from the Department side is to understand really what is the problem with the proposal. Tt's to diagnose before we prescribe the medicine essentially. The option for the medicine is to restore elements but first, we'd like to be able to diagnose it so we can all be on the same page. We are not walking in here saying no, we're not going to do it. We're saying we want to do it, but from a genuine place, not because you pointed to a line here or there, but to really understand where the mark was missed if it was. What we're asking for is a real discussion from this team, where the first step is for you to tell us about this, the current proposal that's on the table, where that is missing so that we can have that true understanding.

Yanez: If I may chime in on that point. From this end, it feels we don't understand what was missing or what wasn't applicable from the version that came out of the Working Group and since that process is very well documented, both in grids and the meetings were recorded, we can always look at that document to see what the sentiment and intent of the Working Group recommendations were and what the draft that came out of that process looked the way it did. So it's hard to then say, defend or criticize or identify how the version that came out of your process, which is not documented. We do not understand what wasn't practical in the previous version, so from this perspective I would hope from your end that it is word for word, that it's viable in draft that came out last year.

Asja: I hear you. So, it is documented, we updated the Working Group grid with everything that was accepted or changed and our understanding of why it was changed, and what was also documented in the Public Comment grid which was submitted to the Commission. We have documented every phase as it relates to the results, we don't necessarily document the decisions that were made in the leadership process, but again, the process itself, I'm required to go through in each of those phases you're not. That's where we're at is that I am beholden to specific requirements on policy development. After the Working Group phase, there are several other opportunities where the document changes and then we're required to report out why it changed or operationally why it changed. So that's where the disconnect is, where we have done that work where we have documented it. But clearly there's something that we're not understanding.

So that's why if we can hear from you directly, like we're just being told it's not there, OK well, we believe that we put that information out there by updating the grid. By saying what changed after

concurrence, which is the last step before Commission. But if that's not enough, then maybe the discussion will be helpful.

Yanez: One of the items that has already been identified is the actual process and protocol when we're writing DGOs, it's a protocol. It's a step by step description of what is expected of each officer in the absence of a Superior Officer or a Commanding Officer. With that in mind, the version that is being presented in, in my opinion, does not provide a protocol for how to identify the primary language or a limited English person. So that is the concern and that is the biggest issue that a lot of people have expressed to me exists with the draft that was submitted to the Commission.

Asja: OK. We're going to write down the specific protocols to identify primary language are missing. Does that capture what you were saying?

Yanez: Yes

Asja: OK. So what we have in there is "proactively asking the person their primary or preferred language using the department language identification cards, the translation app right, which is what we have, potentially AI, nearby people, dispatch which is DEM, professional interpretation service, etc." So we open it up by giving examples. I think Lorena had showed the tool that we use, the app, that has that language identifier tool. We're saying that that's not specific enough and then saying that we should err on the side of providing language assistance when unsure of LEP and then offering the potential indicators, misuse of language switching between languages, inability to answer questions sufficiently, confusion with intricate enforcement procedures, cannot respond to open-ended questions? That's not enough? We want more. Is that what we're saying or we want more specificity so I understand?

Yanez: I think some of the examples and the instruction in section 5.20.04.A.1 and what is now in the draft that was submitted 5.20.04.A, the identification process for the primary language is a process that assumes that an officer knows that someone already comes with a need and allowing that level of subjectivity. It creates an issue because then we can't hold someone accountable for not providing a service that this City requires by law. The process that is described in the version that was produced by the Working Group I feel does require these steps and provides a little bit more clarity about how to go about determining if someone needs a service and then we can go into 5.20.04 which is identifying what that primary language is because those are two different steps. Does that make sense?

Asja: They seem so similar to me that because we pulled that language from that version, we talk about the misuse of language, the code switching. It's from that bullet point list that we have truncated to show that it's these that are potential indicators, right?

Yanez: It's not just truncated. It's massacred, it is not the same version, it is nowhere close to providing as much detail and as many examples, and that's the concern.

Asja: So, it's the number of examples you're saying you want a longer list of examples. Is that the core of it?

Yanez: I think once again, the procedure, the way it's written that was presented to the Commission, does not provide instruction on how to determine when and if, as the Ordinance requires, a person would prefer their primary language. We're skipping to identify the primary language if and when we believe it is necessary based on the couple of examples that were adopted from the previous version, so I feel there's an actual a protocol step that is missing, which is what triggers and activates the identification process itself. Does that make sense? They read differently. It's a different protocol and if we're missing the primary step of determining whether an individual would prefer a different language then how are we going to get to offer the best service and create the best evidence to

submit to the prosecutor's office if and when a crime is committed, has been committed, or if and when the victim wants to report a crime?

Asja: OK. So in this version, we're requiring officers to proactively ask about a primary or preferred language and based on those indicators, that doesn't exist in in the public comment version or in even the currently active version in 2007. That's the core requirement, right?

Yanez: But the previous one says "the following procedure shall apply when you encounter a member whose LEP" and then we provide examples and a process for how to move into that determination and that is missing now.

Asja: So you're saying that the version that was proposed stops officers from being able to identify whether someone speaks? That's what we're saying?

Yanez: Not that it stops them. It doesn't provide instruction or how to determine if and when a person not just needs it, in some cases would prefer it. That's what the Ordinance says.

Asja: Preferred is in the proposal. Preferred is there. I don't think that's the core issue, but I think if we're trying to understand how it says something.

Yanez: I'm going to break it down. When encountering, the previous version says, "the following procedure shall apply" and the version that is being presented says "when an employee believes Language services are needed." Are you telling me that that is the same?

Asja: Or as requested.

Yanez: Not every person knows that this is an ordinance and a mandate that every department is supposed to follow, and the Working Group worked really hard to get the Department to accept that we need to improve our delivery of the service when 20% of the population is LEP identify or self identifies as LEP. The Department only provides 2.5% of its incident reports with LEP translation provided and so that that's missing.

Asja: I'm writing down missing step of determining if LEP individual has a preferred language. Then is it the requirement that the following shall apply? That is what we should write down as something that's missing?

Yanez: You could say in the policy that there shall be an instruction that you know has to take place versus language that says when someone believed something needs to happen and from the accountability perspective, which DPA brought up, it is almost impossible to hold someone accountable when the instruction is so subjective.

Asja: OK, we're writing it down. The concern is that this shall apply to everybody, every encounter, regardless of LEP. The concern is that it's not that we have to remember who we're trying to identify, but we're going to write it down because we need to figure this out. The core of this is we have to dissect the proposal that was given to the Commission so we can understand how the proposal that was given to the Commission in February doesn't meet the LAO or meet the ability to provide language access. I'm concerned about a belief that we should have 20% of interactions of all interactions LEP. I think that we have to remember what we do. We're not providing public health. We are a law enforcement agency, so we're talking about the criminal element. That's really where we're getting involved. I don't know if we want the numbers to be higher and we don't want them to match the disposition of the demographics.

quick back and forth on confusion of which version of the DGO people physically at the meeting had

Asja: We just want to make sure that we're keeping track of that conversation. We have accountability, the heart of it, the best practices exist, where do they exist, making sure that all this information lives somewhere. When you take a look at 21-072, there's a feeling that there's no protocol for identifying primary language or we need more examples or to make it a requirement, missing step of determining individuals have a preferred language.

Janice: The entire section of identifying LEP individuals was removed and a lot of the language that was in the Working Group version was actually directly coming out of the Department Notice 21-072. I don't want to speak for Jesus, but I think that's a big question of was there something in that that needed to be removed because when you look at the side by side, it goes from identify primary language, which is the next step here, but it removes this entire section around identifying LEP individuals and, in what I see, that language in the bullet points is almost word for word what's in the Department Notice.

Sharon: What I was saying is that the idea that they need to identify an LEP person is in your DGO. But what's not in the DGO is how to do that. All the steps that they should take to ensure that they're asking the right questions and they're making the right determinations, which is what was in 21-072, all of the steps that were in the Working Group proposed DGO, under identifying LEP individuals. That's missing but, your question, Asja, is what? What's not in there, right? What does the DGO not do? It does say you need to identify LEP individuals, but what it doesn't say is how to do it and what questions should you be asking. I think that's what I feel was really important to the Working Group. I've called it the heart, but it's why it makes it important. So that's one.

Dan: To clarify, for me it's more procedures how you identify someone, what to look for, what are the different things that would indicate that they need language access.

Sharon: How do you do it? Identify a language or LEP individuals, and then your DGO just says, "identify LEP individuals and their primary language," but it doesn't say how to do it and that, I think is the texture of it. That's what makes it important.

Ana: Which has to do with applying the common indicator level language barrier that is laid out in the in 21-072.

Dan: So the procedures from the DN, you like seeing them in the DGO?

Sharon: Well, it was in the Working Group copy of the DGO. That's what I'm saying.

Dan: You like seeing those procedures in the DGO is that what this about?

Janice: Yes and we're trying to understand was there a reason this was removed? Is it because it's in a DN or maybe it's part of the training manual? That's the part we don't understand. Because I think otherwise, an officer would make assumption "Oh, that person is speaking English, so I can just use English," but I think anyone working with LEP folks realize it doesn't sound like just because that person is speaking English, or it sounds like maybe they don't have that much of an accent that they're LEP.

Ana: Language proficiency is context specific and it's affected by emotions and adrenaline and all that stuff.

Asja: OK. Thank you. We're hoping that this isn't a line by line, but we do want to know what are the other like big concerns that somehow have gotten in the way of this process from the proposed one from February, so I can really understand because that was a helpful discussion?

Janice: This is so random, but is there a reason under definitions, you went from letters to bullet points?

Asja: Just a style guide thing.

Dan: Oh, OK. We tend not to use bullet points.

Janice: Yes, but it was in the Working Group version. It was actually letters and then in the proposed version it changed.

Yanez: Along those lines in the definitions, the definition of an LEP individual in the Working Group version was a verbatim cut and paste definition from the ordinance, and the new definition is a very different version of the definition and doesn't convey the fact that someone who's otherwise unable to communicate effectively in English. That says a lot and it provides a lot of context for an individual officer who is encountering someone. Can you explain why that definition was changed so drastically and why the ordinance language doesn't apply to a DGO in this case, when we do use references to Penal Code in other cases?

Asja: The goal is writing a document (the DGO) so that it is easy to understand by officers in the field. So there is a lot of making it make the most sense in the easiest way possible. We did see this actual definition on OCEIA's site, it's the site that has the language access reports, that's the SF data portal that is when you go to see the LAO reports, there's a specific definition for LEP and that's the same. I think the from the policy perspective and in the discussions had, it wasn't a significant enough difference. I think again it doesn't get in the way of understanding the core intent of it.

Yanez: Well, I'd like to flag that just because that is one of those things that when people are talking about taking away the heart or the spirit, if we're trying to elaborate and prove a DGO from the previous iteration, which is what every DGO revision process I expect happens. You know that didn't take place in that transition from the Working Group version and the one that is being presented to the Commission's, and there are a lot of examples like that, but it sounds like you're saying we aren't going to go through it word for word?

Asja: I think it's really important. We're trying to understand and we have to come to a common understanding that we were required to go through several other drafting phases after the public review phase. So, we have to let go of the idea that we're going to get the exact draft that came out of the Working Group; that has to go away. But if there are elements that we can go back to and figure out how to work in because you were able to have this meeting with us and can really enlighten us on how this version gets in the way of the end result that we all share.

We all wanted it. I think certainly makes much easier for us to look back at that version. See what we can pull from it, but I'm not gonna go through a line for line defense of where we're at. I can't do that. There were too many other feedback kind of areas with too many members of the department, too many leadership decisions. I'm not in a position, nor do I want to defend every single decision that was made. If you really want to know, you can go back to the grid that is publicly posted. If you have, if you specifically have an interest in knowing the exact changes. And why we made it, I welcome you to go to our it's publicly posted, the grid. But today, really again like just now. We had, I think, a good discussion to understand what the what the desire is right and why it's important. That's something that we can go back and and look at, right? But it so that's that's really the hope is we have discussions and it's not a why did you do that? Why is it there? There's too many people involved in the development for me to even substantively respond in a way that anyone would find satisfaction with the but for us, we're asking you to impart your knowledge on us on how. So we can, you know, find the middle ground if needed. Because again, if if the goal is to put out a policy that allows SFPD to do this work, if if you're telling me something stops it from doing that in the proposed, then we can have that discussion.

Yanez: So just in the case of that definition, the word from the ordinance and we're all trying to follow the ordinance, you said that's part of the policy's responsibility, is to ensure that we're following the letter of the law, and if the letter of the law says that, an individual is allowed to conduct an interaction in a language that they prefer in their definition of the Ordinance, but yet that that preference is removed in your definition of LEP individual.

Asja: The definition as proposed is "a person whose primary or preferred language is not English and who has a limited ability to read, write, speak or understand English." The preferred is not removed.

Yanez: The ordinance language says, "If an individual doesn't speak, read, or understand or communicate in English or is otherwise unable to communicate effectively", and I think that's the word there. If someone isn't effectively able to communicate and we're trying to generate evidence, I think that that's a key term and the ability to then offer the preferred, have the preference and ability to conduct that interaction differently. Those are two concepts that I think are important.

Asja: I think you just hit on it. You hit on the core of it, because also you said it earlier Ana, it is that the communicate effectively is the key. It's not necessarily the preferred that's the core. I'm saying in terms of operations, is that there's this concern that while someone may not be able to communicate effectively, so are you OK with me writing that part down as the core concern? OK.

Sharon: I think that we the reduction in the training portion of it just says you'll do training periodically, but there was real texture as to the type of training and what the training should look like in the Working Group draft.

Asja: I can see why that would be disappointing. Training depends on so many things. It depends on available staff and on how many people are helping the Language Liaison, the materials available, etc. I think the problem that we're running into with policy, and especially discussions with leadership, is where requiring something based on staffing that isn't available or periods that aren't available, sets us up for something we can't deliver. I'll give you a good example. DGO 301 has a lot of detail, but didn't have infrastructure to do the detail right. That's a completely separate DGO. Our issue is making sure that we require something, but if we get into the level of specificity of what exactly needs to be done every single time without dealing with the Commanding Officers that oversee the staff that do that work, I can't promise that goes into a DGO. But, I hear the concern about maybe generalizing training in a way, so that's what we did. Policies, procedures, interpreting techniques, roles, and ethics, that we can definitely deliver, we can absolutely 1000% deliver on that. But I think where we have some wiggle room is taking those specific things and then making sure the things that maybe you've noted before, having us work directly on some training scripts. That's outside of the DGO and maybe doesn't feel as much fun, but it's what we can get. We can get this group involved in how that training looks. We can talk about that as a as part of this, but putting it in a DGO with a paragraph long of the exact things that are happening without talking to the staff that rolls that out and is in charge of it, is challenging.

Sharon: Maybe we could put on the board we want to talk to them to see what they can actually do.

Janice: Yes. This might be a good example where you're telling us you want the flexibility in the DGO for very reasonable reasons. We want to make sure it's strong for obvious reasons on our end. So perhaps this gets strengthened a little bit, but really the meat of it needs to live somewhere else in terms of goals for the frequency of the training. The section in the Working Group version, including the language identification tools, which you just said you go through training for everyone, it's not that you all are doing it. I think desire to strengthen and bring about some of the meat of this, but also if it needs to live somewhere else, help us understand where that lives and why that might be a better place for that to live. Because right now, you're using the Language Line App, but maybe in 10 years this is something else, right?

Asja: Can I ask a ridiculous question? Is this group, if we were able to formulate some sort of training, could we use this group as a group to bounce ideas off for the training formula?

Anisha: But Asja, you hit on a point that really excited me because I have a shared goal, which is that we as the Language Access Network would love to be involved in the development of the training. We would love to be part of the training. I know that in some cases, the Department allows groups to audit trainings; that's something that we would be very much open to because we hear countless examples every day about how folks are experiencing City services as an LEP person. I feel like we would be able to offer some really important expertise into the space and I would want to sign us up for that. Absolutely.

Asja: That is really reassuring and helpful to hear because that is where a lot of the best practices, how to do it, how to identify, what to do next can live, and I know you'd like the help as having the lens and the access that you have to LEP communities throughout the City, maybe not necessarily dealing with the criminal element, but there's things that we need to get better at. I think if we could use you as a resource for materials, that might be a more fulfilling way to do it, then dealing with the constraints of it in a DGO necessarily, but certainly like strengthening this, but the detail that was in your the version that you guys worked on goes into like a training video, training pamphlets, training scripts so we know that it lives somewhere, and that seems to be an ongoing theme, right? Where does it live? We can find a more appropriate place and if you're willing, we'd love to take the help.

Janice: I'll just say I in my role, I joined the meetings at the Mayor's Office of Victims' Rights with SVU and like we all know, Tony Flores talked about language access, specifically with special victims with him going to the Academy regularly. He's talked through the slides that he includes as part of that, and I know it's something that has been done in the past. There's been a lot of discussions there to bring it back to have more of the engagement directly with victim advocates and people who provide direct services. I want to say it was specifically around DV cases, but he had been creating some training videos that he was bringing to the Academy but he's sort of seen it all and I can see how things play out in those spaces. So all that to say yes, very interested.

Asja: That's fantastic. I'll bring up the deaf and hard of hearing. If we create a video, that lasts for a long time and it's easier for the training staff and it's something that could be blasted Department-wide. So it's not done in a cohort of 12 recruits or whatever. It's Department-wide and then we wouldn't need to update it for several years and then you guys could have a direct impact on that. If that's something you're interested in, I'm taking that as a yes.

Janice: As materially possible, strengthening the language in the DGO itself.

Asja: Given in mind that on our side we have to deal with the staffing and that kind of thing, that might not have the availability. Give me an idea of strengthening this. Maybe we extend it right so it's the policies, procedures, interpreting techniques, roles, ethics, maybe a specialized unit like working with victim advocates. We can add other things or components without it being a training requirement step by step.

Janice: I think the language in the Working Group version really is quite specific. Help us understand, after you've had your internal conversations, maybe it's too specific and say it's too specific because of XYZ or like we can't commit to that, but we can commit to this. But I don't want to offer anything different than what's come out of the Working Group, because that's been vetted by LANSF and others.

Yanez: If I could recommend Asja, the language that's in the Working Group version, there's nothing interfering with the Department offering those options or those descriptions that are in there via a

video either. It doesn't tie the Department to doing this face to face, it just said it recommends the types of trainings and the period when they should happen, but they could still take place via video.

Asja: I'm not going to go specifically over the language. We've had so many revisions and discussions. I'm saying taking the entire section as is might not be an option. That's why we're having this discussion. But the version that you're talking about does say specifically like roll call and service. I can't guarantee you that goes into a DGO. That is the best way to do it, which is why is one of the considerations we revised was training to make it more general so that it can be done and we're not setting ourselves up for failure. We could certainly say by way of video or in person, or at the Academy, but to say specifically how the training will be done and when, is the thing that we were trying to solve for in the proposal to the Commission.

Yanez: I'd be fine with "or". We don't have all the Working Group members here and obviously, as you said, it's not like we're still active members that are able to vote on this. But an "or" would be fine and the roll call requirement may be a stretch as to whether that's something that could be considered being removing. I think from what I remember of those conversations, it was the types of trainings and the frequency, but not necessarily the manner in which those were applied. We want that content and we want that expertise to be conveyed to the officers in some way, shape or form.

Sharon: I'm also not giving up any ground, but you might want to consider the last two lines as being the first part of when it talks about what the training should look like and the last two lines say when it should happen.

Asja: So that's the standard. That's why we ask for effective dates. That's separate from the adoption date. When we adopt a policy, that doesn't mean it goes into effect right away. That's part of 3.01. The effective date is based on the type of training that's needed. That is the concern.

Sharon: I'm looking at the Working Group one. You're saying, what part of that in training?

Asja: No. I guess when you said the last two lines, that's conducted within a specific time frame agreed upon by the Police Commission and Department.

Sharon: I'm talking about the Department shall conduct these trainings for new recruits and everything above that is what the training should look like, right? It doesn't say like you have to do it. I wasn't part of the Working Group, so I don't want to offer that as a compromise, but at least you give texture to what the training should be, not just there should be training periodically. There should be training that helps identify LEP individuals. First part of that paragraph that you're concerned about, which requires the training take place at roll call every two years, that's a potential compromise.

Asja: OK, I hear that.

Sharon: Can I ask in the incident report section, which is page four, why is there a drop down menu for the interpreter? Who the interpreter is OK. That's what I was going to ask because you did say follow the dropdown menu. Because for a prosecutor, it is incredibly important to know who did the interpretation. If they're certified and what their qualifications are. That's why it was removed from the incident reports. That's fine.

Anisha: Yes, I wanted to go back to the definitions because I know that the Department has an interest in not using unnecessary words and so I wanted to make a friendly suggestion that for the definition of Translation, it says "For the purpose of this DGO," I don't think you need that. I think you can assume that and you don't have it anywhere else, so I think it's more consistent if you just get rid of that phrase. For Required Languages, I was trying to put myself in the role of somebody who had no idea what language access meant and what the laws meant. It feels very confusing because it says "for which the requisite number of persons qualifies as a substantial number of LEP persons."

That doesn't seem very operational to me, and I also wanted to mention that we have a new certified language, Vietnamese, which needs to be included in the list alongside Chinese, Spanish and Filipino. I believe that something that is more workable. Something along the lines of "for required languages, languages that the Department must have, vital information for proactively translated vital documents and signage for and fill public contact positions with bilingual staff certified per SF Admin Code 91" and then including the languages Chinese, Spanish, Filipino and Vietnamese. Then you actually get to summarize what the ordinance requires of all Departments, and you actually get what the list of required languages are. I don't feel like "based on a substantial number of LEP persons" actually makes sense to anybody except folks who are well versed in the ordinance language.

Asja: I think it certainly arms our Language Access Liaison who's really going to be taking on the compliance measures for this. But we did add the vital documents section of the procedure. We're trying to get away from adding procedures in definitions. But I hear what you're saying so we can take a look at it, but we again, we want to make it a definition and not a "This is what you have to do with this definition."

Anisha: And maybe Ana could also suggest some workable language in the definitions as well, so that it makes sure that we're consistent with the Ordinance language and that it's operational for the officers.

Ana: I can look into it so I can give it some thought and bring something next time we meet, thank you.

Asja: We have about 10 more minutes. This conversation's not done, right? We have two more meetings on calendar. We'll check other times and dates that are better for everyone so that they can participate. But what would be helpful for the next meeting, is if we make sure that you look at the version that was proposed more so than the version that went to Public Comment because my job is to focus on what was operationalized. The version that went to Commission was operationalized by members, by the City Attorney, by leadership while the version that came out for Public Review didn't. It didn't go to members at large, it didn't go to the City Attorney, it didn't go through leadership approval. For whatever reason, if you're attached to that version, the only thing I can say is we can't go back to that version, but we can talk about the version that's on the table that was presented to Commission and figure out ways to make sure that we get all of the needs met. We can discuss that. My ask is it for the next meeting, we're all prepared to discuss the proposed version to the Commission. I apologize for not having hard copies here today. That's our fault. But we did e-mail it to you, so you have it in your e-mail. That would be helpful.

Sharon: You mentioned that Commission and the City Attorney agreed to change under Miranda. Is it to remove the word when required?

Asja: No, it was just swap to move the word in after the Miranda admonition. "When the Miranda admonition is required, it shall be provided in the suspect's primary or preferred language." That was the City Attorney because they thought it would clear up the language a little bit better.

Sharon: Can I also ask for the Language Access Liaison? You removed all the different reporting requirements that they had delineated in the Working Group.

Asja: It was a separate non-required group. The LAO report has around 24 data points in it and then anything else OCEA determines that's required. The unfortunate part is that we were doing a required report by legislation and then this extra report that wasn't lining up because the OCEIA report is a fiscal year and the current report is calendar year. That's something we're trying to fix in terms of the 2007 version. Also, with PROP E, we are required to review any requirements for reporting that aren't

required by law. The LAO report is required by law, so we're trying to streamline the process to make sure that the report we do is the LAO.

Ana: I just want to mention under 5.20.04 B, Non-Criminal Incidents, that my concern is as to if it aligns with the LAO because here in a non-criminal incident, there are situations that do not involve a violation of the law and are unlikely to result in court proceedings early in scrutiny. Employees should determine the appropriate level of interpretation needed, which may include Certified and Uncertified Bilingual Members or civilians, neighbors, family members, friends, bystanders, etc. So here in the LAO 91.14 department responsibilities, it states that it's the department's responsibility to provide language access services. I don't see how that would be compatible with having neighbors family members friends provide interpretation services, not to mention that it could affect the quality, of the interpretation and could put children in a police station, which can be highly traumatizing.

Asja: What we're talking about is directions. This is non-criminal. This is like how do you get to Chinatown but in Portuguese? It could be maybe not the interpretation, but they give a sticker to a child and speak to the child. This is completely consensual, non criminal. We're not talking about a police station or an incident report. Right now, there's an idea that this is prohibited, which gets in the way of community engagement and building rapport with community members on the street. But we're talking about interactions that are entirely consensual. We're not talking about something that's traumatizing.

Ana: I understand that. I hear you saying this around providing City services. That's where we use the LAO as it states that it is the Department's responsibility in 91.4 for the utilization of bilingual employees.

Asja: I think we have a really good list to start with. I am going to move to Agenda item #5. So right now, we have on the books March 12th and March 26th, but we do have a request from members of this meeting to maybe look at daytime meeting availability. We'll go back to looking to see what time during the day might be a little bit more convenient and we'll do a poll. So, expect an e-mail from either myself or from Emily so that we can get that on the books. We are taking notes for the things require some more substantive responses to this group. We'll have that, but our hope is to continue the discussion again using the version that was proposed to Commission as the basis of the discussion and I really want to thank you guys for taking time out to be available for this discussion. I think it's important to have. I want to thank you all for coming. I'll see if there's any last question from Teams. Is there anyone on Teams that has a question before we adjourn?

Anisha: I also wanted to thank the Department for hosting this space and being willing to really unpack our concerns and where we're coming from. I also wanted to mention that the Language Access Network has monthly meetings where we discuss language access issues, share updates and resources. We also invite departments to come and present on their language access efforts, and so we would really like to invite you, Asja and Officer Prasadi to these meetings to meet with us, to share more about your work. Our next meeting is next Wednesday from 3:00 to 4:30 PM. I will follow up with an e-mail invite with more details. But essentially, we want to be able to work with the Department beyond this DGO policy to strengthen collaboration and communication, to ensure that language services are working effectively and we do this with a number of departments. Ana can tell you. And the idea of a recurring space to bring concerns up, resolve issues, get resources, ask questions like that would be really meaningful to us. I hope that even beyond these meetings, we can still find ways to stay in touch.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 7:02 PM