

**5.20 Community Meetings per Resolution 26-13**

**San Francisco Police Department**



**Meeting Transcript**

Time	1700-1900
Date	3/12/26
Venue	Teams Online

Attendees	<i>Attendance:</i> Manager Asja Steeves (PDD), Officer Dan McLaughlin (PDD), Emily Queliza (PDD), Gabrielle Cota (PDD), Officer Lorena Prasadi (LEP), Sergeant Stacy Youngblood (Police Commission), Jamal Anderson (DPA), Sharon Woo (DPA), Anisha Hingorani (LANSF), Janice Li (CAA), Ana de Carolis (OCEIA), Ratha Chuon (Southeast Asian Development Center), Jose Ng (CAA), Gaby Castellanos (Carecen)
-----------	---

**Topics:**

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

Asja: I am going to formally call this meeting to order. It is 3:03 PM and this is the DGO 5.20 Language Access Community Meeting and this is again for the resolution from the Commission for the department to meet with the Language Access Network San Francisco and Community to discuss their concerns, as well as consider elements from the public review that was posted in February [2025] as one of the development phases that's required by SFPD DGO 3.01. So, we can just reintroduce ourselves. I know most of us were here for the first one, but I'm just going to go around and hopefully everyone can just say who they are. My name is Asja Steves. I am the manager of the Policy Development Division with SFPD, and my division is where policies are developed before they go to the Police Commission for approval.

And Emily, if you could go next.

Emily: Hi everybody. Emily Queliza- I lead the working group meetings with my team here, including Asja.

Dan: All right. I'm Officer Dan McLaughlin, police officer at the San Francisco Police Department, but also a policy writer in the policy group.

Jamal: Hi, I am Jamal Anderson. I am the new Policy Director here at DPA. This is my 4th day, so I look forward to working with all of you.

Lorena: Sorry I can't get my camera on, but I am the Language Access Liaison for the San Francisco Police Department.

Ana: My name is Ana de Carolis, and I am the language access and policy manager for the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs.

Janice: Yeah. Hey everyone. My name is Janice Li. I'm the coalition director of the Coalition for Community Safety and Justice.

Anisha: Hi everybody. My name is Anisha. I'm with Chinese for Affirmative Action and I'm a member of the Language Access Network of San Francisco. And I served as a working group member for DGO 5.20.

Gabby: Hi, this is Gabby. I work with the Central American Resource Center. I am the Latino health and advocacy. And this is my first meeting here. I'm excited to talk with everybody.

Ratha: Hi there everyone. I'm Ratha. I'm with the Southeastern Development Center, director of programs, and we're also part of the Language Access Network San Francisco. This is also my first meeting here. Thank you.

Stacy: Good afternoon. My name is Sergeant Stacy Youngblood, and I am the Police Commission secretary.

Asja: Thank you everyone. I really appreciate you for making the time to attend the meeting. I will move on to agenda item number 2 and that's just to review the community feedback from the February 26th meeting. So, we did meet on February 26 at City Hall from 5:00 to 7:00. I want to thank everyone that came in person and everyone that was able to jump online. That was really the first meeting to get oriented and develop the scope of this. So this is not just a repeat, it's not a Working Group meeting. We're not continuing the 5.20 working group, but we did extend this invitation to members of the working group so they can kind of continue this discussion. So we are here because there were some concerns expressed by Language Access Network and I think the stated goal was to reinstate a version of the policy [in its entirety] that was posted as part of the development process. Here for SFPD, that's not an option. It's actually not on the table, but we did really want to hear from the community members and those that joined us during that meeting where their concerns were with the department proposal, right, because the concerns were expressed that the dept. proposal was the issue. It was going to create issues in the LEP communities and immigrant communities and of course, that's a concern of the department's. So we wanted to hear what those concerns were with that draft proposal. There were a few revisions that came up, so I just do want to go over some of the things that were discussed. They're were about 17 recommendations or concerns that we were able to capture[at the last meeting]. We had a scribe in the meeting writing down those concerns, but there were three major themes, right. The themes were the training. How to identify LEP individuals and also some of the definitions. So some of the easy things that we were able to fix in the draft were- recently, Vietnamese was added as one of the required languages. We received a notification from OCEIA, I believe OCEIA. You can correct me if I'm wrong, but that goes into effect in June. So we can get ahead and just add that as one of the languages. But we do believe that the definition captures it even if OCEIA does determine that additional languages are added, that's still here in the required. We added Vietnamese because of that new requirement. So we were able to make that change. These were easy coming out of the discussions that we had on February 26th. Another concern that came up was the definition of LEP individual. I know that there was discussion about taking it directly from the LAO [Language Access Ordinance]. We didn't take it directly from LAO, but it does have the same meaning. And so our constraints are we have a DGO and just for those of you that are new a DGO is a department general order- this is our most authoritative written directive. This is the policy that goes to the Commission for approval and then does go to impacted labor unions for bargaining. They [commission and unions] also can change language in the policy and it's a general order because it's general in nature, it is a document that applies to all of the members of the department

and really deals with field operations. And it's general nature to create uniformity so that you can expect almost the same level of service from any member of the department. OK, so that's what we're talking about - a general order. It is a policy. So we have over 120 of them in our in our catalog of DGOs, which means our officers need to have quick recall on 120 general orders when they're in the field. One of the general orders is called DGO 3.02, and that's our terms and definitions, and that's where all of the terms and definitions that are used regularly live. That's the controlling document. This definition is as stated here in 3.02. So we can't conflict with 3.02. We're using 3.02 as the definition for LEP. So that puts us in a kind of a crossroads on with this one. Because we can't conflict with 3.02, which is a completely different policy, and this still does align with the general definition of it [LEP]. We can keep it here or we could just remove it all together if it's causing confusion, I don't think that would help to remove it, but that's where our limitations are with revising this particular definition. So I just wanted to give everybody the heads up on why that one isn't changing. But those were kind of the main themes that we heard. Again 1) definitions 2.)how to define LEP and then also 3.)the strengthening of the training section. And I'll stop talking now. But I was wondering if that does capture the themes for those of you that attended the meeting on February 26th? Am I leaving something out in terms of the themes of the concerns that were brought up on the 26th. Yes, go ahead Ana.

Ana: Yes, thank you so much and thanks for this presentation. I don't want to take too much space, I just wanted to come back to the conversation the previous time. I believe we discussed the piece around identifying LEP limited English proficiency. You did mention that, so that was another piece that came up and we also talked about the restrictions to the use of family members, children, neighbors and bystanders as interpreters. So I just wanted to bring that back, yeah.

Asja: Oh, thank you. And so where have you on agenda for the next item is a discussion between OCEIA, LANSF and SFPD. Because we have some very specific questions about that OCEIA guidance and that is specifically what we'd like to tackle for the next agenda item.

Janice: I just want to make sure I wasn't missing anything. Were there any notes or summaries of the first meeting that was sent out before this meeting? OK.

Asja: No, there were not, no. We had the large pieces of paper that were in there. So we were going off of the what the scribe took in on the notes during the meeting. Is there an interest in us sharing that with the group after the meeting?

Janice: I think it'd be helpful to see how you're identifying the 17 different areas and also mostly because I can't remember some of the comments that I made and others made and in what order. So I don't know if the thing that you're showing right now.

Asja: OK

Janice: Encompasses other issues we brought up, or if we're going to go like one by one, I just. It was hard to follow.

Asja: Yeah. I just wanted to give you an overview of what was captured. So the overview is there were about 17[concerns captured]. There were duplicates, right? There was, you know, multiple people saying the concern is the definition, so we would take that as one. We put that all into one concern, right. But because it came up multiple times, it was part of the themes that we put together. So what we heard multiple times was the definitions was a concern. The "how to identify" and the training situation. So we think we have as a later agenda item, but we believe that there is a solution for the training and I know that we talked about LANSF interest in and also CAA and the other attendees interested in participating in putting together the training with us and so we're hoping that you're still interested in partnering with us to put that together so we've put that on the agenda to discuss.

Sharon: Yeah. So as it relates to the training, I think also part of that too was ensuring that whatever was taken out of the working group, that was part of the accountability piece. They're also accountable in the training, right. So I know that when I talked, we talked about it before. Lots of the texture was taken out of, for example the DB DGO and put into a manual. Members are accountable to the manual, and if there's something similar to that for 5.20, another document that shows accountability. Then I think that that is a decent compromise of a lot of the texture that was taken out of this DGO. So I guess my comment is, if we're talking about training, I think there needs to be accountability with that training as well.

Asja: So my question with that, just as a follow up, if training is required by the DGO, that's the accountability piece and then we put together that training that is in itself the accountability or are you asking for it, I guess I'm not clear what that means, because the DGO itself is the requirement and as you know right, officers can be disciplined for not complying with the policy. That's the accountability piece. I guess I want to make sure I understand you clearly. What do you mean by that?

Sharon: So I'm talking about the various -I guess elements or questions that are asked to define how a person is determined to be LEP. So in the working group they had a number of different methods upon which a person can be identified as LEP and the requirements that each member needs to establish to ensure that an LEP individual gets the proper assistance.

Asja: So we're going to talk about the training item later. It's later on the agenda, so we can either totally get into it at that point.

Sharon: OK. So that is my question- I want to make sure that training is also accountable and it's consistent, right? And whether it's a manual or something or else the other thing too, in the definitions, I understand that it's the LEP definition is from 3.02 or 3.01.... So the one area that I thought was important, that should go in somewhere whether it's in definitions or not is not just that it's a person whose preferred language is not English, but the ability to effectively communicate in that language. So that needs to be somewhere in there. If it can't be in the definition itself.

Asja: Understood. Yeah and I think again when we get to that agenda item, I think that this will my hope is it'll alleviate a lot of the kind of concern that we have, the way we've tracked it out for you. And again, if people on this meeting want to participate, that makes it even more effective for us.

Anisha: I will also just add that I recall a conversation from our first meeting that under external requests for translation, the language went from shall to should, and I understand that the shall is required under the Language Access ordinance. I wanted to make sure that was not lost in the discussion.

Asja: OK, so external request required Language, vital written materials and applicable digital content should be available to the public directly or will be made available by request. You're saying that needs to be a shall per the LAO?

Anisha: And the non-required language request as well.

Asja: Non required language. Any employee receiving a request for vital written information not in required language will provide acknowledgement, send request, make an effort.

Anisha: Yeah, yes. Will is the same thing as shall?

Asja: I believe in 3.02 we have it defined as the same as shall.

Anisha: OK

Asja: So again, our terms and definitions is what goes across all of them, but I understand your request in terms of the external requests is what you're saying is the shall. Lorena, I have a question for you since you're on. With a vital written materials. These are typically already- my understanding is that they're already translated in those core languages.

Lorena: yes, they are translated in the five core languages, and then we're working on Vietnamese currently.

Asja: And then also, if they're not already translated. How long does it take to turn them around to make them available per request?

Lorena: At least 2 weeks.

Asja: Thank you.

Ana: So I believe in this one, the language in the previous draft. Highlighted the department responsibility to provide the vital materials, so something along the lines of the department or the department shall make available, I think because here is like should be available. It's just a little bit like, abstract, like I think it's usually much more understandable, where you know there is like a subject to the sentence. So "the department shall make available to the public vital reading materials". That would be my recommendation. And then when it comes to the required language- that's the piece where departments are required to make available those materials into the required languages. The piece around the by request piece applies to the non-required languages, right? So I just wanted to flag that so that there can be a bit more alignment with the LAO language there.

Asja: OK. I appreciate that clarification. So non-required language is by request. And required language is a "shall make available".

Ana: That's right.

Asja: Thank you. All right, let's move forward. OK. If we can move to item number three, this is the discussion where we really want to focus on OCEIA, LANSF, and the department to get some clarity on several pieces. That's what's actually required by the resolution and that's why we're here. So again, I just want to make sure that we have time and space for just OCEIA, LANSF and SFPD reps to have a discussion. So I do want to kind of call the elephant out in the room, right? So we're here because these claims were made. And they're concerning claims, but we want to make sure that we understand these claims so that we can be thoughtful with any revisions that need to be made. And there are things also from OCEIA, had some feedback that we really want to understand as well. So with these claims, is that the draft proposal that we put forward is going to harm communities and doesn't allow the department to provide language access and so I really want to understand so that I can make the case internally, because obviously I'm not the final decision maker before it gets sent back to Commission. But our team really needs to understand where the harm lives in this proposal, so that we can address it, because that was the level that we were at with these claims. So at that level, can LANSF and OCEIA or CAA tell us where it lives here[in department proposal], so we can really help make these changes.

Anisha: Yes, thank you for opening it up for us to share our analysis of the proposed draft. Can I ask? What would be helpful? Is it to go line by line through the proposed draft?

Asja: No, not line by line. I believe we're not going to go line by line. I think there were claims made - that there's an understanding that LANSF has an understanding that the proposal itself causes harm. So if you can just tell us where it is, then we can go to it. But line by line isn't on the table.

Anisha: OK. Because I mean, obviously the letter that we sent in December clearly explains where we think the harm lives so would it be worth pulling up that letter on the screen for us to go through it?

Asja: You know what - actually, I'm wondering if the meeting that we had on the 26th has alleviated any of that concern, and maybe it's just a matter of moving forward instead of moving backwards.

Anisha: And I hope other folks feel free to jump in. But I think that the way that we were envisioning the outcome of these collaborative meetings with SFPD is to have a productive working document that could be shared with the Police Commission that does address many of the missing language and addresses how things were taken out and how things were streamlined. Because I think overall we felt that the level of detail that is required for officers to be aware of when interacting with immigrant communities is such that the current proposed DGO doesn't reflect that level of detail. And so I think if we're trying to summarize where the harm is, it's that in almost all elements of the proposed version, we see a stripping down of the necessary detail and guidance. That we feel like is critical for officers to be able to interact with and engage, support, and serve and respond to the needs of immigrant communities. I will also add to, and I brought this up in the first meeting, which is that there is language from the 2007 DGO, the one that's currently in effect, that addresses some of our concerns. And there's also a lot of really great detail in the Departmental Notice 21-072 around identifying LEP individuals around restrictions around exigencies that the department has already approved adopted renewed that also addresses many of the concerns that we raised in our letter.

Asja: OK. I do have a question for OCEIA, if we can tackle this, because I think we need some clarification on the non-criminal section. So, the non-criminal incident, we need some clarification, and I'm hoping to get some clarification from Ana. Our goal was to expand access by having a section that calls out non-criminal incidents that allows non-certified bilingual members to provide some sort of access to LEP individuals. So what was brought up at the last meeting was that the LAO ordinance, section 91.14, states the departments are responsible for providing that language access. So I'm really hoping we can talk about this particular section because I think we need some clarification on what that looks like. And I'm hoping to give a few examples and maybe have a conversation about how you can walk us through this. There are situations that we're imagining right where, like we talked about, giving directions, right? If there are cops that are on a foot beat that aren't certified themselves but conversationally feel comfortable speaking Mandarin...people speak Mandarin...they come and ask them for directions to a part of the city --that seems to clearly fit into this section. My concern is does that not line up with LAO?

Ana: Yeah. Thank you for that question and for opening up this conversation. So the piece here that to me was a flag that I wanted to flag as part of the recommendations, and I appreciate the space to make recommendations has to do specifically around the civilians, neighbors, family members, friends and bystanders piece. I understand in terms the example you provided involves a non certified bilingual member, right? So. That was not what I was referring to. I was referring to the other prong that we see there. I am familiar with the current DGO that is in effect that contains specific restrictions on the use of children, family members, etc. And that is aligned with best practices, right? Because and I mentioned last time around impact on children, right. Children serving as interpreters, especially in law enforcement situations. That risks one children, friends, volunteers, neighbors. It undermines the quality of interpretation and the accuracy right of witness statements. It may put victim privacy and confidentiality at risk and traumatize family members, especially children, impacting LEP households. And in domestic violence and sexual assault situations, perpetrators may attempt to control LEP victims by taking advantage of the LEP person and their children or family members. So for that reason, that restriction, that explicit restriction on the use of children, family members, neighbors, with the exception of exigent circumstances, that is present in the current DGO, seems aligned with best practices now when it comes to non-criminal and I understand that you were talking about non-

criminal incidents, right? So when it comes to non-criminal incidents, leaving the door open to having children, family members, neighbors, and friends could potentially be in my view, could be not aligned with the LAO because for example, any situation involving a city departments provision of direct services or information to the public response to crisis situation or public meetings or hearings is subject to the LAO right. So there could be non-criminal situations that involve City department service provision, which could involve vital information to the public or crisis, non-criminal crisis response, or public meetings. Perhaps the permit or perhaps someone that goes in to ask for a copy of their police report. There are a lot of non-criminal services that are provided by city departments and asking a neighbor, a family member a child to interpret those situations if there's not an exigent circumstance. That was concerning to me, as it could put the department in a position of not being aligned with the LAO in certain non-criminal contexts.

Asja: Thank you. No, that's great. So this gives me a good - let's talk about this a little bit more if we can conversationally here. So going to get your police report, right- and this happens frequently. Let's say it's someone getting a police report. It's an elderly woman who speaks Cantonese. She comes with her adult grandchild, maybe like an 18-year-old grandchild, to come with her to the counter. And she's the one that's using her adult grandchild as an interpretation service, right? This happens frequently in San Francisco. I was born and raised here. I think I've grown up with this my whole life in terms of, you know, children being first generation and doing translation or, excuse me, interpretation for their grandparents or their parents. So this happens quite frequently, so I just want to make sure we're doing this the right way. If let's say, an elderly woman comes to the counter to the CIS window to get a copy of a police report, she comes with an adult grandchild who's there willingly and their understanding is that they need to get a copy of it. We would need to then stop this interaction and get a certified bilingual member or get on our language line to have this interaction right? So that might cause a delay in in the accessibility.

Ana: Well, you can offer. I mean, I think you would offer the option to access Language Line or to get a bilingual member, right? There are policy measures you could bring, like for example someone denies it, then you can have them have a waiver like you know the person did not accept an interpreter, right? Like, there are ways that you could. Have a policy around that, but the piece around offering, because there could be a situation where someone comes in where it's unclear what they're coming to do. And it might be unclear whether or not it's a criminal or non-criminal situation. Right. Just to know what sort of situation that is having an objective third party interpreter or a member of the SFPD who interprets can help. You know, gather the right information on whether or not that might be a criminal or a non-criminal situation.

Asja: I'm just speaking about the counter because they're getting a copy of something that documents a criminal incident, right? But the exchange itself is administrative in nature, but at the same time it's very intrinsic to the department's service, right? So it falls in line. I completely understand that with LAO and the section that you cited, I think our concern is working it out in practical application. We're trying to again expand the access. So if someone comes in and it's an administrative exchange, but they're trying to get a copy of a police report that is theirs, that is about a criminal incident- so this is not a criminal incident at the counter. They come in, they start the exchange, they're starting to do the interpretation. Our employees should say, "OK, we want to offer you interpretation. We have an actual interpretation service we'd like to offer", and they're like, "no, no, no", we can just keep going or they say "yes -yes, I would like an interpretation". We would now have to take them out of the line and have them wait until we could either get a certified officer to the scene or we could get an interpreter online.

Ana: So here I would say, and I love that we're discussing protocol to this degree of like specificity but here would be like would you like an interpreter? We can provide an interpreter. This is a city service that we provide. We do provide an interpreter, right, and the person gets to choose yes or no.

Asja: It is the dilemma that we're faced with all the time with policy making as well, it sounds lovely and even you see it in legislation all the time, it makes sense on this level. But then we're trying to direct officers on how to do it. Something gets lost, right? And now we've inadvertently created a barrier that makes it harder for them to provide access. While here on paper, it sounds like we're doing the right thing and actually creates five more steps, right? And so that's what we're trying to not do. So OK, this is very, very helpful because that's where we were stuck. So same thing with- let's say there's someone asking in a different language about again another service that we provide. Are these like community meetings could be subject to this, so I understand. And so, say they're asking about a captain's meeting. We have an officer who is again conversationally comfortable speaking whatever that language is, but they themselves are not certified, and someone comes to them and has this conversation. But it's about something that SFPD does, like community meetings. We could offer to have the interpretation. They say no, and then we can continue to have that conversation in that other language without violating LAO.

Ana: Yeah, it sounds like it, but you know, it's. Yeah. And then all these like pieces, I think they're great for training, right? Like all these scenarios that you're mentioning, they're great for training because that's where you can teach folks how to do this in practice, right?

Asja: Thank you. OK, that's fantastic. That was our really kind of big concern, as we want to be able to capture or maybe potentially clarify this section to make it very clear, to line up with what you're saying, essentially, right, if we offer it. But we do want to make it clear to our Members that it's not the use of the family members, the neighbors and all of that. Again, the line in the sand is that it's not criminal. This is the rapport. This is, for example, the Chinese New Year parades where we're walking in the parade and giving, you know, cause we do community engagement, where there are still opportunities where people want to talk to an officer - there are still people out there that do like officers and want to have conversations - and we want to engage but still will comply with policy and still comply with the ordinance. So I think based on what I'm hearing you say, we can clarify this section a little bit more to make it clear of what our requirements are under 91.14.

Ana: Yeah, there's there is room for clarification and I'm happy to, you know, continue providing more guidance if that's helpful. Again, I will mention the restriction on the use of family members, neighbors, friends, volunteers, bystanders or children. That was present or that is currently present in the current DGO [2007] is aligned with best practices. And then making sure again like. Like City Services, city departments, provision of direct services or information to the public response to crisis situations, public meetings or hearings, they're all subject to the Lao, which requires departments to provide language access services.

Jose: Yeah, this is Jose. I just want to add on what Ana has shared. I think if you look at Chapter 91, the language access ordinance, you can find a section dedicated for all public meetings. So basically, when you're referring to officers that want to have public forum where they can talk to the community it's good, but for orders in the action with the public, they would have to make those notices to the public where interpretation would be provided if requested. You have to include it in your file. You have to say that, in Chinese, interpretation will be provided. Otherwise, how would the community know about it? Especially in Chinatown, let's say if you are going to host a forum to talk to the community. If you only provide the English, the community would now have no understanding. So I think those are the requirements that we have for all departments across the board, not necessarily just for SFPD, so recommending using some of those languages still related in 91, I think that would make you more in alignment with what Ana has shared early on. You have to include that in your

languages, assuming that the public might not understand what you're talking about here in languages that are required by the City. I think that's something I want to add on here.

Asja: OK and so you think that should also go into the DGO itself as well?

Jose: I don't know. I'm not a cop, but I think if you have some public facing meeting component of your work, you should definitely include that here. Because I definitely know that your type of work and line work is different from other departments. But when you have that component of your daily work routine, let's say a community forum, I know you want to go to the community and talk to the community. You should definitely include that languages are required if you that have that component and train your officer.

Asja: Lorena, I just wanted to tap you in for the Captains meetings like the community meetings that are held at the stations. Do they notice on their agendas or anywhere on their public facing documents that invite community? Do they notice that people can request interpretation?

Lorena: I've had this at Tenderloin which has actually reached out to me for ASL interpreters, so they do make requests when they need them.

Asja: OK. Do you know if it's already on their documents or their signage?

Lorena: I'll have to check.

Asja: OK. I think Jose, you bring up a good point because if while I know that that's a requirement, the Commission Office knows that that's a requirement and I think that people that do the high level public meetings and certainly on our Working Group Agendas, we put that on that you can request that certainly, but if there's a new Captain that just took over a district station and they are overwhelmed with everything that they have to take over, they might not know that that is a requirement for their community meetings, right? OK. That's helpful. I do have a question again for both. For all of you there and OCEIA in terms of the crisis situations that are in the LAO, there has to be some sort of coordination between the public safety agencies to do the messaging; do we coordinate with OCEIA to get that messaging out? Or are we expected already being fire, police, sheriff or all these public safety agencies, are we required to have that signage as an anticipatory signage or how does that work? With the crisis situations, if you can educate us a little bit on that.

Ana: Yes. Thank you. So if you have signage around emergency situations that you have ready to deploy, if those whenever those situations come up, those would be vital. That would be vital information of public interest. So we do encourage that you have them translated into the required languages in advance so it's ready to go with no delays at a time of emergency. And yes, you're more than encouraged to coordinate with other first responder departments around that messaging, of course. OCEIA provides technical assistance and support based on our capacity. We do have a small team of language specialists in Chinese, Spanish and Filipino. At this time, we're more than happy to support based on capacity. But again, it's the Department's responsibility to provide language access services.

Asja: OK. So my understanding is that in the crisis situations that are rather large situations. It's like evacuation services, maybe an active shooter or, disaster related activities, things like that. And Lorena, if you could chime in as well? Say we know that there's an evacuation in one particular neighborhood? Right. There's a large fire or a gas leak or something. We would go to OCEIA to get that signage or no, we would go through our own translation services to get that signage turned around quickly, correct?

Ana: You don't have to come through us. It is the Department's responsibility to provide language access services, and there are a number of, as you mentioned, in addition to your bilingual staff, Citywide vendor contracts that you can utilize.

Lorena: Sorry, I was just saying that I have a list and I can share that with you as well so you have it.

Ana: Yes, you don't need to come through us. We don't want to delay the process, obviously.

Asja: OK. I think that those were the primary questions that we had for OCEIA. Do you have additional? I think for what I'm getting from this conversation, we'll move on to training at some point so that we can get more clarification from you in terms of that. But with policy, it looks like we clarify this item, the non-criminal incident just to be a little bit clearer to align with the LAO and then also clarify the external, the required language versus non-required language requests. We'll clarify that language to align closer with the LAO and then also take a look at the ways in which to use family members, bystanders, and children to clarify that in the policy. OK. Is there any other concern before we start talking about training that OCEIA finds with this proposal?

Ana: Yes. Thanks again for the opportunity to chime in. And just also for context, part of our role is to provide best practices in addition to guidance for LAO compliance, so around the best practices, I will concur with the other members of the Working Group and the conversation that I would suggest to consider reincorporating, the section on procedures for identifying a LEP individual. That's particularly important for law enforcement situations, and Department Bulletin 18-185 describes the factors that may hinder effective communication with an LEP individual. Some of those were mentioned last time, for example, I'm unfamiliar with stressful situations, which can affect language capabilities. Also, deference and willingness to comply may prevent someone from requesting language assistance. So those procedures for identifying an LEP individual, those common indicators appearing in a 18-185 seem particularly important. I just wanted to highlight that piece as well.

Asja: That segways us back into that discussion. So, in the previous discussion and also with the discussion as it relates to the previous version or the version that went to Public Comment Review, I think we just need a little discussion of where and how this version is very different than the other version. They actually read very similarly in terms of saying that we don't have every indicator but the DN itself is more of what you should consider. And this is also saying here are potential indicators of LEP individuals: misuse of language, switching between languages, inability to answer questions, sufficiently confusion with intricate enforcement procedures or language, cannot respond to open-ended questions, etcetera, which is what we got from the DN itself, which was 18-185 and then 21-072. So both versions relied on the idea that these are the indicators. How are the procedures more helpful or by your indication more critical in terms of aligning with identifying and this is also for Language Access Network because I think it ties back into the original request. We'd still like to hear from Anisha, or Ana or Jose.

Anisha: Yes, I think what was brought up in the first meeting is that you can't identify a primary language before you identify the person itself. And there are specific factors and indicators that are not listed here that relate to the person themselves that needs to be back in the procedures so that officers know that it goes from identifying the person as an LEP person and then going into identifying the language.

Asja: I see. So then this combines the identifying the language and identifying the person, and you want it separated out.

Anisha: And there is important context that was included in the identifying LEP individual that was reflected in the Working Group version, that was reflected in the 2007 DGO, that was reflected in DPA's memo on identifying LEP individuals that they developed during the Working Group process

and provided a lot of really good justification for why these two things need to be separated. That is what we want to see be restored in this version.

Asja: OK. Again, if you can just tell me please where and how this stops that for a cop or an officer from doing what is required? I feel maybe this is your world like this is something you understand intrinsically. I'm asking so that you explain it to me so that I completely understand it so that I can advocate for this to leadership, because I'm having a hard time understanding. So if you can just tell me exactly how this proposal right here and walk me through it so that I understand and, I apologize that I'm not getting this and I want to understand this. I think officers understand this and the officers that have read this understand this, but I don't want to again inadvertently create a scenario where we are getting in the way because the 2007 version actually has less guidance than this proposal does. So the active version has less guidance and we took what was put in the Public Comment and just put it into the potential indicators and putting it into almost like paragraph form instead of bullet points.

Anisha: Could we share or display the Departmental Notice or the 2007 version so we can see what we're recommending be restored? Then I would love to have a conversation to better understand why things were taken out and stripped so that it looks the way it looks right now in the proposed version.

Asja: Were you able to go through the document that was posted online? That describes all of those reasons.

Anisha: Yes. If you want to, I think it would be really helpful to go through that so we also understand because I feel like we've explained it and we've tried to explain the gap that we see and why it's important. But it sounds like you're not convinced and that's OK. I don't know how many more ways we can say it because I think we've explained it both verbally and in written format and I think the Department has also recognized the importance of having a separate section for identifying LEP individuals. Like I said in previous, the current version of the DGO, the Department Notice and also the DPA memo.

Asja: You're saying you want the DN. We want to look at the DN which is expired now? You want to see that?

Anisha: Because the reason why I bring up the DN because I understand that one of the concerns that the Policy Division had is that what was recommended in the Working Group process is not necessarily operational, but I believe the Department Notice is operational. I think it's obvious that the 2007 version is operational and so I'm trying to make sure it's as easy as possible to use and bring in language that has already gone through the necessary steps to become official written directive, which is what I understand is the Department's goal is to try to make this operational, to try to make sure that every single thing has been vetted and those documents have already been vetted, which is why we're bringing those into the conversation.

Asja: Right. So we took the DN and maybe the conversation is about the training and where we put it in the training. The issue is that in these conversations of where the concerns are, there's been discussion of a Language Access Plan versus a language access policy and so our goal is to make a General Order so that it's something that is effective in the field. If it was a larger document or a strategic plan, I could see why we would get expansive language. If it was a training document, I could understand the expansive language. I can't tell you that the Department has agreed to anything other than the proposal that's in front of you. The Department has agreed on the importance of ensuring that language access is provided. So that's what we're trying to do and in order for me to advocate to leadership in terms of larger substantive change, the policy team does need to understand where those gaps are, and so we have put all of the responses that we have in that document, that explains why changes were made after the Working Group. If you had specific questions, I can certainly try to address those questions at the next meeting. If you wanted to send me

an “I don't understand R8 or R12 or R15,” that's something we can definitely expand on, but the only thing that I can say that has been vetted is this document. I want to be able to understand where in a General Order how it fits in, and it's not that I'm disagreeing, it's just that there is a reason we're here and it is because there was this claim that this document here will harm the communities we serve, and that is absolutely something we do not want. And that's something that you don't want and that's something the Commission doesn't want and that's something leadership doesn't want, so we do agree on that.

In terms of this item though, we can skip to the training proposal because I think everyone is in agreement that training is required, that training needs to be strengthened and that a lot of these can live in training (updates, best practices considerations). That's where that can live, training, best practices, considerations, tips; that's training, but the DGOs are really for here's what you're required to do when you're in the field, right? So that's why different written directives were used. My hope is that maybe we can land somewhere in the middle where we take all of this really good important information in terms of indicators, best practices, things to look for and it can go into a training video that Anisha participates in and Ana participates in and we get community members to participate in. We can ensure that the message is modeled. Yes, Ana.

Ana: Thank you so much. I love that idea of training. We're happy to support. Now, I don't want to speak for anyone. I don't want to speak for community. I just want to see if this can help the process so there's something around the language in the most current one in that most current version where it says, I'm trying to find it. Sorry, I have so many tabs open, identify primary language areas when an employee believes language access services are needed or as requested, employees will determine the individuals primary language. I think there's something there when an employee believes language access services are needed that perhaps may not be providing sufficient guidance for officers in the field, I wonder. Whereas in the Department Bulletin 18-185, here it says the DGO 5.20 requires members to provide free language assistance to LEP individuals they encounter or when an LEP question requests language assistance, so it requires members to provide free language assistance to LEP individuals they encounter and here are the common indicators. Language assistance is required, so I think that provides such a level of clarity with examples that I believe can be quite helpful for communities. Obviously, we already talked about the factors that may hinder effective communication last time and also for officers, so I think that's where I see an area, perhaps for improvement or for collaborative work. But thanks again for the opportunity to chime in.

Asja: Now I believe this already says it, it's just somewhere else and so it's in a different place. Alright, give me one moment. So just to clarify, here in this section for procedures identify primary language, you think there's an opportunity to make it more clear that just overall “Employees shall inform LEP individuals of their right to request free language access services and will provide these services when requested or as needed”? We have that in the DGO; it's there. Is it that you believe that it would make more sense if it was under the identify primary language section?

Ana: I cannot tell you exactly how to move things around, I can just share with you best practices and to share with you for your consideration some best practices.

Asja: Yes. I think that's where we want to focus on where the best practices live. I think that is important as a complement to the policy and so while policy is “this is what you do when you're in the field, this is how you address it when you're in an encounter, this is what you're required to do,” the complementary tools are where we can really add a lot of that context, or as we said in the last meeting, as Sharon said, the texture, we can put that in there and ensure, and especially if we have control over those training documents, that is something that officers are required to do that gives them more of an expansive options in terms of what to do when they encounter, while policy is this is what you've got to do. I think that's where we can win here is we can find that that middle ground.

Because the current standard is the 2007 version which still allows officers to make that determination. And we're not having, we're not seeing large scale issues with language access being provided, so, if we don't mind, can we move to the training just so we can get...I'm sorry. I see Jose's hand up who is with CAA, so this is still on agenda for this particular item.

Jose: Thank you for recognizing me. I'm trying to think through, not from a policy person, not from an advocate, but from a community member specifically whose first language is not English, because I know it's already a fear to talk to your police, to report a crime, so I feel the pressure is higher. The priority it's the police person. When I look at the policy, especially considering the priority, which way of intervention services that you should go for, I think when I go, when I look at 2007 version, that's the order of preference there is so much more clear even from a layman perspective. As someone who doesn't know who and doesn't act with limited English, proficient immigrant community member that often, I think this is very clear policy. The 1st order is to provide qualified bilingual Person who can provide that all if you have a bilingual Chinese cop, definitely. That's the best way. And then the second best would be providing a qualified interpreter. I think these are good practices. I think we would want to keep it. That's why I don't think we want to see it being reduced or being removed from here. That's why I think what we are trying to achieve it's for your operational purposes. You want the cop to have more direction. First of all, as you go for this and then second and then third and then 4th. That's why when we see this being moved, I think that was not right to us. What's the purpose of doing it, especially right now, we want more guidance? We want the community to feel safe in our reaching out to cops, to policemen. That's why, I think the sense from us is here we want guidance and why we are seeing that guidance from 2007 are being removed, which is interesting to us. So I just want to point out there, that's one portion, the order of preference, it's always bilingual and then interpreter.

Asja: Understood.

Gaby: Yes, my name is Gaby. I'm with the Central American Resource Center. We are also part of LANSF. I just wanted to go back to Anisha's request of seeing the prior DGO side by side and I think conversationally it would really help us to see, this is the language that was changed and this is why. Then that that way, we can come back and say, this is why it can't be changed and if that needs to be a different agenda item, I think that would be fine, but I think if we went through that and saw both the thought processes on your side and then we matched it with, this is why we don't believe that should be changed, I think that would be incredibly helpful for both sides.

Asja: I appreciate that. We did, the Department, put together a document and it's been posted online publicly since I believe December. That goes through all of the Working Group recommendations and what it was all the way through Public Review, and then why it was changed after Public Review. It has all of the reasons, so we've had this posted since December.

Gaby: I would like to see it conversationally though.

Asja: We'll send a link to everybody after the meeting, so you have it.

Gaby: Conversationally, I think it would be a little bit more helpful than a written notice. Personally, I can't speak for the rest of us, but I think that having a conversation and us sitting down as both the community members and the advocates and the people that have to put these procedures to use, I think having it be a conversational discussion.

Asja: Yes, I think for the interest of time, it's hard for me to go, we've had this up and we've told you about it and we've referenced it and we've put it in letters and if you're not going to read it, do we go through, 67 line items together? I think if we could get to a point where maybe for the next meeting we send you that information and if there are items, like maybe it's only 10 of them that are concerns and

then we can talk about those 10 versus the 67. That sounds like something that we can do, but I think going over it conversationally, line by line, is challenging, again because decisions have been made. Review process has been done. It has been operationalized by members that have to use the policy that are impacted by the policy themselves, leadership and the City Attorney. I'll definitely send it to you and if there are some that really, really don't make sense, I think that would rise the level of discussion in terms of the next meeting. Does that sound agreeable? I just think right now going over it, I'm not sure how helpful that would be.

Gaby: Yes, that sounds good. I know where to find them. I think you know I'd be open to it even being an agenda item if it is a timely discussion, maybe we do need to dwindle it down, maybe not line by line, but I do think that having the conversation itself would be helpful whether that's in agenda item the next time, that's fine with me. That's just how I'm seeing things.

Asja: I appreciate that. Thank you. So for purposes of this item, I'd like to close it out and then just move to the SFPD language access training. So again, I think if you just get your eyes on what we do and what we've done in other Working Groups, we did this with the deaf and hard of hearing where there are just things that operationally don't make much sense to go into a General Order but are critical in terms of best practices or something, that officers should know our options so that they can have it in their tool belt when they're out in the field. Or maybe it's not required to do, but it makes sense to do or some sense to know. We're going to go to item number four, the language access training proposal, I'm just going to show you. Just kind of an example of what comes out of the deaf and hard of hearing working group. There were pages in the DGO, the current DGO for deaf and hard of hearing, that were about best practices and common indicators but again, these are pages of documents for officers. For the tool that we're talking about, a DGO is just, the shalls, the wills, the what you need to do when you're out in the field so that they can recall quickly. And then there's these extra tools. We came up together with is creating this visor card for officers to have in the field, this is double sided, and then the members themselves really came up with what looked best for them and what made the most sense for them, what was easiest for them to understand and on the backside of this card is the language access tool. We know that officers encounter community members every single day that are LEP individuals; this happens on a daily basis. But coming into contact with a deaf and hard of hearing individual, maybe only happens twice or three times in their career, right? If we put something that is perishable, like deaf and hard of hearing in terms of what they deal with, something that isn't perishable, like dealing with LEP individuals on a daily basis, this increases their likelihood of knowing exactly what the tool is and when to use it, if they encounter a deaf and hurt of hearing person. So that alleviated a need in terms of now it's a tool, it's part of training. But it's not an extra additional page that officers might not even look at. If it's a policy that just has a page of best practices from our end users point of view, it's less likely to be read here in the policy because it's not a shall and it's not a what you need to do right now, its a best practice. Then it goes into a tool. So that's our job on the policy team is to determine where these things go. OK, I think that's where we're not seeing eye to eye and that's my function here is to make sure that the end user has the right written directive and then has the right document or right tool that goes with it. We all share the same desire to make sure that it's the best that officers have the best information so that they can provide services to the communities they serve, it's just the how do we get there? This is what we are proposing. If everyone can see the screen, what we'd like to do is work with this community group to create a training plan. Now the problem that we've run into is that if training is overly prescriptive in policy, it doesn't allow us to be innovative with training with actual training implementation. So if we say in the policy, there needs to be training and it needs to be periodic and it needs to cover these topics, that allows us to figure out the best medium. Is it a video? Is it in person? Is it a training tool like the visor card? That's where the innovation comes in and that's what's critical. So this is what we are needing your feedback on. This is where we think how to identify LEP individuals the "How" would

go and that's where like the common indicators and we can have if it's a video. We have examples that play out so that officers can see what it looks like when someone has trouble communicating in English effectively or when someone has trouble maybe when they code switch or, whatever those best practices are we can put several examples of what that looks like in the field in #1 or #2; that's when we can put in the communication with interpretation services. This is where we could put where Ana's concern is with a non-criminal incidents. We offer the interpretation services 1st but if it is declined, then we can talk to the adult granddaughter of the Mandarin woman who comes in to get a police report, or this is where we make it clear how to call or use the app or when someone comes into a station, how to use the interpretation services of a certified bilingual member. Then we have the vital documents and translation requests. We talk about what vital documents are for SFPD. Then we would go into an example of a non-criminal consensual encounter and then it could be just a community engagement situation. Then we could go into an example of a traffic stop interaction with an LEP individual and what that looks like, then the criminal victim witness interaction. We could do an example of that on a video. This came up in the last meeting, the concern about domestic violence incidents and using children as an interpretation as a tool for a victims, we need to show that that's not what we want to do here and so that could be an explicit example or the use of victim advocates, we could put that here. How to file a police report, how to handle it if you were PSA or if you're an officer at the at the desk of a station, how to take a police report from someone who is an LEP individual and then this one is open. This is open for discussion. So this is where we think a lot of where that concern of "where does this live" would be. I think not only is it beneficial to live in training, but then if you give officers real life examples that they can pull from in video format, it makes it easier for them to implement and understand out in the field.

Anisha: Yes. Thank you so much. I just had a point of clarification for this section on the agenda. So this is where DPA and others who are not OCEIA and LANSF and CAA are allowed to comment?

Asja: Wide open. Yes, wide open.

Anisha: OK. I really like what I see here. I really like the topics that have been identified. I think we, as LANSF, get excited when we see that there are ways to contextualize the language access ordinance and also national and state law, in protecting limited English proficient individuals. So I think this is really great and I wanted to thank you for putting it together. We are totally down to be a part of developing this and engaging with officers on specific scenarios. I wanted to go back to the initial premise behind this agenda item, which is that there are things that are not and haven't reached the threshold of being directive enough to include in the DGO and that it has other places it can go like a training manual or a training video. I wanted to ask you for that distinction and that definition of what that threshold is, because I just want to make sure that if there is an objective lens and analysis on what is considered not necessary for a DGO, that would be really good for everyone who is participating in this discussion to know. And if there isn't, that should be really clear and important to state up front, because then it just feels like the determination of a set of individuals versus, that this doesn't belong in the DGO like that determination feels not objective and feels discretionary. So I wanted to understand that because limited English proficient individuals are a protected class, as you know, under our federal civil rights laws, under California State anti-discrimination laws, and under the ordinance, of course. That requires a high level of scrutiny on how public servants, public staff, officers, are meant to engage with this protected class, not to mention the particular vulnerabilities that immigrant communities face when trying to access public services, which I think you know, and you are also very clear on. That's why we're all at this table and then I also wanted to mention that these things that are being called not necessary to a DGO, I think we take issue with because I feel like these are really important to a DGO. They were in a previous DGO, there is additional guidance provided in other DGOs. We're only looking at this DGO because our expertise in language access. But I know from conversations that I've had that details and factors and indicators are in other DGOs

because the subject matter is such that it requires a really high level of care for vulnerable populations. So I just wanted to state that at the outset that I don't think we're finished with the conversation that there needs to be common sense, necessary, detailed, clear, concise guidance in the DGO which I think we can all agree with, and to see these tools like a training video that has these modules that incorporates community feedback and has us coming in to help advise are all really, really great things and I want to make sure that we don't lose sight of the first part and close the door on the first part while talking about this part.

Asja: So I heard you say a lot of things. So I just want to make sure that I am responsive in the right way. The question that I would like to be responsive to is what is the criteria for determining what goes into a DGO? Is that correct? So and then again bringing up what are catalog of DGOs looks like, right? So. For several years, our general orders became more and more and more specific, which got them further away from their purpose and the definition of what a general order is in the 1st place - and that was happening largely in part because there wasn't policy being created under one umbrella. Policy was being created all over the department with no clear guidance and no consistent standardization. So and interest groups were coming in and heavily writing policy for sworn members. So while I think it did its purpose in making communities feel like they were are certain community groups and certain interest groups feel connected to policy creation, what it did is it just created policies that were more and more and more specific that while they do still exist, are not general orders anymore. They've turned into specific orders, which is a different document. A general order is a real thing that has a real definition in military and paramilitary organizations. So with the policy development division, we've been given direction by our chain of command in the agency that we work for to try to get closer to what a general order is and what a general order isn't. Again, general in nature, it's supposed to have. It is foundational. It's so that every officer coming in understands exactly what they are required to do. That is so that it can. That policies can be efficient, right? And the implementation can be as consistent across the board as possible, and it's also so that officers, because of the industry that they are in and the work that they are that they do can recall what they're required to do quickly and efficiently with low levels of inconsistency. But what has been happening over the years is that they've been getting more and more specific, which has, I think, inadvertently created conditions where mistakes happen and services are inconsistent and they've turned into a completely different directive. So again, the orders that we are under is taking - Now listen- we can't slash and burn everything. We can't make everything a three page four page document. That's not possible. We have policies that are, you know, 12 pages, 14 pages. We it's our job under the under PDD to take that information and make sure that it's written for the end user, and in this case the end user they are officers, but we can't get rid of all of the information that has worked in the past, so there is a level of this phase that is discretionary in terms of, OK, we know that we need to keep the foundational, the shalls, that isn't discretionary that needs to be in the general order. If does it apply to all the Members that needs to be in a general order? Is this a procedure that is required that goes into? Are there examples that are helpful that could go into a general order. But what we're under is this. The documents that you've seen that came out between I think really 2009 through 2022 have pages of best practices. Those are not requirements. Those are not shalls, those are best practices. We don't want to let them go. We want them to live somewhere. Manuals are a document that tells you how to comply with a DGO. DGO are the foundation. The general rules that every officer needs to comply with manuals are the how you get there document. What are those specific procedures to get there? DNS are announcements of maybe law changes. There's procedure changes, there's best practices, there's guidance. All of that extra stuff can go in a DN because it's easy to change, right? It's more flexible because general orders are our longest living document. It has to apply for the longest period of time. So there are things that are discretionary and there are things that are not. But also we're dealing with a new environment and I say new because it started in 2023 where the documents are under the same umbrella so that we can deconflict policies, we can ensure that the

languages match. We can ensure that they look the same, we can ensure that they all sound the same. That didn't happen before 2023, which is why we have examples of DGO's that are 23 pages. That isn't the gold standard for a general order. Because again, that is a it's a real document with real requirements under paramilitary and military organizations. So language access, I think you've brought up before plans. That's a strategic plan. That's a living document that many agencies have. That's a strategic plan that you can go back to you can fix. You can think about. You can discuss. It can be out there as a guiding principle, but it's not a policy that's telling officers what to do in the field. So that's what we're really trying to get back to is creating documents that clearly tell people in the field what they need to do. In the newest or most junior officer knows exactly what to do without having to open their phone or, you know, look through a 22 page document. So I wish I had an easier way to describe it to you, but it it's a it has a specific purpose and our goal is to get it closer to that purpose. The balancing act is making sure that we're not cutting out things that are helpful to officers, or that if we are, it goes into a document that also lives and is accessible to officers.

Sharon, your hands been up for awhile, but now that we're in the open item. Let's hear from Sharon.

Sharon: Yeah, it didn't feel too disrespected in the other area. So where does the best practices live in Asja? Are you saying that they only live here in the training video? Because I do agree with Anisha that the separation of identifying an LEP individual and identifying. Language are or sort of two separate things and in the working group they made it 2 separate things. So where does the best practices for identifying an LEP individual live?

Asja: We're proposing that it goes into the training. That's why we're talking about the training is that I think I think that if we can show officers what that looks like and give them visual examples so they can see if it's a role-playing situation where an officer and a Community member who maybe 'cause this came. Up in the last meeting, right where? Just because someone presents to speak English. Doesn't mean they're not an LEP individual. So that is more nuanced and we believe that that's something that they need to see so that they can understand it and then implement it.

Sharon: Will the training be mandatory?

Asja: It's going to be. We'd have to put it in power DMS so that they can acknowledge watching it, yes.

Sharon: And then they would be held accountable for the training in there and the best practices used from my DPA hat.

Asja: That's a good question. I think that they'd be they'd be held accountable for taking the training, but there's no policy document that requires them to go through every single item that is shown to them in the video like it's not going to be a checklist of did they do if, let's say- We do an example of seven things that could potentially show up as how to identify. If that officer didn't do those seven things. I don't think that that is what we're holding them accountable for. It's more- Did they make an attempt to do it?

Sharon: And is that the same for the elements under the common indicators for a language barriers under the DN 21-072 would that be?

Asja: We folded some up. We folded some of those into the policy, though, so that's part of the policy.

Sharon: You mentioned that the DN can also be a training material, but it doesn't. It can't be when you're revising the DGO to then also issue a DN with some training, right?

Asja: No, I was explaining the difference between DGO and DN.

Sharon: Right. But I'm saying this you would not issue a DN associated with this DGO because we're revising this DGO, right, OK. I put my comments in the chat about the non criminal incident I kinda. I just will say that I think it's confusing what a non-criminal incident is and that it needs to be clarified and I also am concerned with just the language in general about using family friends. Et cetera, to do interpretation for an individual, especially even anything that the city offices service, the city needs to, in my opinion, provide those services. So at least request or at least give them the opportunity to have those services.

Asja: Right. I think that's where we landed in that discussion.

Ana: Yeah. Thanks. I have a question and a comment, so I'll start with a comment and it's related to a Sharon just pointed out. So just wanted to kind of really highlight that language access is for both parties like it's to enable communication, right? It's not something only something that we offer because we it's a checklist that we were like, OK, I offered right. It's to actually enable communication between both parties and it is. Past the importance and the benefit that whatever statement is gathered through a qualified interpreter is a reliable statement. So for example, in the in a situation when someone goes to the police station with someone else you mentioned for example an older child, son or daughter who is fluent in the language. But you know, and perhaps the person is like the officer would be. Would you like an interpreter? No, I have here my child and it turns out like it could have been a situation of, like, elder abuse. And there could be a situation of manipulation. So I think that's why it's so important that. That language services are provided for both parties to really assess what the situation is about, what is really going on. Who are the different parties? So I just wanted to put that on the record that if, for example, there's a situation when someone. One refuses an interpreter. Umm, I would encourage you to actually have a waiver be signed or something because in the situation that you know then that becomes a complaint or something like that. Then you know I don't. I'm not DPA so I cannot talk about that, but I'm just like thinking about like the department's responsibility for providing language services and how language access goes like. Involves both parties. So just wanted to mention that and then I just have a question, which is if you could explain what a manual entails, like what kind of information is in a manual?

Asja: Sure, manuals are procedures like specific procedures, step by step procedures. These are things that might not necessarily have heavy public interest, right? And it's specific to like maybe tactical procedures. What step by step procedure an officer do to dismantle a bomb like these are? So it's just the procedures that allow us to comply with that DGO 'cause there are step by step by step things and that now it might not be just the manual that might be in a Bureau order or a unit order. Because the unit order, it might, let's say it's only specific to this one unit. Maybe only one unit does this activity? They'll have their procedures listed in a unit order. Or maybe it's only this one Bureau that does this particular activity. Their procedures will be listed in a Bureau order. The manuals are typically for all members or the majority of the members of the department, and again, it's just the procedures that allow officers to comply with that DGO.

Asja: So to get back to the training. The agenda at hand. Are we OK with these categories? Are there other categories that we should consider? Are there other scenarios we should consider? Are there other resources we need to consider? This is what we need to hear from this group.

Gaby: I think we can add. The scenario that you proposed about, you know, the elderly grandmother coming to the station and and you know we can get into the kind of more minutia of that in this the training.

Asja: Yeah, I think what Ana just said was really important too, because if there's a potential of, like, elder abuse and our employees leaning very heavily on the adult grandchild who might actually be the perpetrator, are there ways to figure? You know what I mean? Offering that interpreter is critical in that

situation, right? So I think these are the examples that if demonstrated, officers can see it and really take it in. So I think we'll add that I like that scenario. Anything else and what are some other resources that we can add to for the training?

Gaby: I mean, I think we can also add the resource to the Lao itself at the end as a resource.

Ana: I'm happy to look into resources around specifically around law enforcement and language access training that I can find from other jurisdictions as well.

Asja: That would be really helpful. And do you know if they're like community members that we could cast in the video that might be interested in actually being participating in the filming also? That could be helpful if you guys had community members that would want to do if we could get different languages represented. You know that align with some of our bilingual certified officers and their languages that they're certified in. We could have some scenarios acted out. I just think again like seeing it live, seeing it happen. Really brings it home as a training tool. And the good thing is if we do it well, it's a training video that lasts for a long time. It's not something that just lives for a year or something that lives for the duration of, you know, the policy itself. Jose, I see your hand up.

Jose: Yeah. Thank you for that opportunity to comment on this training portion. Yeah, I think you said a couple things. You know, like you want to include in the manual, you know, instead of the DGO. You know you don't want it to be too specific in the DGOI was kind of wondering for the department. Do you guys ever department or language access plan?'

Asja: No, we don't have a manual [for language access] . We don't currently have a language access plan. We do have a strategic plan, but I don't know how often that's updated.

Jose: Because I think for our department, I think the suggestion is they come up with a plan basically that would consider the guiding principle. You know what they're supposed to do? So you know, I think that's what you know, the gap it's been here. You know when you don't have that plan, we want things to be more specific here because when I look at the DGO in 2007, you do mention about, you know, how frequent that officer need to be trained on these. You know, in action the LEP. So that's why I think I know our concern is you know we definitely want that to be kept here. Otherwise, you know, we don't know. You know, 'cause, I myself, I would not have any idea how often officers are being trained on this topic, right. So. So that's why I feel like the concern is coming from the Community. You know when you don't have that internal memo? Policy guiding principle- I think we want to have more specific guideline so that you know we make sure Officer aware. Of being trained on these items.

Asja: Access plan, even if it was a plan, the concern that I have there is that if the concern is accountability, if the concern is procedures, a plan is less strong than DGO, manuals, or training. It's sort of a it's a statement. It's a living document that can change, but I don't know many officers that are reading our strategic plans. Or if we were to have a language access plan. I'm not sure who would read it other than community members. And I think that that's again less of a strong document that officers are aware that they're accountable to.

Jose: I think you want to be more specific here. That's what I think we're coming from. You know, if you don't have a plan here, if you don't let us know, the public know how would know. You guys being trained or even we could we could create a very beautiful you know video or training with you all on this. But we don't know you know how often officer being trained it? You know when those video are being updated, you know and where they at, you know how we can make sure things are being communicated and aligned. Aligned what you're talking about and if you want every officer. To have the same understanding, but I think you know what the topic you know from us, you know, we have no idea. You know what are being communicated. So that's one thing we wanted to be more specific and

I think going back to the 2007, I think the DGO, you can see it much more care. The public will know that you know Officer being trained every two years at least, and then once they be hired, you know, initial training should be given within the first six months, 180 days. And I don't know, you know what would be the public thing about, you know, when they comparing the two, you know which one is obviously you know way more you know consistent way more you know responsive to the need of the community, right. So yeah, that's what I think you know, coming from my perspective, at least when I look at the current 2007.

Asja: Yeah. So we did discuss that at the last meeting. So I I understand that we've heard that concern. I think the issue is that while the public may see a document that says they'll be trained within 180 days and every two years, if the reality is the department can't do that operationally because they don't have the staffing or they don't have the ability or we're in a crisis. We're in a staffing crisis, right where all of our officers are being moved from specialized units to patrol. That sets us up to fail. Well, if you say that we're gonna start train 1800 people in 180 days. How you know what I mean? Well, I think it's a document. We it's something we put in there. I don't that it was actually feasibly operationally sound. So we're trying to set it up so that training will be done. It has to be done and it is periodic, but if we overly prescribe it, we set ourselves up for then it's not done. We're not able to do it because we don't have the staff to do it. Or we don't have the ability to put up a training plan within 180 days. That's why our team tries to get ahead of things, right? So before a policy is issued or after you know right timing when a policy is issued, we try to get a a training plan together where it can go. But you know, if the policy was to say PDD is in charge of creating a policy and you'll do it at roll call and this and that and that. I can tell you that the overly specified training plan and policy rarely is able to be implemented. So again, our goal is to make sure that it's done, but we need to make sure that it's actually done and that what we're putting in policy isn't something that we're just saying that we're going to do, but it's something that we actually do. So that is the concern. So that's why I did training, we can at least plot it out and work together to get something out. It becomes the official SFPD training video, which is much easier to roll out. It's much easier to require that they watch. It's much easier to organize and get officers to understand it. I think the world that we're living in, especially with short content video right now and attention spans. Of your average person. We can get this done, but if we get overly detailed in policy I don't that I can guarantee you the efficacy of that.

Gaby: Yes. Hi. I just wanted to continue on and jump on Jose's point of if there was kind of like a deadline timeline timetable that wasn't being adhered to. What would be the harm in having you provide us with one that seems feasible now to add that so? That there's some accountability so that the community feels safe knowing that hey, even if it's not implemented to the best new because of. Short staffing and people being reassigned, There's still some show to the community that like, hey, we're really gonna try to do it with this amount of frequency, even if it can't be feasibly adhered to all the time. Like you said, it is like, happens to be the case now.

Asja: Just so I understand the question what you're asking .How do we put that in policy now?

Gaby: If you are able to provide us with a timeline that feels feasible now that you are undergoing all this short staffing and units being reassigned, even if that's not you know, strictly adhered to. What would be the harm of adding that if it hasn't been strictly adhered to in the past?

Asja: I'm not in the business of putting something in a policy that I don't think can be adhered to. I think the whole point of putting something in general order is 'cause. You know it can be adhered to. So I think we could certainly, I think I would feel better if we had a training plan. And we could agree to timing on this and moving this forward and if we have your kind of agreement that we work on a script and move this forward and work with Lanice F and work with community members to get this going. And I had an actual product. I think I would feel better putting something in policy, but we don't have a product right now. We have a plan. We have an idea. We have some agreement from this group that

we could partner together. But I think putting something in policy, we did. We said we'll do something periodic and that is required if there's an idea to change it, to be more specific to like every two years. I think that's something I'd have to discuss with leadership to see if they're in agreement with that and we could propose that. But in terms of that like 180 days with an issuance, that's something that just hasn't proven to be something that's beneficial for the insurance of getting it out, making sure that the training is done and making sure that there's buy in and making sure that it's quality. So we aren't sort of a time constraint with this one. I mean, we have a report out to the Commission on April 1st. So you know, we have one more meeting with this group. So there is a little bit of a time constraint about the the edits that could go into this policy. So I think there's hope that if we can agree on moving some of those things over into training or moving them into another document, we have a better chance of revising the policy in a way that that makes sense for implementation.

Jose: Yeah, you just said that. You know you don't want to set up a policy to fail. I'm just kind of curious, you know further pass and or just past 2007 for the passenger 18 years, has the department fail to provide those training?

Asja: I mean, he's not the failing training. I'll I'll restate it. We've put out policies that have been very difficult to implement because they were overly wordy, overly detailed, had too many procedures that actually don't line up with real procedures that officers do that have resulted in taking officers off the streets and spend more time doing administrative duties than. Doing patrol work, we have absolutely had policies that have failed San Francisco in terms of the work that we are supposed to do and what our officers are supposed to focus on. Because they're spending too much time on administrative duties that were put in in policies. So yes, there have been failures in policy, and so we're trying to correct that and make sure that we find an even balance with how do we make sure that our officers know exactly what to do, can service the communities with care and with respect and make sure. That they're doing their job adhering with Penal Code adhering with vehicle code, adhering with. State and federal law. They're doing all of the things that they need to do right. All of the things that San Francisco wants them to do. And understaffed, how do we make sure we do that in policy? Because that is what they're held accountable for, right? So that is our job, It's not your job. It's my job, right? It's my team's job, so that's the focus we have and taking the information the communities have and making sure that we balance it in a way that's workable. And we're we're trying to partner with you to do that. But I think that there are things that obviously you're not. You know what I mean that you know that I don't know and that I know that you don't know, right. And so how do we meet together in a place where we can still meet the end directive of creating a clear, concise policy that officers do understand without missing those important ingredients that make that service level all the more better?

Dan: And Asja, if I could just chime in. This is Officer Dan McLaughlin. I think the great thing that's being pointed out now is that with the training we could think of it as skill building and. I think that's a concern to the Community and that's why it gets pushed into the DGO. Is that you want officers to have these skills, but the DGO tends to be the worst place for it. Training is really where you build these skills. So the issue of you know identifying the LEP person and then identifying the language, that's a skill that's the development of a skill. That this video and training would really be a more appropriate place for. And so I know we're coming to the end of the meeting. Thank you, Asja. For that, from what I can hear as an officer, I've 20 years in the department. Really. Building the skills of the officers so they are very effective in the community. It sounds like the goal of really one of the big goals of this group, so I do want to encourage you to work with us on this training video because I think it could have a tremendous effect on the skills and abilities of our officers, much more than written in a policy document. Because you don't build a skill reading a policy document, you see what you shall and shall not do so I just want to encourage everyone there.

Asja: No, that's great. Thank you. Again, we're just we're walking is a balancing act, right? We're trying to change what we have out there right now that has caused confusion for officers, which does impact the services that they provide. It does sometimes decrease or create inconsistencies with the services they provide because there's too much information in there that they're not able or shouldn't have to kind of balance. But if we have it in a way that they can easily digest. Then it's easily implementable, and then they can actually marry that. With the shalls and shall nots. OK. So it sounds like you guys are on board with the training. We're gonna continue to work on that and start building out the scenarios for the training, so hopefully we can get more specific with the scenarios. I will send everybody a link to the document that does outline what changes were made and the why. I do think that we can make some changes to clarify the non-criminal section. And we can make some changes to the policy to clarify the vital documents. Section the required languages and non-required languages section. So we have some changes that we can discuss internally with the policy team. And for purposes of next meeting, it will be our last in terms our last opportunity to get together. Our hope is to show you and have a discussion about the potential changes to those two sections.

And then if we're going to have a discussion about the things that didn't make it in my ask for this group is that instead of going over the 67 that there are, we just don't have the time. If there are some that we there is an impasse. You just do not understand why the decision was made. We can have that discussion. I just don't think it's a good use of our time to go over every single one. Because I'm not going to give you new information. I don't that I'm going to be able to give you new information that sheds new light on what's been posted. But and it would help if in the in the meantime, you can send us an e-mail. You can always send me an e-mail and say I don't understand this one. Can we talk about this at the next meeting? That is, that helps us out also. So my question for you before we end, does this time work like the three to five work, the best over teams or did you we want to move to an in person evening meeting? 'Cause we could do another 5 to 7:00 PM and move it in person. Or we could do another three to five on teams. If there's a preference. If there's no preference, I think we can just do teams.

Ana: I'm flexible, I'll defer to the community.

Anisha: I'm going to be out of the office that week. I don't know if there's another way for me to provide feedback or offer recommendations.

Asja: Send me an e-mail Anisha. You can always send me an e-mail.

Anisha: OK, OK 'cause, I did send an e-mail to you and officer Prasadi after the first meeting. But I never got a response, so I just wasn't sure.

Asja: Yep, send an e-mail if it's about the document and or recommendations for the next meeting. That'll be helpful. Yeah. OK, Emily. We'll send in a poll to the group about the options for the teams versus in person, the evening versus the afternoon, and then you'll get a new invitation from Emily for the third meeting. We'll also send you a link to the document that we talked about that compares kind of gives us the reason why things were changed. So you have that as well. And then our team will just look at those sections to make potential changes so that we can review that at the next meeting. Does that work for everyone? OK, wonderful. Thank you so much for making the time for us. We really appreciate it and we look forward to the next meeting. Thank you. Bye.

**MEETING ADJOURNED 5:01PM**