

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

**San Francisco Police Department**



**Meeting Transcript**

Time	1400-1500
Date	3/24/26
Venue	Teams Online

Attendees	<i>Attendance:</i> Manager Asja Steeves (PDD), Officer Dan McLaughlin (PDD), Emily Queliza (PDD), Gabrielle Cota (PDD), Officer Niccole Pacchetti (PDD), Officer Lorena Prasadi (LEP), Rima Malouf (Government Affairs), Sergeant Stacy Youngblood (Police Commission), Jamal Anderson (DPA), Sharon Woo (DPA), Milli Atkinson (SF Bar), Annie Lee (CAA), Mouneissa Wangara (AANSF), PJ (SOMCAN), Janice Li (CAA), Ana de Carolis (OCEIA), Jose Ng (CAA), Gaby Castellanos (Carecen), Amy Aguilera (Poder SF), Amy Lee (Board of Supervisors)
-----------	---

**Topics:**

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

Asja: Some housekeeping rules so that we are all on the same page. We are recording the meeting and, as mentioned at the first meeting, we will not have formal meeting minutes, but we will have transcription of these meetings so these could be potentially posted on the website. This is not a Working Group. Again, this is just an opportunity to, following the Commission putting out a Resolution at the meeting where the Department initially proposed the draft and, the Department did not receive, but the Commission received a letter from the Language Access Network. The Department had responded and so the Commission issued a Resolution really wanting an opportunity for Language Access Network San Francisco and community members to be heard. This is really the opportunity because public comment is not timed here, your microphone will not get cut off if you go over 2 minutes. This is really an opportunity to discuss the things that maybe you weren't able to discuss at public comment because you only had 2 minutes, but this is the opportunity to be heard. I do want to say that my staff has attended these meetings. We have put about 4 hours into just meeting time which does not include the prepping or the discussions afterwards or seeing what is possible. What I want to make clear here is that this is a one hour meeting; this is not a 2 hour meeting, but a one hour meeting. And I think where a lot of these meetings have resulted in a lot of questions posed to SFPD, that doesn't give an opportunity for Language Access Network or community members to be really heard on anything: your concerns, maybe disappoint in where things have gone, that's fine too, discussion about how maybe the Working Group process was, whatever it is, this is your opportunity to be heard. My hope is that we don't get off track with only an hour left to ask questions that I am not sure I will be able to answer with more context. What I am hoping is that

there was this concern that the Department's proposal wasn't adequate for officers to provide language access to the communities we serve. That's what we need to hear from this group. How is the proposal itself getting in the way of that, of language access getting provided? Because all of us agree that that needs to happen and needs to continue to happen. How we get there is what we are discussing. The Resolution did not state that we are required to revise this policy, it did state that we need to consider elements of the version that was publicly posted. What I said in the email was in order for us to consider those elements of that version, we need to hear from you. So that's what I am asking for, so instead of me talking, the floor is yours so that you can discuss these concerns and let us know where, in the draft that we have proposed, the access is being denied. None of us want that, the Department does not want that, Language Access does not want that, OCEIA does not want that, the communities don't want that; we all want the same thing. That's my hope. I have addressed your questions about what a written directive was, what a Manual was, what a DGO is, so I am hoping that we are past those levels of discussion and that we can really dig into making this policy make sure that officers and all public-facing employees of SFPD can continue to provide language access, not only in a way that complies with state, federal, local law, but in a way that actually serves the communities that live and visit the City because that's what's important. So, that's the opening remark so I will get right into the next item of the format. This is your opportunity to tell us whatever it is we need to know so I can advocate for changes to leadership. I still work in a city government agency, I still work for a paramilitary organization, I still have a chain of command, my job is to hear and my team needs to listen to what you have, to what concerns you have, so that we can see if it's an actionable item in policy. If there are changes, I have to use whatever you give me to advocate for those changes. Now if your discussion is just focused on me answering questions to your satisfaction, that doesn't get us to a place where I can advocate to leadership. What I can say is the letter that was sent wasn't the compelling argument for leadership to make change. So we are here so we can hear from you, maybe even anecdotally, you can paint those pictures for us to make it clear where those concerns are. So, the format is we are just going to go over briefly the minor changes that we have made based on the conversations that we have had and then go over briefly, I believe you have already read it, my hope is that you have already read it, some of the themes that we captured with the conversations that we've had and our responses to some of them. It's to-date so it will get updated. So after that we really just leave it to you to voice your concerns. So I will quit talking about that so we can get moving. So in the Department's version, we've already gone over how we added Vietnamese and we modified the proposed definition of translation. We heard what the group was saying basically you have to identify the indicators before you identify the primary language, so we had that information in there, but we swapped it so that it goes in order of the identifying them first and then identifying the language which is the concern that we heard from this group that that wasn't in order. So we've just swapped these. This might need some discussion, but with the non-criminal incident, again these are non-criminal incidents, so officers everyday face incidents that are just building rapport or community policing or maybe just even giving directions. And then we also have situations where our members interaction with members of the public for a non-criminal incident, but it might be administrative in nature and have to do with policing services. So we got some feedback from OCEIA during the last meeting, so we are hoping this edit addresses that, but I am not sure so that's why this is all still open for discussion. But we did revise this section to make it a little bit more clear. And then we took some feedback from OCEIA at the last meeting to clarify the LAO to us, so we went ahead and made the revision to make it clear so it aligns with the LAO. And then we did add a little bit to the reporting section as well. So, in the themes, I know it was still open, there was concerns about training, making training language stronger, so we are in discussions with the Academy in terms of if we can get a little bit more definition around the periods, the intervals in which the training is given, so that's still open for discussion. But, basically we have 22 of the comments that came in from the last 2 meetings and we've tried to be responsive to each one. That was what was sent to the group. So with that, those are the recaps of where we are right now but I just want to move

forward. So this really takes us into Agenda item #4 where we can just open it up for the discussion where, again, this is your opportunity to really be heard about the concerns you have about the draft DGO and where you still see that there is harm that was pointed out so that we can make this better. So with that, I will stop talking.

Annie: Hi everyone! My name is Annie Lee and I am from the Chinese Affirmative Action. Thank you so much Director Steeves for convening these meetings and dedicating your staff to this and I see that some changes have been made and we are happy to see that. In terms of meeting your request to have specific things and talk about those really substantive items, as for what remains outstanding are the Purpose and Policy sections, the indicators, (I know that there have been some changes made to that, but there are some additional changes we would like to see), the restrictions section, and particularly I would invert it so that it's clear that the norm is not using family members, neighbors, friends and being really explicit in the Restrictions section, which was taken out, and also training, which I know you just said that one is still being worked out because we would like to see some more definition beyond just "periodic". Do you want to go through each of those?

Asja: Yes, why don't you start with the Purpose and Policy sections?

Annie: Excellent. In the Purpose and Policy sections, I don't 100% understand why reference to state and federal laws were taken out. I think in including that, the purpose of this language access policy is because it is in accordance with local, state, and federal law is a great way to ground it and introduce this policy and explain why SFPD has this. I read through the grid that you gave us, and I understand that footnotes are not allowed because of formatting and that's fine if it's not footnoted, but we do think it's important to open with the statutory requirements. Both the 2007 DGO references this and then the Working Group version also references this. "Consistent with federal, state, and local law, SFPD..." And so I can type in the language in the chat if that is helpful for you.

Asja: I think it was noted in a few documents that we received. Help me with this. The understanding that we have is that the local ordinance is essentially the mechanism to ensure that all City agencies with not only just the local regulatory requirements, but state law. So there is the state law that tells state and city agencies that they have to have this language access and that they have to come up with it in a certain way. And now we have LAO which has us comply with the state. Is that incorrect?

Annie: I think that is correct, the LAO is more robust than Dymally-Alatorre, but I think it is also helpful to reference federal law. That is why the DOJ has set out guidance and things like that. So, I don't think it hurts or hinders the officers if we also reference that there are state and federal language access requirements?

Asja: I don't think that is what I was asking. I am just asking if the 91 is the mechanism to have us comply with state law? That was my question. Maybe that question is for OCEIA.

Ana: I agree that there is no harm in discussing the federal, state, and local law. I think it is important for all city employees to know, and we actually also say provided in our training that there are federal, state, and local legal requirements for language access. It's pretty standard to provide the 3.

Asja: Can you point to in the policy where officers are actually doing procedures that align with the federal law and the state law? Procedurally, what are the differences that officers would need to know in the field?

Annie: I don't know if others can answer that question or if you would like LANSF to answer that?

Asja: Anyone. I think I am just hoping to get some guidance here.

Annie: I really just think it's Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires no discrimination on the basis of national origin, which includes language, and when the DOJ does look at police departments and their provision of language access, that is the law they are looking at and then that is the authority they have to go in and investigate police departments across the country. It's not that there are specific things in the LAO that matches a federal requirement, it's that the federal requirements under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is the baseline for this. Referencing that and just establishing that so that your officers know this is why we have this. This is the policy that makes us in compliance with Title VI. If there is no harm in adding that, then perhaps we can add it?

Asja: I am just trying to understand. I can tell you from writing policy the Purpose is the "why" and I think that lines up with what you are saying. The Policy statement is more the "how" and the "what". We had the reference to 91 because it really does guide a lot the "what" and the "how"; it tells us what is required of the Department and a lot of it gives us the guidance of reporting, the data we are supposed to be capturing, how we are supposed to offer the services to members of the public, so that is why the reference to law moved from Purpose to Policy. Our officers are not only providing language access because the law tells them to, it is just the right thing to do. Putting it in the Purpose statement doesn't necessarily align with why we have this policy. The Department and every City agency has to comply with Title VI in terms of not losing funding, but that responsibility by itself does not sit with Field Operations and what officers do in the field. There's not necessarily harm in putting language in, I think if that was the parameter for everything we put in policy, we'd have all kinds of things in policies. I hear what you are saying, that it was in a Purpose statement, and the reference that we moved was to Policy because that is where we explain the "what" and the "how".

Annie: There's limited time so let's just restate it one more time. How we would like this to read is that in the Policy section after "SF Admin Section 91", we would prefer ", state, and federal law" as the reference. I also think what's missing in Policy or Purpose is that moral reason you were just referring to Director Steeves, that "we don't just do this because it's the law, but because it is the right thing to do." I think it is really important to put somewhere in Purpose or Policy that "Hampered communications with LEP victims, witnesses, suspects, and community members can jeopardize safety and create evidentiary investigative challenges." I think it is really important to explain the "why". There's all this research about why leading with the "why" is really important and so being explicit about that would be helpful. And, again, that was in the 2007 version of the DGO that was approved by the Police Commission, so it's existed in DGOs before. We would like that language in. I can also copy and paste that into the chat again.

Asja: And then the indicators?

Annie: The indicators. Thank you so much for moving that above the Identify Primary Language. The Working Group version had a few more details and I think it might be helpful because this part is not proscriptive, which I know is one of the concerns like "we do not want to hamstring officers" and of course we want to give them the flexibility to be able to do their job, but, because these are potential indicators, it could be useful to list them all out just so officers know "that could be helpful." For instance, "gestures" aren't in there which is one of the ways that if someone does not speak English, for instance my parents, they sometimes communicate with gestures because they can't speak English. The original version from the Working Group did have more than what's in Section A right now. Our request is to have all of that in there. And, again, the purpose is for officers to get the full scope of different things they can be looking out for to help them. Our goal is to make sure that officers can provide language access and providing more information, we think is more helpful.

Janice: I would just like to add that the language of the indicators that were noted are consistent with and directly align with and were pulled from an existing Department Bulletin, which might not still be in effect given it's a Department Bulletin, but that is where those indicators come from originally.

Annie: I think it is this one. SFPD Department Notice 21-072. I'll put that in there. Other sections. The Restrictions section, which doesn't exist anymore. Let me pull up this document. Family is referenced twice in this version of the DGO that you sent, in Exigent Circumstances on page 4. "In exigent circumstances, or if waiting for a Certified Bilingual Member or Certified Civilian Interpreter would delay critical actions" you can use a "temporary interpreter until a Certified Bilingual Member or Certified Civilian Interpreter is available (e.g. if someone is assaulted and a member needs the description of the suspect before interpretation services are available, they may use a Non-Certified Bilingual member, family member or bystander to get a physical description)." Family is mentioned again in page 3 in Communications for Non-Criminal Incidents "employees should determine the appropriate level of interpretation needed, which may include certified or Non-Certified Bilingual Members or civilians, neighbors, family members, friends, bystanders, or the use of digital or non-digital tools." So there are two references to family in here both about the very limited times you could use them, but I would invert that and explain that the default is you don't use them. That is actually more clear for officers than naming the very few exceptions. We would like to see the Restriction section put back so that it is very clear for officers that you don't use family members. This is particularly important for us because families tend to be monolingual together and what I understand what some of the most difficult situations for officers are DV cases or elder abuse cases and in those cases, families tend to speak the same language. It's just so important to be explicit about the use of children or other family members. Having that Restrictions section being very up front and clear and then you could have these bits where these are the very few times where you could use family when it's communication related to non-police services and exigent circumstances. That whole section we would like to see returned.

Janice: I would just like to add context here. In my role as Coalition Director at CCSJ, I attend meetings at the Mayor's Office for Victim Right's alongside SFPD's SVU. We've had multiple Captains and there have been a number of Interim Captains of SVU as you might be aware. Tony Flores is always there and language access has come up in that space a few times, and they have specifically talked about the harm and the trauma that family members, specifically children, face when they are forced to be used as translators in certain circumstances. Tony has said multiple times that when he goes to the Academy and does the trainings, he is very clear about the re-traumatization youth and children face when officers ask them to be translators for a DV or even an SA, SV, or a case that happens live right there. So, we see this in real time with actual patrol officers and individual instances where this has come up.

Ana: If I may, I agree with that. Last time we met, I also brought up the piece about the use of children, family members, neighbors, and bystanders and I agree that using family members, friends, neighbors, volunteers, bystanders, or children can significantly undermine the quality of the interpretation and the accuracy of witness statements as well as the victim privacy and confidentiality at risk. It can also re-traumatize family members and, as was just mentioned, in domestic violence situations, perpetrators may control LEP victims by taking advantage of their inability to speak English or a family member or child acting as an interpreter. We also discussed, even in non-criminal context that any situation involving a City department's provision of direct services or information to the public, responding to crisis situations, or public meetings or hearings is subject to the LAO requiring departments to provide language access services. I think that the addition that was made in that section still does not capture the Department's obligation to provide language access services, which is in the LAO. I would consider restoring the piece around the order of preference and the Restriction section that are appearing in the February 2025 DGO draft because it is a more streamlined way to present the order of preference rather than going into this "criminal", "non-criminal", "non-police" which are not defined and may create more confusion, rather than providing a clean order of preference

that's easy to follow with restrictions and the use of family members, children, neighbors, and bystanders.

Asja: I think this is where I am getting lost in the conversation. So, please stick with me and help me work through this. In the beginning, we say for criminal matters, these are your options: Certified Bilingual Member (in-person preferred), Certified Civilian Interpreter, which also includes the phone app and the interpretation telephonic services, and then we say Non-Certified Bilingual Member can only be used for non-evidentiary communication unless there's an exigency. So, it's an exigency when we are talking about criminal or if it is just initial contact. So, that is the order. Are we needing stronger language around the Non-Certified Bilingual Member in criminal? How do we make that order of preference that is being talked about more clear?

Ana: Thank you for the question. I think that in the previous version, both the Working Group draft, as well as the current DGO 5.20, it's clearly stated in the Working Group draft in 5.20.04(A) General Procedures. It says "The following procedures shall apply to members who encounter LEP individuals while performing law enforcement functions." I think that already is a good explanatory "performing law enforcement functions" that includes both criminal and non-criminal and provides a clear order of preference, restrictions versus going into the "criminal" "non-criminal" "non-police" which may create more confusion.

Asja: So if officers have told us that this is more clear, that's not providing any comfort?

Ana: Are you referring to public comment?

Asja: No. I am saying, if we have had sworn members tell us that this is just easier for them to understand because it's clear with 1, 2, 3. Where are we getting the evidence from that this does not operationally make sense?

Ana: I don't know why it would be clear otherwise? Is that a training issue that it wasn't clear the piece around law enforcement functions?

Asja: When we are getting questions about something like language access, what we're also looking for is a way to expand it. I see your hand up Sharon. We want to make sure that our officers that are not certified but are conversationally comfortable, but want to provide in situations where they can build rapport. How do we make it clear to those officers that they can be utilized as a language access tool when it's non-criminal? That's what I need help with.

Ana: I was referring to the use of non-qualified interpreters, family members, neighbors. That's why I referred to the clear order of preference, which is what you are pointing out, Certified Bilingual Member, Certified Civilian Interpreter, Non-Certified Bilingual Member. That's a different topic.

Asja: Right, but we seem to be dancing on both of them here. So my question here is that the Department wants to be able to expand and allow officers that are not certified to have discussions with visitors or residents in another language that's non-criminal in nature. What's the best way to lay that out?

Ana: Through the order of preference, by providing qualified interpreters.

Asja: So the only way to provide interpretation is through certified. But members who are not certified and are comfortable speaking another language should not even speak in another language at all?

Ana: I am not saying any of that because I think we are speaking about a few things at the same time. I do appreciate these questions and the discussion that is going on. But, I think I want to go back to the recommendation, which is to consider restoring a clear order of preference that does leverage those qualifications you just pointed out for bilingual officers and qualified civilians paired with

restrictions to the use of non-qualified neighbors, family members, bystanders, with clear restrictions on the use of that.

Asja: I see. Sharon?

Sharon: I have to agree with Annie on this idea that it should be inversed. It should be that the default is not to use non-qualified family members and neighbors; that should be the default. The exception is to use them. I think that's what Annie was saying: you add in the restriction language, that becomes the mindset of the officers – my first idea should be that I am not going to use a family member or a neighbor or anyone, my first thought should be should I be looking for an LEP interpreter or a certified interpreter? I agree with Annie that the inverse is a much better process to be more careful about the obligation the Department has with LEP individuals. I do think that there is a difference with the idea of using a non-certified bilingual member and this other category of people who are neighbors, friends, family members and I think that has to be delineated. They are not the same thing and those should be separated. If the purpose of this section is to have the Department have more interaction in a more congenial way, with individuals whose primary language is not English with non-certified bilingual members, I think that's a great goal, but I do not think it's satisfied with the idea that family members, neighbors, relatives is all bunched together. So I would separate those two things out.

Asja: Ok. This has been helpful. I hear what you are saying. And then there were concerns about training.

Annie: I know you said you are working with the Academy I believe you said on this Director Steeves? Our preferred language I am going to put in the chat and I want to explain that this is our preferred language because it defines the frequency and the location like at what type of meetings for example, during roll call, during in-service training, so that way it is just super clear for everybody that these are the expectations and this is when training will happen. I think it's helpful to have this level of clarity because I understand from the last meeting that you had talked about how you want to make sure the officers are successfully trained. Being more explicit with the training obligations is better rather than this one sentence.

Janice: Maybe I can add to this given that I was in all of the meetings, including last meeting. It was definitely news to us to hear, and this is me paraphrasing things that you said Director Steeves, that there are officers who are struggling to remember all of the existing 2007 DGO 5.20 and while we were really excited about the opportunities to partner on training, that doesn't include the need to strengthen the language of the training in the DGO itself especially if we know that there is such a need with training. We think that is giving further definition to what periodic means and some of the definition that Annie offered, we are open to what that final language is, but we do really think that it needs more detail. We are aware that there are complaints that have been filed historically with the OCC and now with DPA specifically around language access with findings that upheld that language access was not provided. The fact that there have been these complaints and findings upheld that this is absolutely an opportunity to strengthen the Training section of the DGO itself.

Asja: I do just want to put on the record, I do not recall saying that officers have trouble recalling 5.20 training specifically. As it relates to training, having it specified and outlined in a DGO exactly what will happen removes the ability for the Department to actually give the units that are in charge of the training the opportunity to providing the training. It ends up being something that the Department might be forced to do and not actually take the time to create a quality training or consistent training. Whatever my remarks were from the last meeting about training weren't specific to 5.20 training. I know that we want to expand it, we want to be able to build on it, do a video that could be much easier for dissemination to an entire Department, but this is expanding this particular DGO and is also expanding to all members. It's not a training just for officers, so while roll call training would be a good

idea, that does not impact PSAs or clerks that are at the desks for Records. We are looking for training that's consistent for all the members that this DGO impacts. Again, our goal on the policy side of writing is writing policy that can be implemented. By putting multiple details on what the training is, I cannot guarantee, just because I wrote it, that it can be implemented. I am not in the business of putting something in a policy that I can't guarantee the Department can implement easily. That is the point that I was trying to get at. But I do not have any data about 5.20 specific training for officers. I also know that our complaints are very very very low as it relates to language access. A complaint is a recognition that something is wrong, and I would definitely be really concerned if those numbers were extremely high, but the fact that the numbers are very low, it's hard to draw a conclusion that policy needs to be impacted to deal with one complaint amongst thousands and thousands interactions. That's not to dissuade the concern, but from a policy standpoint, I am trying to make policy that's consistent and easy to implement. Our goal is to make this section work but I think we are still in talks with the Academy on the best way to write it, so they can implement it in a sustainable way.

Ana: From a policy standpoint, and we will all agree, that a policy is only effective if those who are taxed to implement it are equipped with the skills needed to successfully implement it. Training is immensely important. In the complaints that we look into at OCEIA, we very often recommend training because it is important to send that reminder often to city employees so that they are aware of their obligations. Language like what is seen here and what Annie has shared that includes something like "at least every 2 years". That provides flexibility to the Department to offer it more often because of the at least piece. Also, as a City employee myself, there are a myriad of trainings that we have to do on a yearly basis, a ton of trainings that are due at the end of the fiscal year and the calendar year and we do complete them because we know it is important that we are aware of those policies so we can do our job. It is important to find a cadence that is doable but is also going to be providing guidance and making sure officers and other members know what their obligations are.

Asja: POST is the training standard for law enforcement and they have trainings for homicides, DVs, things like that. This a core function of their job, investigative duties, and those can be on 2, 3, 5 year intervals. I understand the idea of wanting to put a timeliness in there, but in terms of something that they deal with every single day in the field, unlike a homicide which they may not deal with every single year, are we saying the cadence should be more frequent than homicide training or DV training? Are we saying it could be less frequent or are we saying it's on par with law enforcement training?

Janice: I am sorry, but I don't think that's something we are qualified to answer at all. What we can speak to as language access experts who provide direct services for LEP folks, we can speak to what's the appropriate amount of training to be able to appropriately serve LEP folks.

Asja: Thank you. That's helpful. Then we will work with the Academy on the cadence. There were other concerns. What were the other concerns? This is your time to give us that information.

Annie: In the reporting section, I know you did add some language. Thank you for that. We think that it should mimic what is already written in the 2007 version, which I have here.

Asja: We are not going to mimic what is in the 2007 version. I will tell you that right now. We are trying to clean up a problem. There's the Language Access Ordinance which requires a fiscal year report, and then there was this new report that was required by policy and that was on a calendar year, but it also asked for different information. What we were having an issue with is reconciling these two data points which one was required by ordinance and one by policy. When we looked at what was in the Language Access Ordinance, it's asking for several data points and we have one Language Access Liaison that's responsible for all the data for the entire Department. We also have this Prop E that was out there that a large percent of San Franciscan voters voted for that has to do with policing and

policy that the policy side needs to be aware of and a lot of that is reports. Department-wide, we have so many reports that are due per policy that are not required by law. One of the things we have been asked to do, not only by Prop E, but leadership and also now with audits coming from the Controller's Office on all of the reports that are required per agency and which ones are required by law and which ones are just required by policy. That was an actual choice that was made to separate because one is required by policy and one by law to defer to the one that is required by law. That's why we are not mimicking the 2007 version.

Annie: Thank you for explaining that Director Steeves. One thing I would add to the red section which you've added here about the complaint data, which I think is important because that should be in the report, how many complaints were filed, it might have been one, it might have been 100. I would also add the resolution of those complaints because it would be helpful to know if it was founded or unfounded and I would add that to what you've put in red here.

Asja: Because that information comes from DPA, that doesn't come from us, they do provide it and we can add the resolution, if available or the disposition if available, maybe DPA can speak to this, but if they get a complaint in a given year, the disposition isn't necessarily found in that calendar year. That is the problem with the language in the 2007 version is it puts the onus on the Department to report out on the disposition and what the resolution to those were, but when we get the complaint data, it might just say "pending", "pending", "pending" or "no misconduct found" or whatever the disposition is, so the Department doesn't have the opportunity to provide a resolution to a complaint that's still under investigation. But I think it's fine to add something like "if available, the disposition of the complaint".

Sharon: Almost all of the complaints aren't guaranteed to be completed in any calendar year, but what you will get is the number allegations involving LEP and the number of cases that were resolved during that calendar year and whether they were sustained or proper conduct was found. You may not get an apples to apples comparison, but it will all be fruit.

Asja: We can add that to make it clearer to this section. We have about 9 more minutes.

Sharon: I just want to go back to one thing on training. Training is both for members, both sworn and all public-facing employees. Figuring out if there is a separation of that type of training. I don't know if that's possible. It's a little bit difficult doing it with one training rule because sworn officers will have different requirements, all the criminal requirements. Maybe that's something we could do, separating sworn and non-sworn in the Training section.

Asja: We put it up in the last meeting. We had a workflow of what the training could be and we wanted to put in the non-criminal situations, and criminal. The problem is that PSAs might be taking reports; that's criminal. We need them to be trained in that world. But we also have clerks that are non-sworn that might only be giving you a copy of your report; that's administrative, but they still need to know the rules. If it's too prescriptive in policy, we then miss all of the topics we need to cover when we are doing it. We're trying to word this in policy that's broad enough to cover the circumstances for all employees, sworn and non-sworn. I don't go to roll call, but I might have to do training, but if it's roll call, then that doesn't apply to me. I think you are right when it comes to the scenarios in training. We want to cover things that are public-facing civilian staff members in the training modules.

Sharon: I get what you are saying. What the group is saying is that this two-line training is just not enough. They want more information about what that training would entail and how often that training would occur. You could also say, as Annie said in the chat, "including but not limited to" these types of trainings for this type of employee.

Asja: Got it. I know that there is more.

Annie: I do feel like I have spoken a lot. There's 6 minutes left and there's others on the call so I do want to take a step back if others have other things. I also have been putting things in the chat.

Asja: Thank you. I think this is what we have been asking for is this type of conversation. We've been asking for this for several rounds, so this is good. Thank you very much.

Annie: I'll put in more of the indicators too because I think you're halfway there, but not all the way. The Indicators section is just giving the breadth of things that folks can have clarify on in terms of "oh, this might be something that indicates that a person is LEP" so I'll put that in the chat too. But, I was wondering with 5 more minutes left if we can talk about the process moving forward? I know that there's an April 1<sup>st</sup> date that's a big date, but I'll pass it off to you Director Steeves.

Asja: For next steps, what we're hoping to do is do a report out on April 1<sup>st</sup>. If we're able to get these changes to leadership before then, we'd let to get the DGO in front of them. We're not timing that; I don't have the answer for that because everything that we're changing in the DGO needs to go back to leadership. Leadership has to approve these changes and then we get it to the Commission. In a scenario where we can't get leadership approval, I do a presentation just on April 1<sup>st</sup> to Commission just to recap what happened here, how many meetings we had, what the key themes were, what the concerns were, the changes that we would like to make, some of the changes that were easy to make, some that maybe take some more discussion with other units. It would be lovely to say that we could make all the changes and have leadership approve it for next Wednesday, but I can't tell you that. If it's not next Wednesday, we wait for leadership approval. I don't think we'll be able to get it to Commission on the 8<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup>, so it might not go to Commission till May 6<sup>th</sup>. I am looking at my calendar. We need to capture all of the approvals first. So, it's just a report-out; this is how many meetings we had, this is the conversation we had hearing the themes and concerns, and here are the changes we're hoping to make. That's it for April 1<sup>st</sup>.

Janice: Would there be a consideration of just pushing the report back because I feel like, from our perspective and, from what the Police Commission had asked is for there to be a consideration of changes that restore previous elements of the previous DGO. It feels like that the step of running it through leadership, even if nothing changes after you run it through leadership, that step seems really helpful for there to be more engagement from the Police Commission and give more of a conclusion for the report out that you are going to give. The position that community advocates and CCSJ has had, is this is a take your time and do it right. There's nothing from the 2007 DGO that urgently needed to be fixed yesterday. From what we have seen, is that the 2007 DGO is actually quite a strong DGO, but we are aware that updates need to be made. Certainly if any updates are made, it should be going into the stronger hierarchical quality direction. I think it's a take your time and do it right thing. It makes sense to me to push back the report back.

Asja: Well, I'm not the one that asked for the report out, the Commission did and it's in the Resolution. So, I can certainly go talk to the Commission.

Janice: The Resolution actually calls for April 8<sup>th</sup>, it wasn't the 1<sup>st</sup> either.

Asja: I will be out of the country, so I asked for April 1<sup>st</sup>. I am out of the country for the second two weeks of April and then they don't have a meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Janice: That seems like another reason to potentially push this back.

Asja: I can reach out to the Commission Office and see what they are agreeable to and I don't disagree with that, but I do want to be clear that this has been under development since 2024. The doing it right situation is that we followed the process for development and then we've issued it to Commission. So, it is in the Commission's hands now, it's not really in the Department's hands

anymore. We're done with the Department development. We are now taking on this extra step from the Commission Resolution. I can certainly reach out to the Commission Office and let them know of that request so we have more time. I'm not sure that means we are going to meet again to discuss the draft.

Janice: I think we understand that, but I just feel like April 1<sup>st</sup> is literally next week, but in order to get into the packet for LegStar, you need it done by Friday. I don't know you well enough, but I feel like I can say it's going to be really unlikely that leadership signs off on what you need to get administratively by Thursday. It just all seems very unlikely. It just makes sense to push this back to the May meeting, if that's necessary, for there to be a fuller report back and a better understanding of where your leadership has landed.

Asja: Sure. I can certainly reach out to the Commission Office and ask. That would make my life much easier.

Sharon: I think that will give the Commission and your team the opportunity to go to leadership to discuss changes and not just report, we had 3 meetings. Because that's all it would be on the 1<sup>st</sup>. I would encourage, I am not sure if Stacy is on this call, to push it back so that we can actually give the Commission some real flavor about what happened and the changes that were requested, what was accepted and what was not and we go from there.

Asja: Yes. My question, actually an announcement, for this group is, once I get a response from the Commission Office, I'll be sure to just send an email to everyone on this group to let you know what the Commission Office stated. At least keep you in the loop with the status. I'd also like to reach out to this group once I do get a meeting with leadership, so we have a better idea of what their concerns were with any of these changes. Either way, we want to be in touch with you before we go back to Commission. Is that alright? It's 3:02. We've gone over next steps, I'll reach out to the Commission Office. Thank you for this discussion. This is pretty much what we've been looking for, tell us where in the draft exactly what those issues are. I can chew on that. I can definitely take a lot of that back to leadership. There are some things that I think are a little easier than other things to get in, but either way we will let you know. I do really appreciate you taking the time, especially those of you that have come to all 3 meetings for the entire time. I know that your schedules are really busy, but this was an important discussion so I appreciate those of you that made the time to participate in this discussion with us. You have our email, so feel free to email in the meantime, but I will be in touch once I find out what is going on with Commission. Sound good? Thank you everyone. Appreciate it.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 3:03 PM**

