

San Francisco Police Department Disciplinary Review Board Presentation 2025 Q1



CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Police Department

07/09/2025



2

Safety with Respect



Presented By:

Lieutenant Lisa Springer

San Francisco Police Department

Chief of Staff Sharon Woo

Department of Police Accountability



First Quarter Disciplinary Review Board Findings and Recommendations

May 15th, 2025

Members present:

Voting Board Members

- Acting Assistant Chief Peter Walsh (Chair)
- Acting Deputy Chief Derrick Jackson

Advisory Board Members

- (Not present)
- Chief of Staff Sharon Woo

Assignments

Chief of Staff/Administration Bureau
Field Operations Bureau

Police Commission

Department of Police Accountability



Aggregate Trends Identified by IAD & DPA

IAD aggregate trends

- Conduct Unbecoming (24/28.24%)
- Failure to Appear, Range (23/27.06%)
- Neglect of Duty, General (18/21.18%)

DPA aggregate trends

- Behaved or spoke inappropriately (CUO) 12.5 % (5/40 allegations)
- Neglect of Duty (BWC) 12.5 % (5/40 allegations)
- Failure to Properly Investigate (ND) 10% (4/40 allegations)



Policy/Training Failure Findings Identified by IAD

There were **zero** IAD cases that resulted in a “Policy Failure” finding in Q1 2025.

There were **zero** IAD cases that resulted in a “Training Failure” finding in Q1 2025.



Policy Failure Findings Identified by DPA

There were **five** DPA cases that resulted in a “Policy Failure” finding in Q1 2025.

There were **zero** DPA cases that resulted in a “Training Failure” finding in Q1 2025.



Policy Failure Findings Identified by DPA

DPA had **five** policy/training failure case in the first quarter.

DPA had **zero** policy failures cases in the first quarter.

The first and second policy failure cases both involved the application of DB 18-027, 20-107 and 22-040 and the criteria of assignment of investigations to General Work Unit from the Station Investigation Team (SIT) or the Burglary Unit. In both of these cases complainants filed burglary reports and complained no investigation occurred.

In both cases, patrol units authored initial burglary reports. It appears that the cases were referred to the Burglary Unit. Per DB 18-027, the Burglary Unit determines if it meets the Burglary Unit assignment criteria. The cases were not assigned for investigation through the Burglary Unit. If it does not meet the criteria, the Burglary Unit refers the case to the Station Investigation Team (SIT).

DB 22-040 shifts responsibility for investigations from SIT to General Work Unit. DB 22-040 does not indicate who at General Work determines if a case is assigned to an investigator or the criteria used to make that decision.

Upon contact with General Work, the unit was unable to confirm if either case was assigned to General Work. General Work did not have a tracking system to record cases referred to the unit.

DPA found a policy failure since there is no clear instruction to the officers on how to log and track these cases.



Policy Failure Findings Identified by DPA

The second policy failure case involved a case in which officers lawfully detained an individual and seized an air pellet gun and was booked in the Property Control room for “safekeeping”. Complainant was unable to timely retrieve his property after going to both the Property Control room and the District Station. DGO 6.15 (from 1994 and currently being updated) does not give clear instruction on how to release property booked at Property Control for safekeeping.



Policy Failure Findings Identified by DPA

The third policy failure case involved a case from Special Victim's Unit (SVU). Investigators assigned to the SVU authored two separate misdemeanors arrest warrants for the same defendant. While the two warrants were entered into the Central Warrants Bureau database, no effort was made to serve the warrants. The defendant was a neighbor of the minor victims and his whereabouts were known. He absconded before the warrants could be served.



Policy Failure Findings Identified by DPA

The fourth policy failure case involved a case in which an officer assigned himself a case where the victim was a friend of the officer's father in violation of DGO 2.01, Rule 57. The officer was not acquainted with the victim.

DGO 2.01, Rule 57 provided, "If a member is assigned to an investigation in which the member knows or suspects, or should reasonable know or suspect, that the member has a personal or family interest the member shall immediately report the interest to the member's immediate supervisor."

The officer did not believe the relationship between the victim and himself qualified as a reportable event. The officer was not close to the victim. The DGO does not define "personal or family interest."



DRB Recommendations from Q1 2025

Recommendation #1: Update DB 18-027 and DB 22-040 to provide clear instruction to officers on how to log and track cases.

Recommendation #2: DGO 6.15 is currently being revised. To ensure the prompt return of property for safekeeping, DPA recommends that DGO 6.15 be updated as follows:

- 1) Provide guidance on when officers may seize and book property for safekeeping.
- 2) Provide guidance on when property booked, including property booked for safekeeping, must be released to its owner at both the station level and at Property Control Division including identifying the members authorized to release the property.
- 3) Conform DGO 6.15 to the EvidenceOnQ system.



DRB Recommendations from Q1 2025 (continued)

Recommendation #3: DGO 6.18 be updated with the addition of the following:

- Provide guidance as to who is in charge or responsible for arrest warrant service borne out of SVU investigations.
- Provide guidance on when and how the officer serving the warrant should perform their duty.
- Provide guidance on what the officer should do once the warrant is served.
- Provide guidance on when, how and under what circumstances the victim of an offense is notified after service of the arrest warrant.

Recommendation #4: DPA suggests that the Department publish a Department Notice or Department Bulletin to include a clearer guidance about what types of conflicts shall be reported when a member is conducting an investigation. This should include a definition of personal and family interests, defined responsibilities for a supervisor receiving a report, and a procedure for the involved member to follow if a supervisor is unavailable.



Office of Equity & Inclusion (OEI) Review Regarding Equity and Discipline

The Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI) submitted their review of the Q1 2025 IAD Quarterly Reports. Based on a review of the information, no findings indicated any negative trends towards bias, disparities, or inequities in the discipline imposed on officers. No corrective action was recommended.



Next Step Outcomes and Inputs:

- The 2nd Quarter 2025 Discipline Review Board has yet to be scheduled.
- The Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI) will review the Q2 2025 IAD quarterly report. Based on a review, they will determine if any findings indicate any negative trends towards bias, disparities, or inequities in the discipline imposed on officers and determine if corrective action is needed.