SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT
IN RE:)
DGO 9.01 "Traffic)
Enforcement" Working Group)
Meeting)
AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION OF
WORKING GROUP MEETING
THURSDAY, AUGUST 25, 2022
FILE NO. DGO 9.01 WG RECORDING 8.25.22
BEHMKE REPORTING AND VIDEO SERVICES, INC.
BY: HE SUK JONG, CSR NO. 12918
455 MARKET STREET, SUITE 970
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105
(415) 597-5600

Г	
1	APPEARANCES:
2	Kevin Benedicto - Commissioner
3	Susan Brockman - Wealth and Disparities in the Black
4	Community Organization
5	Janelle Caywood - Department of Police Accountability
6	Brian Cox, Esq Public Defender
7	Angela Jenkins - Community Member
8	Carolyn Ji Jong Goossen - Director of Local Policy, Public
9	Defender's Office
10	Crispin Jones - SFPD Police Officer
11	Jermaine Jones - Department of Police Accountability
12	John Jones - Community Member
13	Nicole Jones - SFPD Commander
14	Rome Jones - Community Member
15	Brian Kneuker - Asian Police Officers Association
16	Donald Luu - Chinese Chamber of Commerce
17	Tracy McCray - President of Police Officers Association
18	Wesley Saver - GLIDE
19	William Scott - Chief of Police
20	Officer Serin - SFPD Police Officer
21	Allyssa Victory, Esq ACLU
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	
1	(Begin transcription 00:00:17 - 00:19:39)
2	000
3	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right, everyone. The
4	chair has called the meeting to order. We're going to
5	start with line item 1, which is roll call for members
6	that are in the working group.
7	If you are in the working group, we are
8	recording this for the minutes, if you can please project,
9	not talk over each other. And I just need everybody in
10	the working group to say your name and the unit or from
11	the community so that we have that on record. If we could
12	start with Commissioner Benedicto.
13	COMMISSIONER BENEDICTO: Hi. Kevin Benedicto, Police
14	Commission.
15	COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Max Carter-Oberstone,
16	Police Commission.
17	CHIEF SCOTT: William Scott, Chief of Police.
18	ALLYSSA VICTORY: Allyssa Victory, staff attorney
19	with ACLU Northern California's Criminal Justice Program.
20	JANELLE CAYWOOD: Janelle Caywood with the Department
21	of Police Accountability.
22	COMMANDER JONES: Nicole Jones, commander of the
23	Administration Bureau, SFPD.
24	COMMANDER YEP: Commander Paul Yep, Risk Management
25	office.

```
1
         BRIAN KNEUKER: Brian Kneuker, San Francisco Asian
    Police Officers Association.
 2
         UNIDENTIFIABLE SPEAKER:
 3
                                  Angel.
         ANGELA JENKINS: Angela Jenkins, community member.
 4
         SUSAN BROCKMAN: Susan Brockman [phonetic],
 5
6
    representing Wealth and Disparities in the Black
 7
    Community.
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Brian Cox, Public Defender.
 8
9
         WESLEY SAVER: Wesley Saver, GLIDE.
         OFFICER CRISPIN JONES: Crispin Jones, San Francisco
10
    Police Department Traffic Company.
11
12
         TRACY McCRAY:
                        Tracy McCray, SF POA.
13
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Indiscernible] working group
    [inaudible].
14
15
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                Yes, go ahead.
         PAUL JAY: [Indiscernible], Paul Jay [phonetic].
16
17
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                Perfect.
              Commissioner Elias is en route and will be here
18
19
    presently [verbatim].
              We are going to take one item out of order.
20
21
    are going to go directly to line item 3, Discussion on
    Draft Department General Order 9.01, Traffic Enforcement
22
23
    and Curtailing the Use of Pretext Stops; discussions
24
    Regarding Section 1, Purpose; Section 2, Definitions; and
25
    Section 5, Limiting Searches and Questions.
```

1 COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Good morning, 2 everyone. Thank you for joining us for our second working group meeting for DGO 9.01. 3 I wanted to start by thanking the Controller's 4 Office and, in particular, Alice Kassinger, for helping 5 plan and facilitate this meeting. And so I want to 6 introduce Alice first and let her say a few words. ALICE KASSINGER: Hi. Thank you so much. I think some of you may have heard me introduce myself last time. 9 I am the project manager with the City Performance Unit of 10 the Controller's Office. 11 12 As Max said, we are here just to provide a 13 little support on structure and agendizing. And I will be walking you through a little bit about what we're going to 14 15 do today, what's on the wall, why I gave you these mysterious tasks, after Max gives his introductory 16 17 presentation. And at the end we are also going to be taking some comments, have -- have a venue for you to give 18 19 feedback on how this session went, what you liked, what you want to change in the future. Thank you, guys, so 20 21 much. 22 Max, go ahead. 23 COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Great. Thank you. 24 We're going to -- we've got a packed agenda 25 today, so -- but I did want to start off with some

introductory slides that probably, frankly, should have 1 2 been gone through in the first meeting, just so everyone's on the same page. So I will try to be brief, but --3 Sara [phonetic], could you -- could you take 4 this off, the slides. I'm just going to stand over here 5 6 so I can see what's going on. Great. So I think many, if not everyone, in this room 8 9 knows; but -- but for those who don't, the Police Commission is a seven-member civilian oversight body. 10 Its -- the chief kind of duties are to set all policy for 11 12 the police department. That means everything that affects what line officers [indiscernible] do within the field 13 when they carry out their official duties. And it 14 15 includes the SFPD's kind of institutional obligations like data recording. We also hear and adjudicate the more 16 17 serious officer-discipline cases. Next slide, please. Sorry. 18 19 So, yeah, what is this -- what is the 20 pretext-stop policy that we're all talking about today and 21 what is the goal here? I think just in one sentence, the goal of the 22 23 policy is to reduce racial disparities in traffic 24 enforcement while increasing public safety. And the chief 25 [indiscernible] this DGO tries to accomplish that is by

limiting officer discretion.

We -- we know that for every person and for every profession, not just for police officers, discretionary decisions tend to be those that are most susceptible to being impacted [phonetic] by implicit bias and, therefore, the most likely to result in racially disparate outcomes.

And so this DGO tries to limit officer discretion in two key ways: First, by banning stops for certain low-level traffic offenses subject to some important exceptions; and then also, secondly, limiting the use of consent searches, limiting the use of investigatory questions, and, of course, the traffic stop.

This DGO was drafted by the commission in close collaboration with the police department and the Department of Police Accountability.

And then, finally, at the last meeting, I think somebody raised a question about the legality of the draft policy. And I do want to flag that there was a request made to the City Attorney's Office to provide a written opinion detailing if there are any legal concerns about the policy. I think it's critical that we have the City Attorney's Office opinion before we reconvene -- before this working group reconvenes so that we can take into account any legal issues in the course of a policy-making

1 process. 2 So what is the goal of this group? [Indiscernible] also [indiscernible] questions about this 3 last time. 4 This -- this -- this working group is fundamentally an advisory [inaudible]. It is a forum to 6 leverage the expertise of everyone in this room. It is a place for the exchange of ideas, for conversation, and, 8 9 hopefully, for the [indiscernible] of ideas. And, ultimately, I hope that during the course 10 of our conversations, you will get to hear all of the best 11 12 arguments for and against this policy. And I hope that we will unearth all of the most relevant facts that relate to 13 this policy. And at the end of the day, the commission, 14 15 the full seven-member body, will be able to use all this valuable information to make the most informed decision 16 17 they can possibly make as it relates to this -- as it relates to this policy. 18 19 Can we go back [inaudible]? I think Slide --20 Oh, perfect. 21 So why is this policy needed? 22 Rather than speaking at a high level, I thought 23 that it might be useful to just pluck out one example that 24 is emblematic of a larger problem. So I just decided to 25 zoom in on one offense in the traffic code:

drive with two license plates.

I picked this out because this is one of the most common things people got stopped for. In 2019 over 4,100 people were stopped for this. Black people were stopped at a rate of -- or -- I'm sorry -- white people were stopped at a rate of 26 per 10,000. Black people were stopped at a rate of 420 per 10,000 residents, so over 16 times more likely to be stopped for this offense.

You know, these racial disparities obviously impose grievous societal costs. And so if we're going to impose these types of costs on society, you would hope that there would be a counter [indiscernible] that would be bigger than the cost we're imposing. But as far as I have been able to tell thus far, from the data least, I don't see [inaudible].

So in over 4,100 stops that were made, only 15 resulted in the discovery of a gun. So that's 0.4 percent of these stops. 3.5 percent of the stops resulted in discovery of drugs. And of course that -- that includes drugs of quantity, including, you know, small recreational amounts of drugs. And then 85 percent of stops resulted in no discovery of any contraband.

And I will just note that the regulations that define contraband in this context are very broad and include things that are legal in most situations, like

cell phones and money, and a broad category that's simply term "other contraband" and that is undefined.

So, you know, given the enormous cost and given the fact that at least we can't really identify concrete benefits -- or substantial concrete benefits [inaudible], I think continuing to do things the way we are currently doing them is -- is not an option. It is -- it is not a -- it is a defensible [phonetic] option, in my opinion.

I think we covered this one.

So others may have asked last time -- I think at least one person asked -- how is this working group different than the community town hall listening sessions that -- that are being [inaudible]?

And so that is a totally separate process being spearheaded by the Human Rights Commission. It serves a similar function in that it's soliciting feedback from the public, but they are going directly into communities and -- and where people live to ensure, you know, that this policy reflects the ideas and concerns of the people that it will impact most. But that is a separate policy. At the end of the day, that information will be collected and -- and shared with the commission. And at least myself, Kevin, and Cindy will be attending the town halls that HRC puts on.

So I just want to talk about -- a little bit

about this process that we're all engaging in together, you know, and how it's different from the typical DGO process.

In general, DGO revision happens within the police department. It happens over -- usually over a year or the course of years. Drafts -- intermittent drafts are generally not shared with the public. It's very rare for there to be working groups like this one. And when they do exist, they are generally closed to the public and they are generally known to be listening sessions.

This process is definitely a reaction and a response to that. We tried to create the most transparent process -- publicly transparent process that we've ever had for the enactment of a DGO. So at the very outset, we shared a draft with the [indiscernible] public, and we solicited feedback from the earliest time. We opened up this group to the public. It's -- it's not closed to the public, as -- as [inaudible] working groups are. We analyze -- we just discussed a robust community outreach component by HRC. And, also, the three commissioners here will be having four separate town halls that are officers-specific so that we can hear directly from officers.

Lastly, I'll say there -- there has been -- not at the time but a little bit of criticism that I have

heard that this process that we're doing could be even more solicitous of community feedback and could be even more transparent. And that feedback is well-taken. We're kind of trying something new, so we definitely want to hear from people feel about it.

At the same time, for the folks who feel like there could be an even greater community-facing component, I would just ask, you know, please keep that same energy as it relates to the dozens of DGOs being [inaudible] by the department that really have no serious public-facing component, because those DGOs are very critical and important too. And you will definitely have my support if you speak up and ask for more transparency in that -- in those forums as well.

So just very quickly -- and I should say all of these slides will be posted, so no need to take notes on this. But I just wanted to announce the dates for the next working group sessions. So this -- these working groups will pause during the month of September so that HR -- or while HRC does its community outreach. And we will reconvene on October 6th for our first meeting. Recommendation grids for that meeting will be due September 13th. And then we'll reconvene again on October 20th, and recommendation grids for that meeting will be due on October 12th.

1 At our next meeting, we'll be talking about the 2 [indiscernible] list. And at the fourth meeting, we'll be talking about anything we don't get to on the [inaudible] 3 list, as well as the Supervisory Review and Reporting 4 sections of the DGO. 5 This is just a quick slide on where you can find 6 7 data and reports. I encourage people to visit the department's website and also check out the Center for 8 Policing Equity report that it did on our traffic 9 enforcement, specifically. 10 11 And that is -- that's it. 12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And --Oh, before you go, 13 COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: 14 Alice, I know the chief wanted to say a brief word. I'm 15 sorry about that. CHIEF SCOTT: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner 16 [indiscernible]. 17 I'm going to be very brief so we can get on with 18 19 the business of the day. I just want to thank everybody 20 for attending. And these -- these types of community working group sessions, I think, are really, really 21 22 important and is a part of where we want to be as a department. As the commissioner said, there's a lot of 23 24 work ahead of us in terms of more input and more 25 involvement with the community on many of our policies.

So this is just one many. We have hundreds of policies, and they all have to be touched every five years, and we would love to have the community feedback on those that are of interest to you.

One thing I want to also say is I want to thank the offices who are here now.

So just so everybody understands kind of how this process is working, there's a recommendation grid that the Police Commission is managing, where we're taking feedback from all sources. And that includes feedback from the department, feedback from the officers, feedback from community members, feedback from some of academic partners; we're going to have feedback from the California Department of Justice. So we're -- we are listening to everybody. And at the end of the day, the commission will make the decision as to where we will go with this policy.

I bring that up because part of our reform efforts and our collaborative reform initiative, we really want the officers who have to do the work and the members of this department who have to implement those policies to have a voice, and so their voices need to be heard. And they are here to speak for themselves as far as what they see as their professional opinions of -- of these policies.

If you look at the grid, if you've seen the grid

```
1
    already, for those of you, the department has a position.
 2
    And when you see "Chief William Scott," that's the
    department's position on these issues. But I want to
 3
    delineate the difference between the department's position
 4
    and officers who are speaking their -- their opinions
 5
    because they have a right to do that and it's really
 6
    important that they do because, at the end of the day,
    this impacts all of us -- the officers who do the work,
9
    the community members who are impacted by the work. And,
    ultimately, as it was stated earlier, it's about the
10
    safety and the -- of the city and all of that it entails.
11
12
    Safety is not just reducing crime. Safety is doing police
    work actively and constitutionally. Safety is people
13
    having a comfort level that we are there to help them, not
14
15
    to hurt them. So "safety" means a lot of things.
              But the reason I am kind of going on and on
16
17
    about this is that we want this process to be productive
    and helpful. And it's our goal that no voice is drowned
18
19
    out. Every voice is heard, every opinion will be
20
    considered, and everybody has a right to have that
21
    opinion. So I just wanted to make that clear so everybody
22
    knows kind of what the rules of engagement are here.
23
              And, again, thank you for -- for being here this
24
    morning.
25
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
                                          Great.
                                                  Thank you,
```

```
1
    Chief.
 2
              And just before I hand it over to -- to Alice, I
    do want to say that all three of the commissioners here
 3
    reviewed the recommendation grids really carefully. And I
 4
    just want to thank everyone for the incredible,
 5
    thoughtful, and detailed recommendations that we received.
 6
    I can tell that many of them took a lot of time and it
    involved very close reads of -- of the policy. And this
 8
9
    policy -- I can already tell -- is going to be a lot
    better for the recommendations that we've already received
10
11
    to this point.
12
              We're going to try to get through as many of
13
    them as possible. I know that we probably won't be able
14
    to get a chance to get to every single one. But if we
15
    don't get to your specific recommendation, please know
    that it's been closely reviewed and considered by us.
16
         CHIEF SCOTT:
17
                       I didn't get one thing [overlapping].
         ALICE KASSINGER: All right. Thank you guys so much
18
19
    for coming [overlapping].
20
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: I'm sorry, Alice.
21
    Alice, [overlapping] --
22
         ALICE KASSINGER: Okay. You got two seconds
    [inaudible].
23
24
                       I got two seconds. I have one last
         CHIEF SCOTT:
25
    thing -- and I forgot to say this -- but this is really
```

1 important.

We have Tracy McCray, the president of the POA, here. She is here to speak on behalf of herself. This does not subvert the POA's legal ability for meet and confer once this policy is -- is drafted and given to the Police Commission for approval. I just want to make that clear because there's been some confusion on that.

The POA has a right to be here and voice their opinions, but they still have a right to meet and confer. Legally, they still have a right. So I just want to be very clear on because I think for us to go forward, we need to all understand what the rules are. And so I just wanted to thank you.

ALICE KASSINGER: Thank you, Chief.

UNIDENTIFIABLE SPEAKER: Thanks, Chief.

ALICE KASSINGER: Thank you.

All right. We're behind, behind, behind, so we're going to get started. I'm going to take two seconds just to briefly introduce how we're going to do this exercise. Some of you may not have had the time or the ability to read through all the really great recommendations that were submitted. So we're going to make sure that when we discuss, we're discussing something that we've all read and we know what we're talking about.

So what we're going to do is members and

audience members together, I'm going to split you guys 1 2 among these stations on the walls, randomly. I'm going to give you guys two minutes at each section. You're going 3 to take the time to quietly read the recommendations that 4 we have up on the wall. You all have been given dot 5 stickers. 6 Members of the working group, yours should be Members of the public, yours should be yellow, 8 9 maybe even green. If you run out of stickers, you let me or my incredible colleague Jeff Jack Palmwright [phonetic] 10 11 know. We'll get you some more. 12 What you see is gradients of agreement. 13 every recommendation has -- is numbered 1 through 27, 14 completely randomly. And there's a corresponding number 15 on the sheet next to it. You will -- remember, quietly. It's, you know, a legal reason for Brown Act we can't have 16 17 small group discussion going on that other people can't hear. 18 19 You're going to take your sticker and put it one 20 of the five options to represent for each recommendation 21 how strongly you agree or disagree: 22 So it's "I fully agree." "If this was part of 23 the memo, I would" -- "and I had the ability to pass the 24 memo, I would do it right now."

"I have some reservations." "I like what was

25

```
put here, but I got some more questions I would want to
1
 2
    ask before moving forward."
              "Abstain" or "neutral." You don't really have a
 3
    comment or a feeling about it.
 4
              "I seriously disagree with this, and I veto
 5
    this." "There is no way I would move forward with
6
    anything on this."
              Are there any questions about those options or
 8
9
    how this exercise will work?
              (Working group went into breakout groups.)
10
              (Working group reconvenes at 00:37:30.)
11
12
         ALICE KASSINGER: Okay.
                                  Thank you, guys.
              I know -- I heard a lot of feedback.
13
                                                     I just
14
    want, you know, my colleague Jeff -- we should have done
    this [indiscernible] on the doors. There's Plus/Delta.
15
    We're going to make sure that there are sticky notes. I
16
17
    want you guys to obviously feel encouraged and free to
    write about "Let's talk about this session itself." You
18
19
    hated that exercise? Write it down. Write down why.
20
    You're welcome to also make suggestions for how you want
    it to be [indiscernible] paper as well. You can also note
21
22
    down things that you want to do next time that you didn't
23
    see today.
24
              I'm going to turn it back over to the
25
    commissioners. We just had two diving [phonetic]
```

questions, but we're really going to go back to root
discussion now that we know that everybody has read the
recommendations as best as they could in a very limited
time.

I will also remind that recommendations,
verbatim, were printed out in a packet right outside the

verbatim, were printed out in a packet right outside the doors. So in case you missed that, please, you know, raise your hand. Let me know. I'm happy to go get some and bring them to you, especially if you feel like you didn't get a chance to read them on the wall today.

All right, Max and Kevin. Please take it away.

COMMISSIONER BENEDICTO: I told you -- real quick,

I'm Kevin Benedicto. I'm on the Police Commission as

well, one of [indiscernible] -- is just to -- I know I

spoke to some people on the side during this process.

Just to provide a little bit of additional context, we -- this is the first time we're trying an exercise like this. So we really do appreciate the feedback from the working group and members of the audience. I would definitely take advantage of the Plus/Delta that -- that Alice had said.

But also that, you know, this exercise is meant to just be sort of a jumping-off point for the substance of the discussion and a supplement to the very detailed recommendations in the recommendation matrix. So, you

know, in this instance is the commission going to sort of look at these dots on here and decide, "Oh, this one got the most dots. That's the" -- "what's going to be adopted." The point is to see if there were clusters that were meaningful and informed the discussion. And that's the purpose.

Another thing is that this working group, as Commissioner Carter-Oberstone said, is the largest and most inclusive working group we've done. For those of you that have been part of the more exclusive, invite-only working groups, the process could be more freewheeling because it's smaller and there's nine people around the table. Because we've chosen to allow more people to participate in this process, we need mechanisms that are -- are -- are less [indiscernible] allowing that discussion and sort of meant to provide us a bit of -- of feedback in that way. So that -- that was sort of the guiding thought behind this.

We are now going to move into a substantive discussion but will get your views. And, again, we are -- we are reviewing recommendation matrix very closely. So, you know, this dot is not the "be all and end all" of your organization or of your view on any of these recommendations.

Sir.

```
1
         JOHN JONES: The deadline for filing supplemental
 2
    suggestions was August 19th, a deadline that I respected.
              How is it the ACLU gets to file briefs on
 3
    August 23rd, filled with this cherry-picked citations that
 4
 5
    none of us can look up?
              The ACLU -- ACLU materials should not be out on
 6
 7
    that table. They should be told not so politely to file
8
    their papers on time. My name is John Jones, and I
9
    approve this message.
10
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: All right.
                                                      Thank
          That's -- that's noted.
11
              I -- I think the ACLU did submit their
12
13
    recommendations on time in the grid. And I don't think we
    set an explicit deadline for -- for materials out on the
14
15
    table, which I think were accepted from a number of
    groups. But your point is well-taken, and I'm glad to
16
17
    know somebody is -- is checking citations.
         JOHN JONES: You know, just file the papers on time
18
19
    like the rest of us have to. That's all you have to do.
20
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
                                         Okay. I hear you.
    That's convincing.
21
22
         JOHN JONES: What's so special about that?
23
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
                                         It's -- I'm -- I'm --
24
    very compelling. It's very compelling. I appreciate it.
25
              So in -- in our -- we're kind of butting up
```

against the end of our time. I -- I thought that we could spend some time -- there were some themes in the recommendation grids and some issues that kind of a lot of people touched on, and I was hoping we could use some time as a group to discuss them. I'm just going to flag at the outset we're not going to be able to get to every one on every topic, but -- but I do want to kind of make sure that we get some additional discussion on some of the things in the recommendation grid.

And I'll just start with one thing which is there were -- one thing -- theme that came up was the issue of discretion and whether it was a net benefit for officers to continue to enjoy broad discretion in enforcing our traffic laws, and other folks felt that -- and I've already added myself -- we're in the camp of -- of limiting officer discretion to address racial disparities.

I think that the POA and Officer Crispin Jones had some comments on the issue of discretion -- of maintaining the importance of discretion. And I think that the coalition and -- and others had suggested that it's -- about the importance of restricting discretion. And so I just wanted to open it up on that general topic first.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So my opinion about

discretion -- and what I spoke about it and what I speak about it in the academy -- is that by removing discretion from the officer, they become robotic. They'll have to issue citations in every situation; they won't be allowed to consider the human element. So maybe somebody's having a bad day; maybe somebody has a legitimate excuse for why they committed the traffic violation. We're talking about low-level offenses such as burned-out brake lights and burned-out headlights. There's -- it's common that people don't know that their taillights and brake lights don't work because they don't walk around behind their car. And if we remove the discretion, then the officer would have to issue citations in every situation because they're not allowed to consider the human element; they're not allowed to have the discretion to advise somebody of a violation. And taking that away from them, I think, goes down a very slippery slope. So like -- like him, I'll just UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: chime in. But I think my perception of what we're trying to do with removing discretion is not removing an officer's discretion to let somebody off with a warning or [inaudible]. I think the -- it is [inaudible] discretion to -- to limit what happens after the stop occurs so that the -- the stop is really just to the violation, not to

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

matters that are not going to the violation.

So when I think of discretion, I think it's kind 1 of that because that [indiscernible] behavior and their 2 [indiscernible] harm [phonetic] is like -- that are --3 that result from those interactions. So my view of 4 discretion is not necessarily the same although I -- I 5 6 think I -- I do agree with you because people have bad days and there's reasons why their taillight is busted, and there might be a reason to let somebody off with a 8 9 warning or fix-it ticket or whatever. But I think it's -my view of it that it's tailored with discussion of 10 discretions [inaudible] what happens on matters that are 11 not even [inaudible]. 12 13 TRACY McCRAY: I hear you on that. But, also, when 14 you have traffic stops for investigative purposes. So we have people -- you know, our Plainclothes Unit or Crime 15 Violence Reduction Unit, you know, it's different from 16 17 when the traffic people [indiscernible] doing enforcement, right? 18 19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh. TRACY McCRAY: They're in uniform, and they're seeing 20 21 somebody that commit a violation and they're stopping them 22 for that violation -- right? --23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh. 24 TRACY McCRAY: -- versus where our specialized units 25 who are investigating some serious, serious crimes, they

1 have the discretion about talking to someone to see about 2 a particular crime, right? Our whole job is based on discretion. And if you start limiting that and putting 3 rules and curtailing that, where else will you do that in 4 other areas that we -- we work in? 5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh. 6 TRACY McCRAY: So I get -- you know, we have to have 8 that because it's the spirit of the law, the letter of the 9 law. 10 And, look, I got stopped this morning on my way to work. You know, a guy got me with the -- with the 11 12 LiDAR. I was doing -- it was 35; I was going 45. I never 13 said who I was. He came up to the window. I was like, 14 "Yeah, you caught me" --15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh. 16 TRACY McCRAY: -- because I was trying to get to work 17 because we had a little break-in this morning, but whatever. But he used his discretion, and I didn't say 18 19 who I was. 20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: tth-huh. 21 TRACY McCRAY: And I was like, "Yup, you got me." I 22 couldn't -- couldn't argue with the -- with the LiDAR, 23 right? So, you know, he had this discretion and used it. 24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I -- I love the idea of 25 downside discretion.

```
1
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: I'm sorry, Mike.
 2
    we just get -- Susan's had her hand up for a while.
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
 3
                                Yes.
         MIKE: Oh, I'm sorry.
 4
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
 5
                                          Sorry.
         SUSAN BROCKMAN: No, that's all right.
 6
 7
              I wanted to make two points: One to follow up
8
    on what Brian was saying is that I actually see discretion
9
    a little bit different. Discretion happens before the
    stop is made, the discretion to decide to stop someone for
10
    something that really is insignificant. So I think that
11
    an officer making discretion in that part, I think
12
    [inaudible] discretion of [indiscernible] earlier.
13
              And then as to the issue of officers having
14
15
    discretion, I think that it's so often exploited and
16
    abused --
17
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                Uh-huh.
         SUSAN BROCKMAN: -- that it's no longer something
18
19
    that we feel [inaudible] police exercise [inaudible].
20
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.
         SUSAN BROCKMAN: And then if there weren't an issue
21
    of racism and [inaudible] stops coming up and if every
22
23
    stop was fair, we would say officers used their discretion
24
    [indiscernible] and all the time and [inaudible]
25
    discretionary. That's not true. I think discretion has
```

1 become a tool in which officers can operate on 2 [inaudible]. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I ask you, Max, to back up a couple of slides to the -- what was it? -- the broken 4 taillight, the data [overlapping]. 5 6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, it's to the license plate. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: License plate. Sorry. Just to use it as an illustration, Tracy, what 8 9 you were saying, you know, how many of those stop are conducted by plainclothes officers versus uniformed cops? 10 You know, and I think it's because the racial 11 12 disparities are so substantial there, I think, you know, 13 it's important to really think about, Yeah, you can have 14 the discretion. What was the harm caused by -- you know, 15 to the community? You know, Chief's got [inaudible] 16 17 [indiscernible] Department of Safety and [inaudible]. I think we have to be very clear about the fact that 18 19 there's a lot of psychological harm, not to mention 20 physical harm and other risks, that accompany a traffic 21 stop. 22 So you can -- I think when we talk about that, 23 you have to be -- that has to be [inaudible] of that 24 discussion. So to me, you know, focusing on whether or 25 not someone has discretion [inaudible] non-uniform versus

```
1
    uniform, you know, the -- the data is very clear. And I
 2
    think -- I mean, that's -- I think that's what we're
    trying to do is like try to -- try to craft a policy that
 3
    limits that discretion because that's the result of
 4
    discretion -- right? -- the disparities. So that's the
 5
    problem [inaudible].
 6
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible] was saying a
    shared concern [inaudible]. I mean, why is that -- there
8
9
    is undue weight in an -- in -- in an outside -- outsized
    role and in a permissible role --
10
11
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                Uh-huh.
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- to the officer's calculus
12
13
    for something that -- such as race, anything they can
14
    perceive here, right? That's what we're trying to remove.
15
              And the challenge here is try to capture that,
    right? And so if we can remove that underlying reason
16
17
    where a stop has little to do with a technical stop --
    right? -- it's -- it's pursuing -- it's
18
19
    investigating a crime that they've not identified; they're
    looking for something. So that's -- that's [inaudible].
20
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Indiscernible].
21
         UNIDENTIFIABLE SPEAKER: [Indiscernible]. We've
22
23
    spoken before.
24
              I wish we could, you know -- we could really
25
    improve this and this would fix the racism over the last
```

50 to 60 years. It will not. And there are certain things that are helpful.

But like I said, to be fair, when you remove, you know, any -- any matter, like you said, that this is what we must do no matter, a lot of the time, who is going to pay the -- pay the price for that? It will be the public. We won't have the option of giving someone a break. And this is any of the communities.

I've grown up in all of them in the city from day one. So I've had the -- the unfortunate feeling of being -- of feeling disparity as far as how things were -- why I was stopped, the wrong reasons; some for the right reasons. So I've experienced all that.

So when you take away an officer's discretion completely, you also -- so you take some of the neighborhoods that we're speaking of. So say Bayview. That's where most of my time is spent. You have a -- there's a huge problem. Part of that problem is the whole neighborhood was just neglected for about 30 years. And so now -- and I understand we do need to address -- these types of meetings have to happen; change in the police department does have to happen. I just say that you need to take care in what you remove from the department --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- because in order to -- for

the citizens of the city to get what they want and deserve, officers need to have some of that latitude in order to give you what you want. If you take care -- take it away completely, you will not get it. It's just -- you know, these are just hard issues to have to consider [inaudible].

COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: I appreciate that, and -- and I do want to just address that point and -- and -- because Officer Jones said something similar.

I do just want to clear as a factual matter, this draft as it currently exists would not take away all officer discretion. And in fact Commander Yep, in one of our closed-door meetings when we were drafting this policy, made a point that when he was doing traffic enforcement, sometimes he would pull somebody over for a moving violation and exercise his discretion to give them a ticket for a lower violation, for an equipment violation instead because of the particular circumstances.

This DGO -- I -- I heard that, and I thought it was a great point. And this -- this DGO has an exception for exactly that situation that Commander Yep called out where, you know, he identified some low-level violations that we don't want officers to make stops for; but you can ticket someone for that violation if you pulled them over for, say, a moving violation and you want to give them a

```
1
    break and give them a ticket for a lower -- for -- for a
    lower infraction.
 2
              So I do this as a -- as a factual matter so I
    make clear what's currently -- we're all currently doing.
 4
 5
    I would still permit a lot of discretion to -- to not
    enforce or to enforce for a lesser offense.
 6
              If there's going to be one more comment on this,
8
    Chief, and then let's move on.
         CHIEF SCOTT:
9
                       Okay.
10
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
                                          Okay. We'll take two
    more comments, and then we'll move on to the next issue.
11
12
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                 Right.
13
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
                                          Chief -- or I'm
14
    sorry.
15
              Do you want to go first?
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                 Yes.
16
17
              Okay. I want to agree that I'm not hearing
    ultimatums of officers have unlimited discretion.
18
19
    [Inaudible] really the case that all -- they're still
20
    limited by the law, by our constitution, by existing
    policies. And I see this as a chance to revise in what
21
22
    are the limits of the discretion. I hope you find it in
23
    this particular circumstances. And we're trying to get at
24
    the real issue of the racial disparities and of the
25
    pretextualness and that pretext where it comes in to
```

questioning and how it goes beyond what -- what we're 1 2 stopped for. So I, again, just want to echo I'm not hearing 3 this debate of, "Oh, we have to completely remove 4 discretion" or give unlimited, but it is about what is the 5 6 policy limits to ensure people's rights are protected and that we can address the extreme disparities that we see coming out of [inaudible] stops. 8 9 COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Great. Thank you. 10 Chief, do you want to have the last word on 11 this? 12 CHIEF SCOTT: Yeah, I -- so it's kind of similar to 13 what we just said here. 14 Really, the policy questions in our minds are 15 what happens -- "What types of discretion are we talking about limiting?" Because we -- you know, part of this --16 17 our -- our -- the forum [phonetic] initiative, we've been working with a lot of academic partners, including the 18 19 Center for Policing Equity, Spar -- Stanford. And I think 20 there's agreement among the academic community that there needs to be limits to discretion. The issue is what does 21 22 that mean. So does it mean limit searches? Does it mean 23 limit certain types of offenses? Does it mean limiting 24 25 pretext stops?

These are all things that are on paper now in policy. And I -- and for what we're trying to do as an organization is find this balance between what that means and the other part of the equation is how that impacts the general public and public safety and the officers who have to do their job who want to protect the public. So I know that it's a little bit similar to what you said. I think that the difficulty in this conversation is what's the [indiscernible] right here? The department is taking the position that we realize in order to change the disparities issue, we're going to have to limit discretion. What we're trying to find is the balance of what discretion is reasonable to the limit where officers can still do the things that they need to do to keep the public safe within the scope of their duties. So I think that's the real discussion that we're -- we're here for. COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Great. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible]. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, good. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No [phonetic]? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just as a reminder, whenever anybody speaks, if you wouldn't mind, just say your name prior. That way, it makes it a little bit cleaner for the news. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Great. 2 COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Great. Thank you. So that was great. Appreciate everyone's 3 thoughts on that. I wanted to move on to something else 4 that came up in the recommendation grids which is the 5 6 issue of parole and probation searches, Incident 2, "Traffic stop." This is something that, if I recall, three 9 participants -- or three working group members brought up: The Department of Police Accountability, Officer Jones 10 raised this issue, and Officer -- the coalition raised 11 this issue. 12 13 And there wasn't 100 percent overlap, but there 14 was some support, I think, between all three members on the notion that there should be some limits. And it's not 15 necessarily something I went into this thinking that --16 17 that this -- this group would have overlap on. So to be clear, currently, the draft policy says 18 19 nothing about placing any limits whatsoever on parole or 20 probation searches or questioning incident to a traffic 21 stop, but it was raised by those three commenters. So I 22 did want to open up for discussion on that topic. 23 JANELLE CAYWOOD: [Inaudible]. 24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible]. 25 Good morning -- or good afternoon. JANELLE CAYWOOD:

I am Janelle Caywood. I'm a policy director at the Department of Police Accountability.

From our perspective, because pretext stops, whether or not they're occurring, is often [indiscernible] on the state of mind of the officer who want to limit behaviors that are the hallmark of pretext stops.

In the earlier drafts that we developed with the commissioner and with Chief Scott, we requested that during the course of traffic stops, that consent searches and questions about unrelated investigations be limited. That made it into the draft.

Our third recommendation is that there not being probation and parole searches conducted on the heels of a traffic stop.

[phonetic] of a probation stop. You pull some over -someone over for a minor traffic offense. The officer
starts questioning them about unrelated crimes. That
issue is addressed in the policy. The officer asks for
consent to search. That's addressed in the draft policy.
But we also think that there needs to be parameters or
guardrails limiting officers from conducting probation and
parole searches on the heels of a routine traffic
infraction.

COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Okay. Thank you.

OFFICER SERIN: Yeah, I'm Officer Serin [phonetic], 1 2 Northern station. Is there any direction that -- you know, here, 3 we're not supposed to ask questions. And I'm -- I can get 4 on board with that. If I pull you over for a tint 5 ticket -- or a tint violation or no license plates on your 6 car, come up to the car, "Officer Serin. License" -- "I pulled you over. You have no license plates on your car." 8 9 You're supposed to have two, right? state of California, in legislation, everybody's supposed 10 11 to have two. I pay my registration; I pay my insurance, 12 just like probably everybody in this room. 13 They don't got any ID on them. So now what? Do 14 I -- can I ask you where you live? Can I ask you if you're on probation or parole because maybe I can identify 15 you that way. "Have you been arrested in the city?" 16 That's -- that's [indiscernible] available to me? 17 There has to be some -- some guidelines. 18 19 mean, you can't -- like, does everybody in this room --20 does everybody in this room want no cars on the roadway 21 with license plates and no lights on at night and -- like, 22 is there -- can we all be on that level that we probably 23 shouldn't have cars on the roadway that are fully tinted 24 out where we can't see who's in it? Ninety percent of the 25 time I can't see -- I just see an egregious movement, a

```
1
    CDC violation, and I make a stop. I use discretion all
 2
    the time. Cops use discretion. We [phonetic] advise --
              You said 4,000 -- 4,000 stops were made in 2019
 3
    for license plates. Out of those stops, 85 percent
 4
    nothing was found. In 2019, there was 103,000 stops.
 5
 6
    That's what your office gave me last week, 103,000. So
    you said I have 103,000; 4,000 were stopped for license
    plates. A very -- very, very low percentage on a license
 8
9
    plate.
10
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
                                         I do just want to
11
    stay let's stay on top- -- like, there's a --
12
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                Yeah.
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: -- we're going to get
13
14
    to all of this throughout these working groups --
15
         OFFICER SERIN:
                        Okay.
16
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: -- a lot of points
17
    you're raising. But we are trying to confine it to the
    subject matter for each working group and, within subject
18
19
    matter for each working group, specific questions that I
20
    want us to be able to get to today before we leave.
         OFFICER SERIN: Oh [inaudible].
21
22
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: So I hear you.
23
    appreciate your -- your comment.
24
         OFFICER SERIN: Do you agree we shouldn't have cars
25
    on the roadway with no license plates and fully tinted
```

```
1
    out -- do you agree with that? --
 2.
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
                                         T --
         OFFICER SERIN: -- driving around whoever -- in
 3
    whatever neighborhood, whenever you want? Do you think we
 4
 5
    should have that?
 6
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Well, it -- honestly,
    I would love to have this conversation with you, but it's
8
    not on topic right --
9
         OFFICER SERIN: [Overlapping].
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: It's not -- right
10
    now, I want us to be able to discuss --
11
12
         OFFICER SERIN:
                         Okay.
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: -- parole and
13
    probation searches, which is the topic, and --
14
15
         OFFICER SERIN: Yes, sir.
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: -- and -- and please
16
17
    save your question, please save your comment --
18
         OFFICER SERIN: Yes, sir.
19
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: -- for our next
20
    working group meeting where we will be talking about the
21
    stuff that --
         OFFICER SERIN: I'll be there.
22
23
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: -- you just raised.
24
         OFFICER SERIN: Yes, sir.
25
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: And I think I just
```

```
made a mistake. I shouldn't have called on you because
1
 2
    this right now is for working group members.
         OFFICER SERIN:
                         I apologize.
 3
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: And there's -- no
 4
 5
    need for apologies. My mistake.
              But there will be a public comment portion at
 6
 7
    the end of this where anyone from the public can comment.
8
    So I was out of order by --
9
         OFFICER SERIN:
                         Thanks for letting me [overlapping].
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: You had a very
10
    assertive hand raise, and I just kind of went with it.
11
12
    But. --
13
              (Unidentifiable speakers speaking
              simultaneously is indiscernible and/or
14
              inaudible and not transcribed.)
15
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: But that was my
16
    mistake.
17
              John, I'm sorry. Your comment is also going to
18
19
    have to wait for a public comment [overlapping].
                                 [Indiscernible].
20
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                [Inaudible].
21
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
22
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Yes, please.
23
    parole/probation searches. We're still on that.
24
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, thank you. Absolutely.
25
              I agree with what -- what DPA has stated that
```

even people stopped and being asked that question can 1 2 indicate the bias itself to assume that, you know, people of color are more likely to be on probation and parole. 3 We are recommending that the question be 4 prohibited entirely or that there will be blanket language 5 6 about prohibiting questions that are unrelated to the stop and to the reasons for the stop. And having a probation or parole violation is a 9 very different type of -- type of events than a traffic infraction/traffic violation [inaudible] separate 10 reasonable suspicion or probable cause for that to occur. 11 12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. Chief? CHIEF SCOTT: Yeah, I -- and so there's -- I think 13 14 there's a couple issues to unpack here. 15 Where the department is in agreement is officers should be -- there's discretion about the officer walking 16 17 up on a traffic stop and saying, "Are you on probation?" "Are you on parole?" without any other reason to say that. 18 19 The department is in agreement that that's not 20 [indiscernible] in the course of the way things are. 21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh. 22 CHIEF SCOTT: However, the -- the flip side of that 23 is in the course of that traffic stop, say the officer is 24 doing the -- the records -- I mean, the check on the 25 They're going to run the person for

license or whatever.

warrants; they're going to run a person. If that parole flag then comes up, I think this is where the department is slightly in a different position because when you are on parole, you're -- you're -- basically, you have signed a document say -- that says "In order to get out of prison, I have to abide by these certain conditions," correct?

And if those conditions are -- if an officer then asks them basic questions as a part of that traffic stop investigation, I think we really need to think that through because these are the type things -- and this is feedback that I'm getting from officers -- that there's a little skepticism because now you're getting into an area where we're -- we're really inhibited from doing the job that I think we should be doing.

I think we're all for limiting asking the question. But during the course of the investigation, officers they have to run the person. It is a part of what they do on a traffic stop. That's what they do. And that's what they should be doing.

So if they find out that person is in parole, they already know where -- our position was if there is evidence of criminal activity, then that can be taken to a further degree. So, I mean, I -- I -- I think we're partially together on that, but I think we're -- we're not

on what happens after an officer discovers what -- whether 1 2 or not a person is on parole, if that makes sense. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My -- my question is really if 3 you're stopping somebody for a traffic stop, how does --4 invoking their parole search or probation search, how is 5 that useful? 6 If -- if you're stopping them for the broken taillight, you come up, you talk with them, you issue the 8 ticket for the broken taillight. 9 10 What benefit or purpose is there to execute a search, a parole or probation search? 11 CHIEF SCOTT: Well, it's not our position that that's 12 13 an automatic thing. But we've discussed internally in 14 our -- in our internal work group meetings is if there is 15 some type of reasonable -- reasonable suspicion from that point and the search is -- it should be proper for an 16 17 officer to do a parole search at that point because if you know a person is on parole -- they blew a stop sign. You 18 19 They're on parole. You verify it because run them. 20 sometimes the system is [indiscernible] still on parole. 21 And then you see something that indicates criminal

Are we saying -- well, we're -- we're saying that that should be okay for that officer to take that to whatever degree of searching you need to search to further

22

23

24

25

activity.

investigate that reasonable suspicion. I think --1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But I'm saying like say you --I -- you stop them for the taillight. You're issuing the 3 ticket for taillight. You find out he's on parole and he 4 has a search condition. So at that -- no other -- there's 5 6 nothing else. He hasn't made any furtive movements, no other -- no other factors. So at that point -- because the only thing that 9 is known to you is that he has a search condition, so at that point do you get to say, "All right. I get to search 10 11 you because you're on parole"? 12 CHIEF SCOTT: No. What -- what --13 I quess I'm trying to UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 14 understand the correlation between the two. Like, I 15 stopped you for the traffic violation. I now find out 16 you're on parole and you have search conditions. Do I get to exercise that? 17 CHIEF SCOTT: Well, as part of -- our position was if 18 19 there are other things there, then yes. 20 But to just ignore or not ask the question or 21 not determine whether a person is parole -- is -- is on 22 parole is -- we're in disagreement with that. 23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So they should be able to ask, 24 "Hey, are you on probation or parole?" 25 No, no, that's -- so in a traffic CHIEF SCOTT:

```
1
    stop -- they ran a stop sign.
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                Right.
         CHIEF SCOTT: The restriction should be you don't go
 3
    up and ask, "Are you on parole?"
 4
 5
              Okay. You run the person. And then
    [indiscernible] --
6
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                Right.
         CHIEF SCOTT: -- yeah, they're on parole.
 8
9
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                Okav.
10
         CHIEF SCOTT: And that, with other factors, will
11
    trigger that parole search.
                                If the other factors are
12
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
13
    reasonable suspicion that a separate crime occurred, I
14
    mean, I could get behind that barrier.
15
              What we're trying to -- what we don't want is
    probation or parole searches on the heels of a traffic
16
17
    violation only, because we want to avoid "hotspot"
    policing which is a term where officers go into high-crime
18
19
    neighborhoods, see a Black youth in a hoodie and say,
20
    "Okay. Well, maybe they're on probation or parole. It's
21
    a crap shoot. Let's pull them over for this tick" --
22
    ticky-tacky thing" for the purpose of conducting a
23
    probation or parole search, if they happen to be on it.
24
    That's what we want to avoid.
25
              But if there's a boundary around it where
```

```
1
    officers can conduct a probation or parole search if
 2
    there's reasonable suspicion for a separate crime, then I
    think that -- that's like a quardrail we could live with.
 3
         CHIEF SCOTT: Yeah, I mean, we're trying to put
 4
    quardrails. We -- we understand the issue at hand so I
 5
 6
    took the commissioner's question.
              Where this conversation has gone is that
8
    officers should just ignore the parole issue altogether,
    and I -- we don't agree with that.
9
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
10
                                          Okay.
                                                 Great.
11
              I want to get to one last -- one last topic
12
    before we go.
13
              John, your comments may have to wait till the
14
    public comment at the end.
15
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                [Inaudible].
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: No. You have to
16
17
    wait -- no, no, no, you're going to have to wait --
18
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                [Overlapping].
19
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: -- until general
20
    public comment to -- to make your comment or question.
21
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible].
22
         JOHN JONES: I think we all agree that
23
    [overlapping] --
24
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
                                          John, John, John,
25
    I -- I'm so sorry to interrupt, but right now we're --
```

```
1
    we're having a working group [indiscernible] discussion.
 2
         JOHN JONES: I'm sorry. [Overlapping] --
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: If you have a -- if
 3
 4
    you have a comment --
 5
         JOHN JONES: Yes.
 6
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: -- it's going to have
 7
    to wait for a public comment at the end.
 8
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's on the board.
9
         JOHN JONES: Public comment [indiscernible]?
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: [Overlapping] --
10
11
         JOHN JONES: Am I not a member of the public?
12
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
                                         Yes. But we're not.
13
    doing public comment right now.
14
         JOHN JONES:
                      I see.
15
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
                                         Okay.
16
    [Overlapping] --
17
         JOHN JONES: So this colloquy is supposed to be for
    our mutual benefit. Is that it?
18
19
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
                                         I think that's it.
20
         JOHN JONES: That's it? Okay.
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: I think that's it.
21
22
    Thank you.
23
              Okay. Last topic that I wanted to -- to cover
24
    before we leave. There was the issue -- and this is less
25
    of a policy issue but more of a -- a form issue.
```

There were various comments about the need for either more concision in the document, and others had the opposing view that -- that we needed to -- to have more explanation.

So POA, in -- in -- in two different areas, I believe, said we need to be way more concise; we need to cut this down. And the reason given, I think, in both instances was clarity for officers in the field who will need to be, you know, pulling this up on their phone at 2:00 a.m., perhaps, to figure out what they're supposed to do.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: There was BASEF [phonetic] -- who's not, I think, present today -- they had a comment basically using the same rationale, saying that for the benefit of officers, we actually need to provide way more context "because you haven't brought enough context here. So here is a rewrite that is way longer than what you're currently doing."

And as someone who has zero experience enforcing our traffic laws, this is something that I was actually very interested to hear from -- from folks about what is most helpful to the end user of the DGO in terms of should we have a document where we provide a lot of explanation and background so folks feel like, "Okay. I'm not"

```
[inaudible] "doing this. I understand why this document
1
 2
    says what it does or is it better to just have something
    more bare bones that just is a clear cookbook for what you
 3
    need to be doing?
 4
              I would love to hear any thoughts on that as a
 5
 6
    last topic before we move on.
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, you know, I've always
    been with the "clear and concise," which -- and it's true.
 8
9
    I mean, officers need that, whether it's 2 at -- 2:00 a.m.
    in the morning or 2:00 p.m. in the afternoon because they
10
    don't want to be sitting there, leafing through, you know,
11
12
    basically a textbook of, you know, words and phrases.
13
    They need to understand what it is you want them to do.
    And that's what these policies, you know, are supposed to
14
15
    be able to tell them, right? If they have a question,
    clear and concise -- right? -- and talk about --
16
17
              Yeah, we don't teach -- you know, the -- in the
    academy when you do your traffic stops, you know, it's
18
19
    identify yourself, state the reason you stopped them,
    "Please give me your license, registration, and
20
21
    insurance, and go back and do it from there.
22
              If the parole or probation is going to show --
23
    it's going to pop up when you run them --
24
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                Right.
25
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                 -- you know. And then it's
```

going to say, oh, they have a search condition. You have 1 2 the authority to exercise that. Your discretion is do you 3 want to. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there other reasonable 5 suspicion that is added to the weight of what you just 6 found out -- right? -- and then act on it. And so it's just like, just the policies have to 9 be clear and concise. And I think to remove the --10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: to -- to make the policy clear and concise removes any 11 12 ambiguity that the officer, at 2:00 in the morning, isn't 13 having to research a policy and read through it and then call their sergeant and say, "What should I do here?" It 14 15 should be very clear and concise. They should understand that this is what they should do when faced with these 16 17 situations, not just for traffic but for all of our policies. 18 19 COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Susan. 20 SUSAN BROCKMAN: I think that making something 21 concise definitely allows a lot of ambiguity because if 22 they -- if it says don't do this, then what about that? What about that? 23 24 And I think that if -- if you think that an 25 officer cannot absorb a lot of information in a policy,

1 then they should not be acting on their discretion or act 2 upon it. And if they are unsure of a policy, they should be calling their sergeant or calling someone for more 3 information. 4 So I do worry that -- that if you leave 6 something so vague, you're going to have them just doing anything that they want. COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Brian and then 9 [inaudible], do you want to do it? 10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, sir. COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Well, let's have 11 Brian and then [inaudible]. 12 13 BRIAN COX: I assume this is going to be in the 14 training rotation protocol for this. 15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes [phonetic]. BRIAN COX: [Indiscernible] like our policies 16 17 [inaudible]. So I [indiscernible], you know, [inaudible]. But will the training kind of distill some of 18 19 [Inaudible] bullet points for people even if the policies -- and they're substantive -- to kind of flesh 20 21 out these complex ideas? 22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's -- that's generally how 23 I do it is I reduce it into bullet points, and they're 24 easy to understand. 25 So then --BRIAN COX:

```
1
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And then I provide examples
    of -- of those situations.
 2
         BRIAN COX: Uh-huh.
 3
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Then the officer kind of
 4
 5
    [inaudible].
 6
         BRIAN COX: I have no questions.
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Okay. Okay. Chief
    and then [inaudible].
8
9
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm fine [inaudible].
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Okay. So the chief
10
    and then Commander Jones.
11
12
         CHIEF SCOTT: Yeah. We're talking about the purpose
13
    part -- right? -- the [overlapping].
14
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: You know what?
15
    Really, any section.
16
         CHIEF SCOTT: Okay.
17
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: The -- the comments
    we got were various sections. But, yeah, purpose was one
18
19
    of them.
20
         CHIEF SCOTT: Okay. Great. Thank you.
21
              Well, I was just going to say I -- I think what
22
    I'm hearing, it is important that we have the context of
23
    the why. The question -- policy questions, whether that
24
    context needs to be in a policy. And I think there's
25
    other ways -- there -- and I think there are other ways to
```

get at that, like Crispin was just saying. 1 The feedback that I get as far as that is -- and I'm not going to repeat what Tracy said, but I'll 3 reiterate it. You know, we have all these paragraphs 4 that -- that are, you know, historical context and things 5 6 I'm not saying they're -- it's not important, like that. because it is. The officer -- and I understand why they're, you know, grasping at getting to what we want 8 9 them to get to. However, these policies become so voluminous 10 that it just kind of gets kind of lost in -- in the noise. 11 12 And I think there are other ways to get -- to get at that. 13 And what we were trying to do, when we incorporate an implementation plan, is to really focus on some of the 14 15 "why" in the discussions as we implement the policies. That also will be documented because when we have a lesson 16 17 plan or we have a module of training, we -- we document that as well. 18 19 But what I'm hearing feedback from the -- the 20 officers who have to read these policies and apply them is 21 these things will come just kind of -- it gets lost in --22 in all the flowery language and all that; the meat of what 23 we're trying to tell them what they need to do gets lost. 24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible]. So that's what we're trying to have 25 CHIEF SCOTT:

that balance in.

I'm for concise and really making the -- the contextual part, keeping it -- keeping it as concise as -- as we can keep it. I'm not saying it shouldn't be there at all, but I think we need to really try to not have just voluminous paragraph after paragraph of opinions and things like that that really don't help the policy move forward.

So that -- that's kind of what the department's position [inaudible] discussion [inaudible].

COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Okay. Let's have Commander Jones.

And I think those would have to be the two last comments because the commissioners actually have an officer -- a town hall after this that you don't want to be too late to.

COMMANDER JONES: I also just wanted to advocate for clear and concise, but I wanted us all to be on the same page about what we mean when we say "clear and concise" because that means different things to different people.

I think that if we make a statement to our officers that says, "Absent reasonable suspicion or probable cause, you shall not" X, Y, Z, that's clear and concise for us.

I think what I would advocate for is to give a little credit that, you know, we understand what "reasonable suspicion" means and we're continuing to train on it and that we don't need a road map Step 1, Step 2, Step 3, Step 4, Step 5 that we can -- you know, we will be able to understand and train those concepts. So I just wanted to make that statement.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible].

ROME JONES: I just wanted to say I hope "clear and

ROME JONES: I just wanted to say I hope "clear and concise" isn't like some slippery language for "vague and open to interpretation" because that -- that's kind of what I'm getting, and that sounds like kind of dangerous.

So I actually would envision that there's a way to do both of these things: Have a longer explanation and a shorter one. I'm sure, like, in the moment of decisions, you need a very, like, clear answer quickly.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Cool.

ROME JONES: Also, like, if you're a grownup who gets paid ninety, a hundred thousand dollars a year -- I don't know where they start at, but let's assume -- I would assume that you would take note and then be like, "I didn't understand this situation. I'm going to go back and reread whatever I should be reading to have a deeper understanding for the next time I'm in that situation."

And then if we can't trust you to do that,

```
1
    should our city really be paying you this amount of money
    to enforce laws?
 2
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
 3
                                          Great.
              Matthew [phonetic], we're going to have to leave
 4
 5
    it on -- on that note.
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Indiscernible] do
 6
 7
    announcements?
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE:
                                         So --
 8
9
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But go -- [unintelligible].
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: I think -- so, yeah,
10
    we're going to -- we have a couple other agenda items we
11
    have to do. I think --
12
13
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Adoption of minutes.
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Adoption of minutes
14
15
    and general --
16
                                 [Inaudible].
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
17
         COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: -- public comment.
              Did you want to --
18
19
                           Just a couple of announcements with
         COMMANDER JONES:
    respect to the chief mentioned earlier the Center for
20
21
    Policing Equity. The department reached out to them and
22
    solicited their feedback on this process. They provided
23
    their feedback with respect to the pretext stops and the
24
    DGO. And I've asked that it be posted on the station
25
    [phonetic] websites, so please check it out. It's there.
```

Secondly, DPM [phonetic] and the department are 1 2 working on a probation and parole DGO currently that's being drafted and will hopefully soon be up for a final 3 draft for us to vote on and/or solicit feedback from, 4 because with respect to that DGO, I am [indiscernible] 5 that we will be using the 3.01 process and soliciting 6 feedback from the public for the 30-day-window period, as well as officers. 8 9 And thank you to the POA. I'm told that they 10 provided lunch. So a huge thank you to Tracy and the POA. 11 Those are my announcements. [Inaudible] the minutes. 12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible]. 13 All right. So we're going to 14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 15 go back to line item 2, which is going to be the Adoption of Minutes from the August 2nd, 2022, Meeting. It's an 16 17 action item. This is going to be a line item vote. One of the commissioners will make a motion and a second. And 18 19 then everybody's that's on the working group either needs to say "yes" or "no" for the approval. I just need 20 [inaudible]. 21 22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible]. 23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. So I just need a 24 motion. 25 Motion. COMMISSIONER ELIAS:

```
1
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And a second.
 2
         COMMISSIONER BENEDICTO: Second.
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. Motion by
 3
    Commissioner Elias; second by Commissioner Benedicto.
 4
 5
              On that motion to pass the minutes, how do you
6
    vote, Tracy McCray?
 7
         TRACY McCRAY: Aye.
 8
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                 "Aye" for Tracy McCray.
9
              Crispin Jones?
         OFFICER CRISPIN JONES: Aye.
10
11
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                 Crispin Jones, "aye."
              Brian Cox?
12
         BRIAN COX: Aye.
13
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                 Brian Cox is "aye."
14
15
              Angela Jenkins?
         ANGELA JENKINS: Aye.
16
17
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Angela Jenkins is "aye."
              Susan Brockman?
18
19
         SUSAN BROCKMAN: I wasn't here.
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You weren't here for the last
20
21
    time?
22
         SUSAN BROCKMAN:
                          No.
23
                                 Okay. If anything, then you
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
24
    can just [inaudible].
         SUSAN BROCKMAN: [Inaudible].
25
```

```
1
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, you can [inaudible].
              All right. Brian Kneuker?
 2
 3
         BRIAN KNEUKER: Aye.
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Brian Kneuker is "aye."
 4
 5
              Commander Yep?
         COMMANDER YEP:
 6
                         Aye.
 7
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                 Commander Yep is "aye."
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                 Commander Jones?
 8
9
         COMMANDER JONES: Aye.
                                Commander Jones is "aye."
10
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
11
              Janelle Caywood?
12
         JANELLE CAYWOOD: Aye.
13
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                Janelle Caywood is "aye."
14
              Allyssa?
15
         ALLYSSA VICTORY: Aye.
16
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's "aye."
17
              Montgomery [inaudible]?
18
         MONTGOMERY: Aye.
19
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                                 "Aye."
              Chief Scott?
20
21
         CHIEF SCOTT: Aye.
22
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Rome Jones?
23
         ROME JONES: Aye.
24
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. And Commissioner
25
    Carter-Oberstone?
```

1	COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Aye.
2	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commissioner Benedicto?
3	COMMISSIONER BENEDICTO: Aye.
4	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. We have all
5	unanimous. The motion passes.
6	Line item 4, we have already covered the
7	upcoming working dates unless you want to cover it again.
8	All right. So the next item is going to be
9	general public comment.
10	General public comment, due to the need to get
11	through this, [indiscernible] number of people will be
12	limited to one minute. If you have public comment, please
13	raise your hand.
14	Please state your name and then your comment.
15	DONALD LUU: Yes. My name is Donald Luu. I do not
16	have any comment for today's presentation, but I will
17	have provide a comment next time as we discuss the
18	guiding rules.
19	It is unclear to me, you know, who's on the
20	working group and who's who's the public. I thought
21	I'm I'm on the on the working group. It's unclear.
22	So does that mean that, you know, when we sign
23	in next time, we can we can ask to be on the working
24	group? I I I need to I need to have that
25	[inaudible] because next time I would like to have I

1 would -- I would like to have the opportunity [inaudible] 2 to make more comments beside the very short time that we have [inaudible]. 3 COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Okay. 4 think -- let's talk about this. Well, maybe it's -- it's 5 better to address right now. 6 So for the first working group, we allowed 8 anyone who wanted to be on the working group to opt in, 9 and so it was totally open. And I believe you were here. I believe you did express a desire to be on the working 10 group. And so you're -- as -- as far as I was counting, I 11 12 thought you were in the working group. I -- I -- so I think it's going to be difficult 13 14 for future meetings if someone shows up for the first time 15 or the third or the fourth meeting to join the working group for the first time, though. 16 17 (Timer.) COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: 18 But because I agree 19 we -- we were not clear and I personally was not clear on 20 this, if there's anyone who's here that wasn't on the 21 working group for the first one but wants to be on the 22 working group going forward, we will welcome you; but I 23 don't think we're going to take any new folks for the

Thank you [inaudible].

24

25

third one.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just for clarity, if do you 2 want to be on the -- on the working group, there is a sign-in sheet. Please write your name and your e-mail 3 address so that we can send you the [inaudible]. 4 All right. Next -- next public comment. 5 Yes, sir. Please state your name and your 6 7 comment. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, please [phonetic]. 9 COMMANDER JONES: You're up, Mr. Jones. JOHN JONES: Oh. I think we would all agree that you 10 11 cannot justify a search by what it turns up. We all agree 12 on that. 13 I would suggest to you that you cannot condemn a 14 search by what it does not turn up for the same reason, if 15 what a search turns up is irrelevant to the bona fides of the search to start with. 16 17 If you look at the statistics proposed -propounded in favor of this rule, this new rule, it rests 18 19 on the presumption that you conferred from a particular 20 group as low -- you get a low percentage of contraband, or 21 whatever, in the search as to that group; therefore, 22 searches as to that group are banned. But the -- what flows from a search is 23 24 irrelevant, the bona fides of the search. And if you

accept that, 50 percent of the rationale in favor of this

25

1	proposed rule is irrelevant and should be discarded.
2	Most of the people on this
3	(Timer.)
4	JOHN JONES: committee have legal training. They
5	know this. This is this is Search and Seizure 101 in
6	law school.
7	So two questions: I suggest you, one, disregard
8	the reasoning and you question where it comes from. These
9	are people who know better, and they're flushing this on
10	you to try to convince you that this new proposed rule
11	actually has merit.
12	My name is John Jones, and I approve this
13	message.
14	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Any other public comment?
15	Yes, ma'am.
16	TATIANA WOODS: Hello, everyone. My name Tatiana
17	[phonetic] Woods. I'm a policy advocate at Legal
18	Services
19	(Telephone ringing.)
20	TATIANA WOODS: for Prisoners With Children.
21	I don't think anyone in any community would
22	describe a traffic stop as a positive contact with police
23	especially when their stop immediately turns to unrelated
24	questions about why that officer really pulled you over:
25	"Where are you going?" "What's your address?" "Have you

1 ever been arrested or are you on probation or parole?" 2 "Can you roll down the back window?" None of these questions have anything to do with a broken taillight or driving without a front license 4 plate, but this is how those stops go. Along with shining 5 flashlights, searching for something more than whatever 6 traffic violation happened, stops like this lead to a feeling of being targeted. And we know from SFPD data 8 9 that stops are handled differently --(Timer.) 10 TATIANA WOODS: -- in different neighborhoods in the 11 12 city. Thank you for taking steps to limit these 13 interactions and for making sure traffic stops are no 14 15 longer an excuse to harass someone in Bayview-Hunters Point or the Mission. 16 17 And I am from Bayview-Hunters Point. I grew up on Harbor Road, born and raised. And I've witnessed these 18 19 types of traffic stops. Also, I've also been a victim of 20 these type of traffic stops. I was actually beaten out of 21 my car one day just because I'm on probation and they thought I had somebody in the back seat with a firearm. 22 23 Thank you for hearing my public comment. And I 24 hope you guys take that into consideration. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 25 Thank you.

1	Any other public comment?
2	Officer.
3	UNIDENTIFIABLE SPEAKER: Yeah, Officer Serin,
4	Northern station.
5	To touch on your point, Mr. Rome, we're 500
6	officers short right now, so we ain't hiring nobody at
7	\$100,000 right now.
8	To take your point, ma'am, about knowing a lot
9	of policies, I behoove anybody in here we got 200
10	bulletins-plus every year; we got DGOs; we got penal
11	codes.
12	Anybody do a like a scenario? I'll give you
13	all the reading you need, I'll give you six months, and
14	we'll do some scenarios testing to see how it is to do a
15	traffic stop to why we ask to roll down the back window,
16	ma'am. For safety. I can't see in the car. That's why I
17	ask to roll down the back window.
18	Now, I agree with everybody. If I pull you
19	over, like I said to the commissioner, yeah, pull you over
20	for a license plate. "How you doing? Officer Serin. The
21	reason I stopped you is because you have no license plates
22	on your car."
23	And that's a law here in the state of California
24	that everybody in this room, I believe, follows I hope,
25	follows. That's how we treat people during that traffic

1	stop. I can get behind all that.
2	But a blanket of not enforcing anything
3	Commissioner, you couldn't even ask
4	(Timer.)
5	DONALD LUU: you said you don't want cars in
6	your in your city with tinted-out windows and no
7	license plates on it at 2:00 in the morning with maybe no
8	lights on, too; maybe one taillight out. You want these
9	cars rolling around in whatever neighborhood? Okay.
10	I don't think that's the best for public safety,
11	like you said, sir.
12	And safety, too, is how we treat them
13	[indiscernible] into the car.
14	So I think we need to just use reasonableness.
15	We need to keep our feelings out of it, keep our feelings
16	out of it, and be reasonable and accomplish the goal.
17	I want to stay here in the city. Okay? I've
18	been a cop for ten years, on the streets, on the streets.
19	So just thank you for your time, and I hope you
20	can come to a reasonable goal here because
21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, ma'am.
22	CARLYN JI JONG GOOSSEN: Hi. Good afternoon. My
23	name is Caroline Ji Jong Goossen. I am a policy
24	[indiscernible] with the Public Defender's office. I'm
25	also a mother, and I run the prayer community in

1 San Francisco. 2 And we've been talking about these issues -- I just wanted to share because you can't tell in the room. 3 Of course it's during a workday at police headquarters --4 but over 60 organizations, members of communities ranging 5 from faith communities, communities of color across this 6 city, civil rights groups, and traffic safety groups have been talking about this issue for well over a year in 8 9 San Francisco. These are very reasonable and commonsense ways that we can increase human rights in the city and 10 address racism and racial bias. 11 12 And I just want to thank everybody who's been a 13 part of it. I want to thank the [indiscernible] community 14 members who come out to a place that not everyone always, 15 you know, feels safe here and to -- I just appreciate all the work that's gone into this new commission [inaudible]. 16 17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thanks [phonetic]. 18 CARLYN JI JONG GOOSSEN: So thank you. 19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Any other member? 20 All right. Seeing none, public comment is 21 closed. 22 We'll move on to line item 5, Adjournment. 23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible]. 24 COMMISSIONER CARTER-OBERSTONE: Thank you, everyone. 25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

```
(Unidentifiable speakers speaking
1
 2
               simultaneously is indiscernible and/or
               inaudible and not transcribed.)
 3
 4
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Overlapping]. Please feel
    free to fill them out and [inaudible].
 5
6
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Officer Martin? I wanted to
7
    say thank you [overlapping].
               (Unidentifiable speakers speaking
8
              simultaneously is indiscernible and/or
9
               inaudible and not transcribed.)
10
11
              (End of transcription. See next page.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```