



DPA

San Francisco Department of Police Accountability

PAUL DAVID HENDERSON
Executive Director

November 13, 2019

To: President Robert Hirsch
Members, San Francisco Police Commission

Re: SFPD Third Quarter 2019 Document Protocol Report

Dear President Hirsch and Commissioners:

This letter supplements the San Francisco Police Department's 2019 third quarter report concerning documents requested by DPA under the DPA-SFPD document protocol. In compliance with the established protocol, Chief of Investigations Erick Baltazar reviewed and discussed the Department's 2019 third quarter report with Lieutenant R. Andrew Cox, the Officer in Charge of the Legal Division.

During the second quarter of 2019, the DPA made 303 document requests. Of the 303 document requests, six (6) requests were untimely produced, and four (4) requests were denied. SFPD requested extensions for 13 documents in a timely manner.

Sincerely,

Paul Henderson
Executive Director

RECEIVED
R11-4-19

Memorandum

San Francisco Police Department



To: Captain Mark Cota #1335
Commanding Officer
Risk Management Division

APPROVED	YES	NO
Captain <u>Mark Cota #1335</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

From: Lieutenant R. Andrew Cox #287
Legal Division

Date: Wednesday, October 30, 2019

Subject: DPA Document Protocol Quarterly Report - 3rd Quarter 2019

Issue:

Below is a compilation of statistical data regarding the San Francisco Police Department's provision of documents to the Department of Police Accountability from the time period of **07/01/2019 – 09/30/2019 (3rd Quarter)**.

Discussion:

The following report is offered in accordance with Section VII of the Protocol between the Department of Police Accountability and the San Francisco Police Department regarding responding to written requests for documents.

Routine requests for documents received at bureaus, divisions, units, stations, and details were not logged in formally at the Legal Division. However, copies of the requests received are kept in a monthly file.

- I. The number of DPA written requests received at the Legal Division for documents within each category (Routine, Non-Routine, and Juvenile);
 - a. Juvenile 4
 - b. Non-Routine 88
 - c. Routine 211
 - Total 303**

- II. The number of requests within each category for which there was a timely production;
 - a. Juvenile 0
 - b. Non-Routine 79
 - c. Routine 201
 - Total 280**

- III. The number of requests within each category for which there was a timely notification of an extension or time for production;
- | | |
|----------------|-----------|
| a. Juvenile | 0 |
| b. Non-Routine | 8 |
| c. Routine | <u>5</u> |
| Total | 13 |
- IV. The number of requests within each category for which there was an untimely notification of an extension of time for production;
- | | |
|----------------|----------|
| a. Juvenile | 0 |
| b. Non-Routine | 0 |
| c. Routine | <u>0</u> |
| Total | 0 |
- V. The number of requests within each category for which there was a late production;
- | | |
|----------------|----------|
| a. Juvenile | 0 |
| b. Non-Routine | 1 |
| c. Routine | <u>5</u> |
| Total | 6 |
- VI. The number of requests within each category for which there was a denial or a partial denial of disclosure and the legal/factual basis therefore;
- | | |
|----------------|----------|
| a. Juvenile | 4 |
| b. Non-Routine | 0 |
| c. Routine | <u>0</u> |
| Total | 4 |
- VII. The status of any non-routine request(s) that remain pending at the close of the reporting period of for which there is a dispute between the Department and DPA;
- | | |
|----------------|----------|
| a. Juvenile | 0 |
| b. Non-Routine | 0 |
| c. Routine | <u>0</u> |
| Total | 0 |
- VIII. The status of any request(s) that remain pending at the close of the reporting period;
- | | |
|----------------|----------|
| a. Juvenile | 0 |
| b. Non-Routine | 0 |
| c. Routine | <u>0</u> |
| Total | 0 |
- IX. Recommendations, if any, for improvements to this protocol and the procedures used to ensure timely responses by the Department and to

DPA requests for documents and other materials, and for the effective use of SFPD staff and resources in responding thereto;

No recommendations at this time

Conclusion:

This report satisfies the reporting requirements under section VII of the SFPD/DPA Document Protocol.

Recommendation:

Please review and forward to The San Francisco Police Commission.

Attachments:

3rd Quarter 2019 DPA/SFPD Application print out.