

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

BUDGET AND LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

1390 Market Street, Suite 1150, San Francisco, CA 94102

PHONE (415) 552-9292 FAX (415) 252-0461

Budget Analysis Report

To: Budget and Appropriations Committee
From: Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office
Re: Alternatives to Law Enforcement Services
Date: May 10, 2021

Summary of Requested Action

We were asked to provide an analytical report on alternatives to services currently provided by law enforcement agencies. Specifically, we were asked to answer the following questions: (1) Can the City provide a civilian response to 911 calls related to homelessness and mental health crises?; (2) What is the public safety impact of certain Police assignments?; (3) Are there funded alternatives to certain programs currently carried out by the Police Department?; (4) Are there opportunities to civilianize work-ordered services provided by the Police and Sheriff Departments to other City departments?; and, (5) Are there opportunities to reduce administrative costs at the Police and Sheriff Departments?

For further information about this report, contact Dan Goncher at the Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....2
Policy Options.....6
Overview of the Police and Sheriff's Departments.....8
Police Civilianization Update.....11
Staffing of Select Police Units.....12
Traffic Enforcement.....14
Civilianizing Response to Calls for Service.....21
Police Services to Other Departments.....25
Sheriff Work Order Services for Department of Public Health.....32
Police and Sheriff Department Administrative and Contract Costs.....36

Executive Summary

Airport Security

- The Board of Supervisors could make it City policy for the Sheriff to assume law enforcement responsibilities at the Airport and request the Airport Commission to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Sheriff. This would allow Police assigned to the Airport to instead be assigned to duties in the City but would create new ongoing General Fund costs of \$25.8 million (accounting for the closure of County Jail 4), as Police transfer from the Airport to the City. These costs could be partially offset by postponing hiring police officers, saving \$31.2 million in one-time costs over several fiscal years. Replacing Police staff with Sheriff staff would save the Airport approximately \$5.0 million per year, if Deputy Sheriffs continue to be paid less than Police Officers but would require one-time Airport costs of approximately \$12.7 million to hire deputy sheriffs to replace Police at the Airport.
- Deputy Sheriffs would have to undergo special training related to Airport law enforcement activities and assume responsibility for ongoing investigations as the transfer of functions takes place. According to the Airport, the San Mateo County Sheriff has indicated that he would retain the police power at SFO for San Mateo County Sherriff's Deputies if any changes to current law enforcement staffing were implemented.

FY 2020-22 Budget Issues

- The Board of Supervisors made several reductions to the Mayor's proposed FY 2020-22 budget, totaling \$6.3 million in FY 2020-21 and \$20.1 million in FY 2021-22. These reductions included deletion of funding for one General Fund Police Academy in FY 2020-21 and both General Fund Police Academies in FY 2021-22. In addition, the Board reduced General Fund overtime expenditures in FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22. Funding was then added to the Police Department budget to create positions to continue the Department's civilianization process. In addition, the Board reduced the Body Worn Camera project budget and uniforms budget to align with expected expenditures at the time. Finally, the Police Department and Library agreed to reduce the work order funding Police patrols at Library facilities.
- Our FY 2020-22 budget review recommended a reduction to the Police Department's FY 2020-21 materials and supplies budget, with which the Department disagreed. Instead of reducing that budget, the Board of Supervisors place \$400,000 of the Department's materials and supplies budget on Budget & Finance Committee Reserve, of which, as of the writing of this report, the Department has not requested release. In addition, the Board placed \$12,765,681 of overtime expenditures in FY 2021-22 on Budget & Finance Committee Reserve. To remain on Budget & Finance Committee reserve during FY 2021-22, the Committee will have to take action again during the upcoming review of the FY 2021-22 budget.
- The Board of Supervisors reduced the Mayor's proposed FY 2020-22 budget for the Sherriff's Office by \$345,608 in FY 2020-21 and \$488,413 in FY 2021-22. These reductions

were to the Sheriff's air travel and justice storekeeper budgets. Additionally, the Board of Supervisors placed \$9,283,178 of community-based organization funding in FY 2021-22 on Budget & Finance Committee Reserve, pending a review of the feasibility of transferring oversight of these services to a civilian agency. In addition, the Board placed \$7,943,916 of FY 2021-22 overtime expenditures on Committee reserve. To remain on Budget & Finance Committee reserve during FY 2021-22, the Committee will have to take action again during the upcoming review of the FY 2021-22 budget.

Police Civilianization Update

- In response to civilianization studies released in 2018 by the Budget and Legislative Analyst as well as the Controller's Office, the Board of Supervisors authorized the creation of 75 civilian positions in order to civilianize an equal amount of sworn staff positions over the three-year period of FY 2018-19 to FY 2020-21 (25 positions each year). The Mayor's proposed FY 2020-22 budget deleted 45 previously approved civilianization positions that were vacant and the Board of Supervisors restored funding to nine of those positions for FY 2020-21. This has resulted in 39 net funded additional civilian positions in the current year from the original 75 authorized by the Board of Supervisors in 2018.

Staffing of Select Police Units

- We reviewed the staffing levels of select Police units as requested by the Budget & Appropriations Committee. The results of this review are shown in Exhibit 6 on page 13 of this report. Between June 2020 and March 2021, staffing of these units were generally stable, with two notable exceptions: (1) there are no longer any staff assigned to the School Resource Officer program and (2) Police staffing at the Healthy Streets Operations Center decreased from 33 to 14.

Traffic Enforcement

- Due to State law, only law enforcement officers may conduct traffic enforcement activities. In San Francisco, the Police Department is responsible for traffic enforcement. The Police enforce a variety of traffic code requirements, many of which are related to life safety. However, approximately 29 percent of traffic stops in 2019 (18,620 stops out of 64,282 total traffic stops) were for equipment violations or other non-moving violations that did not present an immediate threat to human life or were to enforce local traffic regulations. If the City de-prioritized enforcing those violations, it would free-up approximately 6.25 FTE Police Officer time.
- Further analysis is needed to specify the universe of traffic stops that the City should de-prioritize, as certain non-life safety violations may implicate a serious crime (such as hiding a license plate from a stolen car) or further another policy priority, such as transit-only lanes or smog control.
- We also note that Black drivers were stopped for equipment violations at a higher rate than their estimated proportion of the driving population and that the Police Department is still in the process of implementing recommendations related to bias in traffic enforcement from the Department of Justice 2016 assessment of the Police Department.

- There are opportunities to expand the City's red light camera program (if funding is identified) to detect red light violations, but other automated enforcement, such as using speed and parking cameras, requires a change in State law. A bill pending in the California State Legislature would allow for the use of speed cameras and allow civilians to issue citations for speeding violations detected by those cameras. To transfer most traffic enforcement activities to civilians, State law must be changed.

Civilianizing Response to Calls for Service

- We reviewed 2019 calls for service for 911 calls and self-initiated activities related to behavioral health crisis and homelessness, as requested by the Budget & Appropriations Committee, as well as for wellness checks and noise complaints, two other high-volume calls for service identified by the Police Department for potential diversion for an alternative civilian response.
- Our estimate of full-time equivalent Police staff to respond to mental health, homeless related, wellness checks, and noise complaints in 2019 were 102.24 FTEs for Priority A calls, 50.93 FTEs for Priority B calls, and 44.39 FTEs for Priority C calls.
- The budget for FY 2021-22 includes funding for a total of six Street Crisis Response teams with the intention to respond to all Priority B Mentally Disturbed Person calls throughout the City 24 hours per day, seven days per week. All teams are expected to be active in July 2021. The effectiveness of this program and outcomes of individuals served by the program are being evaluated through two parallel evaluations, with early results from full implementation of this program expected in fall 2021. While the diversion takes place, the Police Department will continue to respond to these calls and may co-respond even if the calls are primarily responded to by the SCRT.
- According to Street Crisis program documents, the team could potentially be expanded to respond to 801 calls (persons attempting suicide), as well as calls for 5150 (mental health detention). Calls coded 806 (juvenile beyond parental control) may be suited to a similar behavioral health team. Further study is needed to determine whether these calls would be suited to the Street Crisis Response Team.
- The Police Department has identified other call types that could potentially be diverted to civilians, including calls related to homelessness (code 915), wellness checks (code 910), and noise complaints (code 415). These call types may not be suited for the Street Crisis Response Team because they do not involve individuals in acute mental health crisis.
- The City does not currently have funded civilian alternatives that could respond to homeless, wellness checks, and noise complaint calls. Homeless-related 911 calls are currently responded to by Healthy Streets Operations Center Police staff. Further analysis is needed to determine the appropriate composition of civilian staffing to respond to these calls.

Police Services to Other Departments

- The Police Department provides law enforcement services to other City departments, the Transbay Joint Powers Authority, and Treasure Island Development Authority through

work orders and a memorandum of understanding. Exhibit 17 on pages 27 & 28 of this report summarizes Police work order and potential alternatives. The FY 2021-22 revenues may be adjusted in the Mayor's proposed budget for FY 2021-22.

- Significant services provided by the Police Department for other City departments include:
 - A work order with SFMTA to provide security for Muni and parking garages; night-time parking enforcement; and taxi enforcement.
 - A work order with the Port consisting of bike patrol, community engagement, and cruise security.
 - A work order with Public Works to accompany juvenile offenders during graffiti clean-ups.
 - A work order with the City Administrator to provide Police overtime for large events at the Moscone Center.
 - A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) to provide law enforcement services to that TJPA property, which primarily consists of the Transbay Transit Center.

Sheriff Services for the Department of Public Health

- The Sheriff has a work order with the Department of Public Health (DPH), totaling \$21.3 million in FY 2020-21, to provide law enforcement services at Zuckerberg General Hospital, Laguna Honda Hospital, and San Francisco Health Network clinics. The Sheriff maintains fixed-post security stations; conducts foot, bike, and vehicle patrols; responds to public safety emergencies and calls for service; and proactively searches for missing persons.
- In response to a request from the Budget and Appropriations Committee during the FY 2020-22 budget process, along with internal DPH concerns and advocacy from staff and community groups, DPH developed a proposal to partially civilianize the public safety services. This proposal is summarized in Exhibit 20 on page 34 of this report.
- We estimate that the DPH's civilianization proposal will cost \$2.7 million more per year than the work order service provided by the Sheriff. The cost increase is due to a net increase in staffing of 26.40 FTE.
- In FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20, uses of force on Black and White patients at General Hospital were both disproportionate relative to their share of the overall patient population. According to DPH, nearly all use of force incidents occur in response to a call for service from DPH staff, not from self-initiated activity.
- DPH's civilianization proposal is a pilot project that involves the creation of a new clinical team to respond to patients in crisis at General Hospital and replacing Deputy Sheriffs currently performing patrol and fixed-post security at General Hospital, Laguna Honda Hospital, and San Francisco Health Network clinics with civilian security.

Police and Sheriff Administration Costs

- As shown in Exhibit 22 on page 36 of this report, between FY 2017-18 and FY 2020-21, administrative costs increased by \$14.4 million at the Police Department and decreased

by \$500,000 at the Sheriff's Department. Administrative costs include executive management and support functions such as accounting and information technology. Between FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21, Police Department administrative costs decreased from \$132.9 million to \$120.4 million, primarily due to deleting vacant positions and reducing vehicle purchases.

- We will review administrative costs for the Police and Sheriff Departments as part of our annual budget review and will provide recommendations for budget adjustments, as appropriate.

Project Staff: Dan Goncher and Nick Menard

Policy Options

The Board of Supervisors could:

1. Choose to fund the civilianization positions recommended by the Police Commission in FY 2021-22 or enhance funding for civilianization positions based on the recommendations of prior staffing studies.
2. Work with the Mayor, Police Commission, and Police Chief to align staffing of Police units with Board policy priorities.
3. Work with the Mayor and MTA Board of Directors to increase funding for Automated Traffic Enforcement.
4. Work with Mayor, Police Commission, and Police Chief to provide policy guidance to the enforcement priorities of low-level traffic violations.
5. Request an update from the Chief of Police regarding the implementation status of the traffic enforcement bias recommendations from the 2016 Department of Justice assessment.
6. Request the Mayor, Police Chief, Department of Public Health, and Fire Department conduct further analysis to determine if a civilian behavioral health team is suited to respond to other mental health related calls, including persons attempting suicide, mental health detention, juvenile beyond parental control, wellness checks, and noise complaints and report back to the Board by May 1, 2022.
7. Request the Mayor, Police Chief, and Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing to develop a plan for a civilian response to homeless-related 911 calls and report back to the Board by May 1, 2022.
8. Work with the Mayor, City Administrator, SFMTA Board of Directors, Port Commission, and Police Commission to evaluate the ongoing need for Police Department work orders for SFMTA Garage Security, Taxi Enforcement, Nighttime Parking Enforcement, Port Cruise Security, and Public Works Graffiti Abatement.
9. Work with the Mayor, Police Commission, Police Chief, and TJPA Board of Directors to reduce the scope of Police Department services at the Transbay Transit Center (removing responses to homeless and mental illness incidents) and enter into new agreements

between TJPA, the Department of Public Health, and the Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing to fund the work of the Street Crisis Response Team and Homeless Outreach Team at the Transbay Transit Center.

10. Request that the Mayor include the civilianization of security at Public Health hospitals and clinics in the FY 2021-23 two-year proposed budget.
11. Request that the Mayor, Director of Public Health, and Sheriff define measures of success to the civilianization effort, including timeline for implementation, demographic patterns for uses of force, and impact on public safety. Depending on the outcome of the pilot, the Board of Supervisors could then request an expansion of civilian security at DPH facilities.

Overview of the Police & Sheriff's Departments

The Police Department provides citywide and Airport patrol and investigation law enforcement services. The Sheriff's Department operates the City's jails and provides protection for City facilities, including for the Departments of Public Health, Emergency Management, Public Utilities Commission, Medical Examiner, Library, City Hall, and others. Exhibit 1 below summarizes each department's budget by major funding source.

Exhibit 1: Police and Sheriff Expenditure Budgets

Police	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21	Change
General Fund	\$519,400,588	\$553,981,517	\$601,939,671	\$573,788,841	\$54,388,253
Airport	58,264,799	60,852,566	78,072,176	80,386,750	22,121,951
Work Orders	4,846,066	5,377,094	5,892,359	5,866,974	1,020,908
Special Revenue	5,765,031	8,626,998	6,418,110	7,848,537	2,083,506
Total	\$588,276,484	\$628,838,175	\$692,322,316	\$667,891,102	\$79,614,618

Sheriff	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21	Change
General Fund	\$205,750,473	\$221,270,749	\$227,711,491	\$213,177,140	\$7,426,667
Work Orders	21,867,052	23,463,118	27,768,805	27,428,573	5,561,521
Special Revenue	4,217,444	3,859,148	5,338,193	4,406,900	189,456
Total	\$231,834,969	\$248,593,015	\$260,818,489	\$245,012,613	\$13,177,644

Source: Annual Appropriation Ordinances & Financial System data

As shown above, both the Police and Sheriff's Departments are primarily funded by the General Fund. Between FY 2017-18 and FY 2020-21, total budgeted expenditures increased by \$79.6 million in the Police Department and by \$13.2 million in the Sheriff's Department. However, in FY 2020-21, the Mayor's proposed budget and final adopted budget approved by the Board of Supervisors both reduced Police and Sheriff expenditures between FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21. Exhibit 2 below shows the changes to the Police and Sheriff budgets between FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21 that were made to accommodate lower revenues in FY 2020-21 and to redirect funding from law enforcement to other activities.

Exhibit 2: Reductions to Police and Sheriff Budgets, FY 2019-20 to FY 2020-21

	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21	Change	Percent Change
Police	\$692,322,316	\$667,891,102	(\$24,431,214)	(3.5%)
Sheriff	260,818,489	245,012,613	(15,805,876)	(6.1%)

Source: Financial System data

As shown above, between FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21, the Police Department's budget was reduced by \$24.4 million (3.5 percent) and the Sheriff's Department's budget was reduced by \$15.8 million (6.1 percent).

July 2020 Budget Priority Report

Our July 2, 2020 Budget and Policy Analysis Report of the Police Department detailed policy considerations for the Board of Supervisors in advance of the Board's review of the FY 2020-22 proposed budget. The report included information and analysis regarding: (1) an update to the Police Department's progress on civilianization; (2) alternative staffing options at the Airport, including replacing Police sworn staff with Sheriff sworn staff; (3) litigation settlement spending over the prior five years; and (4) staffing levels of certain Police units.

Airport

As noted the July 2020 report, the Police Department provides law enforcement services to the Airport. The Police Airport Bureau is funded by Airport revenues, which are restricted by federal regulations to be used for airport purposes only. The Board of Supervisors could make it City policy for the Sheriff to assume law enforcement responsibilities at the Airport and request the Airport Commission to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Sheriff. This would allow Police assigned to the Airport to instead be assigned to duties in the City, but would create new ongoing General Fund costs of \$25.8 million (accounting for the closure of County Jail 4), as Police transfer from the Airport to the City. These costs could be partially offset by postponing hiring police officers, saving \$31.2 million in one-time costs over several fiscal years. Replacing Police staff with Sheriff staff would save the Airport approximately \$5.0 million per year, if Deputy Sheriffs continue to be paid less than Police Officers, but would require one-time Airport costs of approximately \$12.7 million to hire deputy sheriffs to replace Police at the Airport. Deputy Sheriffs would have to undergo special training related to Airport law enforcement activities and assume responsibility for ongoing investigations as the transfer of functions takes place. In short, transferring law enforcement functions at the Airport from the Police to the Sheriff would require immediate one-time Airport costs and ongoing General Fund costs. According to the Airport, the San Mateo County Sheriff has indicated that he would retain the police power at SFO for San Mateo County Sheriff's Deputies if any changes to current law enforcement staffing were implemented.

As noted in the March 2021 Update to the City's Five-Year Financial Plan, the fiscal outlook for General Fund depends on the pace of recovery from COVID-19, which is uncertain. The Airport's fiscal outlook is also closely tied to the economic recovery from COVID-19.

Updates in This Report

This report provides updates on the Police Department's civilianization efforts as well as the staffing for certain units in the Police Department.

Board of Supervisors Budget Modifications

As noted above, the Mayor's proposed budget for FY 2020-22 reduced both the Police and Sheriff Departments' budgets and the Board of Supervisors made further reductions to both. The Board modifications are detailed below.

Police

Exhibit 3 below shows the changes the Board of Supervisors made to the Police Department's budget for FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22.

Exhibit 3: Board Reductions to Police Department, FY 2020-21 & FY 2021-22

	FY 2020-21			FY 2021-22		
	Proposed	Approved	Change	Proposed	Approved	Change
Body Worn Cameras	\$3,077,973	\$2,477,973	(\$600,000)	\$3,077,973	\$2,777,973	(\$300,000)
Uniforms	1,073,925	1,073,925	0	1,073,925	873,925	(200,000)
Overtime	18,143,303	13,893,303	(4,250,000)	18,293,303	9,793,303	(8,500,000)
Fall Academy	4,722,744	4,722,744	0	5,087,776	0	(5,087,776)
Spring Academy	2,192,347	0	(2,192,347)	7,667,890	0	(7,667,890)
Civilianization	0	986,785	986,785	0	1,961,677	1,961,677
Library Work Order	262,467	15,000	(247,467)	265,092	0	(265,092)
Total	\$29,472,759	\$23,169,730	(\$6,303,029)	\$35,465,959	\$15,406,878	(\$20,059,081)

Source: BLA

Note: All budget values above are General Fund only and do not include Airport, Work Orders, or Special Revenues. The exception is the Library Work Order, which was funded by Library revenues.

As shown above, the Board of Supervisors deleted funding for one General Fund Police Academy in FY 2020-21 and both General Fund Police Academies in FY 2021-22. In addition, the Board reduced General Fund overtime expenditures in FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22. Funding was then added to the Police Department budget to create positions to continue the Department’s civilianization process, described below. In addition, the Board reduced the Body Worn Camera project budget and uniforms budget to align with expected expenditures at the time. Finally, the Police Department and Library agreed to reduce the work order funding Police patrols at Library facilities.

Police Budget Placed on Reserve

Our FY 2020-22 budget review also recommended a reduction to the Police Department’s FY 2020-21 materials and supplies budget, with which the Department disagreed. Instead of reducing that budget, the Board of Supervisors place \$400,000 of the Department’s materials and supplies budget on Budget & Finance Committee Reserve, of which, as this writing, the Department has not requested release.

In addition, the Board placed \$12,765,681 of overtime expenditures in FY 2021-22 on Budget & Finance Committee Reserve. To remain on Budget & Finance Committee reserve during FY 2021-22, the Committee will have to take action again during the upcoming review of the FY 2021-22 budget.

Sheriff

Exhibit 4 below shows the changes the Board of Supervisors made to Sheriff Department’s budget for FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22.

Exhibit 4: Board Reductions to Sheriff Department, FY 2020-21 & FY 2021-22

	FY 2020-21			FY 2020-21		
	Proposed	Approved	Change	Proposed	Approved	Change
Air Travel	\$21,000	\$1,000	(\$20,000)	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$0
Justice Storekeeper	1,338,092	1,012,484	(325,608)	1,338,092	849,679	(488,413)
Total	\$1,359,092	\$1,013,484	(\$345,608)	\$1,359,092	\$870,679	(\$488,413)

Source: BLA

As shown above, the Board of Supervisors reduced the Sheriff Department’s air travel budget in FY 2020-21. In addition, the Board reduced the Justice Storekeeper budget in both years to account for the closure of County Jail 4.

Sheriff Budget Placed on Reserve

The Board of Supervisors placed \$9,283,178 of community-based organization funding in FY 2021-22 on Budget & Finance Committee Reserve, pending a review of the feasibility of transferring oversight of these services to a civilian agency. In addition, the Board placed \$7,943,916 of FY 2021-22 overtime expenditures on Committee reserve. To remain on Budget & Finance Committee reserve during FY 2021-22, the Committee will have to take action again during the upcoming review of the FY 2021-22 budget.

Police Civilianization Update

Civilianization refers to a process that assigns civilian positions to civilian job assignments, allowing sworn staff to focus on assignments that require peace officer training and expertise, such as patrol, investigations, and special law enforcement operations.

In November 2020, voters approved Proposition E, which modified sections of the City Charter pertaining to Police Department staffing. City Charter Section 4.127 requires the Police Commission to annually review Police Department staffing to “civilianize as many positions as possible” and submit a report to the Board of Supervisors each year that identifies opportunities for civilianization. City Charter Section 16.123 states that no sworn officer may be laid off in the processing of civilianization.

Our June 2018 Performance Audit of Police Staffing and Overtime identified 202 positions filled by sworn officers that were assigned to non-patrol/special operations functions at the Department, and additional positions that could potentially be civilianized in the Investigations Bureau. Our audit recommended the Controller complete a civilianization analysis of the Police Department. In May 2019, the Controller issued an analysis that recommended 50 positions be civilianized and stated that, “additional study will likely yield more opportunities for civilianization of key functions. Clear opportunities exist in two Bureaus – Administration and Investigation.”

In response to these studies, the Board of Supervisors has authorized the creation of 75 civilian positions in order to civilianize an equal amount of sworn staff positions over the three-year period of FY 2018-19 to FY 2020-21 (25 positions each year). The Mayor’s proposed FY 2020-21 – FY 2021-22 budget deleted 45 previously approved civilianization positions that were vacant and the Board of Supervisors restored funding to nine of those positions for FY 2020-21. The status of hiring these positions is shown below in Exhibit 5.

Exhibit 5: Summary of Civilianization Hiring Status as of April 2021

Previously Funded Positions	75
Cut by Mayor in FY 2020-21 Proposed	(45)
Added back by BOS in FY 2020-21	9
FY 2020-21 Net Funded Positions	39
Filled	32
Vacant	7

Source: Police Department

As shown in Exhibit 5 above, as of April 2021, of the 39 funded positions authorized for civilianization during FY 2018-19 – FY 2020-21, the Department has hired 32, and seven remain vacant.

Policy Option

1. The Board of Supervisors could choose to fund the civilianization positions recommended by the Police Commission in FY 2021-22 or enhance funding for civilianization positions based on the recommendations of prior staffing studies.

Staffing of Select Police Units

We reviewed the staffing levels of select Police units as requested by the Budget & Appropriations Committee. Exhibit 6 below shows the changes to staffing of these units between June 2020 and March 2021. The Board of Supervisors approves the number of funded positions in the Police Department and the Police Chief then determines staffing levels of the organizational units.

Exhibit 6: Staffing of Select Police Units, June 2020 vs. March 2021

Unit/Assignment	Mission	June 2020	March 2021	Change	Annual Cost (based on March 2021 staff)
Homeless Outreach Team	Proactively patrol areas with high density homelessness	27	29	2	\$2,289,872
Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC)	Respond 911 calls related to homelessness	33	14	(19)	1,206,439
School Resource Officers	Assigned to high schools	11	0	(11)	0
Honda	Patrol parks, beaches, and large events	19	17	(2)	1,662,798
Marine	Coastal patrol	8	6	(2)	535,320
Mounted*	Park patrol and large events	15	15	0	1,326,543
Bomb Squad	Investigate suspicious packages & diffuse explosives	10	7	(3)	662,465
Traffic**	Traffic enforcement and accident investigation	61	62	1	7,004,156

Source: Police Department

Note: In November 1988, voters approved Proposition V, which made it City policy to maintain a mounted horse patrol. Traffic refers to Traffic Company, which is responsible for citywide traffic enforcement and investigation and does not include Airport Bureau traffic assignments. Costs are based on full-time equivalents at the stop step and include fringe benefits. All positions are sworn except for six in Traffic Enforcement and five in the Mounted Unit.

As shown above, the staffing units with the largest decreases were in the School Resource Officer program, which has been suspended, and for the Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC), which was reduced from 33 staff to 14 in the period June 2020 to March 2021. The only staffing assignments that show a staffing increase was the Homeless Outreach Teams (an increase of two positions), which is assigned at each Police Station to proactively patrol areas with a high-density of homelessness, and the Traffic Company, which increased headcount by one.

We did not identify civilian alternatives to the Bomb Squad or Marine units. Additionally, the Mounted Unit's existence, though not its staffing level, was approved by voters in 1988. We discuss policy options for civilianizing response to calls for service and for traffic enforcement below.

Policy Option:

2. The Board of Supervisors could work with the Mayor, Police Commission, and Police Chief to align staffing of these units with Board policy priorities

Traffic Enforcement

According to the City Attorney's Office, under current state law, only a law enforcement agency may issue citations for moving violations which carry a criminal penalty. As a result, the Police Department is the primary agency responsible for enforcing moving violations in San Francisco and SFMTA is responsible for issuing parking citations which have been decriminalized. The Police Department has a dedicated unit for traffic enforcement, the Traffic Company, which is responsible for proactive traffic enforcement, traffic-related investigations, and motorcades for dignitaries. In addition, car patrols conduct proactive enforcement and respond to traffic-related calls for service.

Types of Traffic Violations

There are three types of moving violations. In order of seriousness, they are: (1) infractions, (2) misdemeanors, and (3) felonies.

- Infractions are violations of administrative requirements, such as expired licenses, mechanical requirements, or locally adopted traffic requirements, and are remedied by paying fines.
- Misdemeanors are crimes that involve actual or threatened injury or damage to property, such as excessive speeding, and may be prosecuted and result in up to one year of jail time.
- Felonies are the most serious crimes, typically those that cause or could cause serious bodily injuries, such as driving while under the influence.

City Policies Related to Traffic Enforcement

Vision Zero

In 2014, the City began to implement Vision Zero, an interagency effort to reduce traffic fatalities. As part of that effort, the Police Department has committed to ensuring that at least half of its traffic citations were for top five causes of traffic fatalities: speeding, violating pedestrian right-of-way in a crosswalk, running red lights, running stop signs, and failing to yield while turning. Exhibit 7 below shows the number of traffic citations issued by the Police Department in 2019 and 2020 and the proportion of them that were for the top five Vision Zero violations.

Exhibit 7: Traffic Citations and Vision Zero

	2019		2020	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Vision Zero	21,552	50.2%	7,320	54.6%
Non-Vision Zero	21,419	49.8%	6,075	45.4%
Total	42,971	100.0%	13,395	100.0%

Source: Police Department stop data

As shown above, in 2019, 50.2 percent of the Police Department’s traffic citations were for Vision Zero violations, and Vision Zero citations were 54.6 percent of total citations in 2020. Traffic citations decreased from 42,971 citations in 2019 to 13,395 citations in 2020, which may be due to less driving during the pandemic.

District Attorney Policy on Pretextual Stops

In February 2020, the District Attorney issued a policy directive that stated that the Office has a presumption against prosecuting possession of contraband (such as drugs, weapons, or other property) when the items are found by Police during a traffic stop for an unrelated infraction. The policy does not cover contraband that is in plain sight. According to the policy directive, the purpose of the policy is due to racial disparities in traffic stops.

Traffic Enforcement Statistics

As part of its law enforcement activities, the Police Department may detain, search, and arrest persons the Police have probable cause to believe are breaking the law. Exhibit 8 below shows the total traffic stops completed by the Police in 2019.

Exhibit 8: SFPD Traffic Stops in 2019

Type	Count	Percent
Self-Initiated	76,561	79.6%
Dispatched	19,670	20.4%
Total	96,231	100.0%

Source: Police Department stop data

As shown above, the Police made 96,231 traffic stops in 2019. The majority of these stops, 76,561 or 79.6 percent, were Police self-initiated activity. Dispatched-related stops (those made in response to a 911 call) totaled 19,670, or 20.4 percent, in 2019. The traffic stop data indicates that the Police Department had considerable latitude in the stops that it makes.

Of the 96,231 stops made by Police in 2019, approximately two-thirds, or 64,282, were the result of a traffic violation. Exhibit 9 below shows the composition of traffic stops in 2019 by violation type.

Exhibit 9: Traffic Stops in 2019

Violation Type	Count	Percent
Equipment violation	9,865	15.3%
Moving violation	42,363	65.9%
Non-moving violation	12,054	18.8%
Total	64,282	100.0%

Source: Police Department stop data

As shown above, traffic stops involving equipment violations totaled 9,865 in 2019. The most common equipment violations include not displaying license plates in compliance with the California Vehicle Code Section 5200(a) and not having lighting equipment maintained in compliance with California Vehicle Code Section 24252(a).

Traffic stops involving moving violations totaled 42,363 in 2019. The most common moving violations were failure to stop at a crosswalk (California Vehicle Code Section 22450(a)), failure to obey turn signs (California Vehicle Code 22101(d), and speeding (California Vehicle Code Section 22350).

Traffic stops coded as non-moving violations totaled 12,054 in 2019 and has similar violations as the equipment violation category. The most common of these stops were for violations of local ordinances (the San Francisco Transportation Code) and unregistered vehicles (California Vehicle Code Section 4000(a)(1)). The San Francisco Transportation Code regulates parking, transit-only lanes, sets speed limits, and vehicle weight restrictions on certain streets. The Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors is the legislative body that legislates the Transportation Code. Police stops for local ordinance violations are typically related to transit-only violations and illegal parking.

Racial Composition of Traffic Stops

Exhibit 10 below shows the racial composition of 2019 traffic stops in comparison to the City’s driving population, which is composed of residents and visitors. The driving population is estimated based on the racial composition of persons involved in traffic collisions in 2019, consistent with the methodology used by the U.S. Department of Justice in its October 2016 assessment of the Police Department.

Exhibit 10: Racial Composition of 2019 Traffic Stops

	Asian/PI	Black	Latino	White	Other
Equipment violation	11%	34%	20%	26%	9%
Moving violation	18%	14%	17%	39%	12%
Non-moving violation	15%	18%	22%	24%	21%
Total Traffic Stops	16%	18%	19%	34%	13%
Proportion of Drivers in Collisions	18%	14%	20%	29%	20%

Source: BLA Analysis of Police stop data and Public Health collision data

Notes: Race in Police stop data is based on perceived race of person stopped. Police stop data included separate categories for Asian and Pacific Islander, which were added together in the table above and compared to the Asian collision population. The Police stop data includes indicators for Middle Eastern, Multiracial, and Native American, but there were no comparable categories in the Public Health collision data, which had the four race categories in the table above in addition to “other” and “not stated.” The “Other” race category in the table above includes stops for persons perceived to be Middle Eastern, Multiracial, and Native American as well as the “other” and “not stated” race entries in the 2019 collision data used to estimate the proportion of the driving population.

As shown above, for the four racial categories presented, the number of stops were generally consistent with the estimated proportion of each race in the City’s driving population (as estimated by the collision data), though with notable exceptions. Blacks composed 14 percent of the City’s collision population, but 18 percent of Police traffic stops and 34 percent of the Police stops for equipment violations in 2019. Asians were 18 percent of the City’s driving population but 11 percent of equipment violations. And whites were 29 percent of City’s driving population and 39 percent of moving violations. Differences in the proportion of stops versus the proportion of each racial category

in the driving population may be due to explicit or implicit bias in enforcement, socioeconomic conditions, errors in measuring the composition of the driving population, or other factors.

The U.S. Department of Justice's 2016 assessment finding #30 found that Blacks were disproportionately stopped relative to the proportion in the driving population¹ and provided six recommendations, including to develop a plan to conduct further analysis of racial disparities of stops within 180 days of issuance of that report. Of the six recommendations, one was deemed complete by Department's third-party monitor in October 2020, which was to collect additional traffic stop data. The Police Department has developed and implemented a plan for analyzing its traffic stop data for racial disparities and submitted documentation of these efforts to its third-party monitor for review. The Police Department reports that it is in the process of implementing the other three related recommendations, which pertain to analyzing stops for disparate outcomes and the stop activities of individual Police Officers.

The U.S. Department of Justice report also found that Black and Latino drivers were disproportionately searched and arrested compared to White drivers and that they were less likely to be found with contraband and had three associated recommendations. The Police Department reports that it has implemented the three related recommendations regarding analyzing post-stop outcomes and improving training and submitted documentation of those efforts for review by the third-party monitor. As recommended by the 2016 Assessment, the Police Department's third-party monitor has indicated the Department has improved its traffic data collection sufficiently to allow for analysis of possible bias among officers.

Policy Option 1: Focus Enforcement on Safety

As the Police Department continues to implement the 2016 Department of Justice recommendations, one policy option for the Board of Supervisors to consider is to work with the Mayor, Police Commission, and Police Chief to provide policy direction to Police Department's traffic enforcement priorities. The City of Berkeley is in the process of eliminating traffic stops for low-level offense, including:

- Equipment violations
- Not wearing a seat belt
- Improper use of high beams
- Violating a regulation (e.g. expired license tags)

Berkeley's planned reduction of enforcing low-level traffic violations follows a similar policy choice made by Oakland. According to the Oakland Police Department's 2019 Annual Stop Data Report, the Oakland Police Department has directed officers to make stops only if they have knowledge that drivers are linked to a crime or otherwise present a threat to public safety. According to that report,

¹ In particular, the 2016 Department of Justice Assessment found that Blacks were 12.3 percent of collisions and 14.8 percent of citywide Police traffic stops.

this has led to a decline in traffic stops for equipment and registration violations and a decrease in the overall number of Police stops involving Blacks.

We reviewed San Francisco Police Department stops coded as equipment and non-moving violations in 2019 to determine the Police workload associated with similar violations that did not present an immediate threat to human life. This data is summarized in Exhibit 11 below.

Exhibit 11: Traffic Stops for Low-Level Violations in 2019

Regulation	Count	Duration (minutes)
Local Ordinance	6,634	38,741
License Plate	4,544	61,580
Registration	4,595	58,831
Lamps	2,187	23,729
Window/Windshield	527	5,182
Parking	133	1,551
Total	18,620	189,614

Source: BLA Analysis of Police stop data

As shown above, the Police Department made 18,620 stops for low-level violations in the California Vehicle Code and to enforce local ordinances. As noted above, local ordinance violations are typically transit only violations and illegal parking. Exhibit 12 below converts this workload to staff time.

Exhibit 12: Police Workload for Low-Level Violations

Stops	18,620
Duration (Minutes)	189,614
FTE	6.25
FTE Cost	\$1,146,779

Source: BLA Analysis

Notes: Full-time equivalent (FTE) is based on one full-time Police Officer that is available for work 81% of the year (accounting for time-off and training) spending 30% of their time on proactive traffic enforcement. Stops are from 2019 and do not include stops coded as moving violations.

As shown above, we estimate that the Police Department requires 6.25 full-time equivalent (FTE) Police Officers to enforce the low-level traffic violations discussed above at a cost of \$1.1 million annually. De-prioritizing low-level traffic offenses would free-up an equivalent amount of Police Officers for other law enforcement duties, including other traffic enforcement duties. The impact of de-prioritizing enforcement of low-level offenses on overall traffic safety is uncertain and may result in collection of less vehicle-related fees, such as vehicle registrations

Policy Option 2: Automated Enforcement

Red Light Camera Program

The Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) operates 19 red light cameras that automatically detect red light violations at 13 intersections. SFMTA's capital budget includes \$2 million to add red

light cameras at up to eight other intersections, with construction planned for FY 2021-22. The cost to install a red light camera ranges from \$200,000 to \$300,000 and ongoing costs for each red light camera are \$42,000 per year, plus up to \$100,000 to \$200,000 per year in third-party damage repairs for the program as a whole. The red light camera program is funded by Traffic School in-lieu fees, which result from all moving violations, not just red light violations. Therefore, revenues for the red light program may not increase commensurately with the red light camera program expansion and may decrease if there are changes to traffic enforcement due to changes to City policy or because of a change in future driving patterns.

The cameras take pictures of red light violations, which are then reviewed by a Police Officer who, as noted above, is authorized under State law to write a traffic citation. According to a December 2020 memo from SFMTA staff to the County Transportation Board of Directors, the Police Department has one Police Officer assigned to review violations from the existing 19 red light cameras but will need to assign additional sworn staff to review the violations for the pending additional cameras.

According to SFMTA, there may be opportunities to expand the red light program beyond the funded and planned expansion of the eight additional intersections, but further expansion would require additional capital funding and may require identification of ongoing revenues to pay for the ongoing costs of the expanded program and the allocation of additional Police sworn staff to review violations. Red light cameras identify when vehicles illegally enter intersections during a red light, such as running a red light and illegal right turns, for which citations can be issued but citations cannot currently be used for other safety violations such as violating pedestrian right of way, speeding, and failure to yield while turning, all of which are Vision Zero enforcement priorities because they present a high-risk for human life. Therefore, while red light cameras provide an opportunity for additional traffic enforcement, the City cannot rely solely on automated enforcement for traffic enforcement.

Use of Parking and Speed Safety Cameras for Issuing Citations Are Illegal in California

According to SFMTA, parking and speed safety cameras are used by other cities in the United States to provide automated enforcement of speeding but may not be deployed in California unless State law is changed. As of the writing of this report, Assembly Bill 550, which would allow San Francisco to deploy speed safety cameras, is under consideration in the California State Legislature. Speed safety cameras would likely have similar capital and operating costs as red light cameras and require the identification of ongoing revenues if fees are insufficient to cover program costs. Under the current version of Assembly Bill 550, speed violations detected by the automated systems would be treated as civil penalties and therefore not require a Police Officer to review violations and issue citations. A similar bill was introduced in 2017 but was vetoed by the Governor. In April 2021, the Board of Supervisors approved a resolution supporting Assembly Bill 550 (File 21-0314).

Policy Option 3: Civilianize Enforcement

The cities of Berkeley and Oakland are considering whether and how to civilianize traffic enforcement – that is, transfer traffic enforcement functions from their police departments to a new civilian agency. However, as noted above, currently State law only allows law enforcement to enforce traffic violations. A change in State law would provide the City the opportunity to civilianize traffic

enforcement. Exhibit 13 below compares the cost of a Police Officer to a Parking Control Officer to show the potential cost differences of civilianizing traffic enforcement.

Exhibit 13: Police Officer & Parking Control Officer Costs

	Wage & Benefits	Overhead	Total Cost
Police Officer	\$183,485	0%	\$183,485
Parking Control Officer	112,764	85%	208,613
Difference	\$70,721		(\$25,128)

Source: Financial System data

As shown above, Parking Control Officers have a lower compensation than Police Officers but are ultimately more expensive because they are burdened with SFMTA overhead costs. Actual costs may be higher for the civilian traffic enforcement job classification that is developed to enforce traffic violations, since that is not included in the current scope of Parking Control Officer job duties. In addition, civilian traffic enforcement may be more staff intensive than the current law enforcement model, depending on whether civilians enforce traffic violations in teams.

If the City were to civilianize traffic enforcement (pending a change in State law), we estimate the City could create a new job classification and hire staff in six to nine months but it may take over a year to transfer functions to a new civilian agency, as was the case when parking enforcement was decriminalized. The new civilian agency would incur fixed administrative costs, similar to the creation of the Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing, which required new administrative costs when assuming responsibilities for homeless related programs that were previously under Public Health and Human Services. New civilian traffic enforcement staff would likely undergo three months of training (one-third of the time of a regular Police academy) to cover areas such as legal requirements, de-escalation, first aid, and other job safety training.

Civilianization Opportunity for Certain Vehicle Related Violations

Although only law enforcement officers may enforce moving violations, civilians are able to investigate non-injury collisions, enforce parking regulations, and issue citations for expired registrations if vehicles are not moving. The San Jose Police Department has a civilian job class, Community Service Officers, that respond to certain traffic incidents, including traffic hazard calls, non-injury vehicle collisions, and expired registrations. If the City assigned civilians to such activities, law enforcement would still be requested to support and intervene in situations that became dangerous or require certain investigation skills. As noted above, SFMTA is responsible for enforcing parking violations, but the Police Department may also do so.

Summary

Due to State law, only law enforcement officers may conduct traffic enforcement activities. In San Francisco, the Police Department is responsible for traffic enforcement. The Police enforce a variety of traffic code requirements, many of which are related to life safety. However, approximately 29 percent of traffic stops in 2019 (18,620 stops out of 64,282 total traffic stops) were for equipment violations or other non-moving violations that did not present an immediate threat to human life or were to enforce local traffic regulations. If the City de-prioritized enforcing those violations, it would

free-up approximately 6.25 FTE Police Officer time. Further analysis is needed to specify the universe of traffic stops that the City should de-prioritize, as certain non-life safety violations may implicate a serious crime (such as hiding a license plate from a stolen car) or further another policy priority, such as transit-only lanes or smog control. The impact of doing de-prioritizing traffic violations enforcement is uncertain.

We also note that Black drivers were stopped for equipment violations at a higher rate than their estimated proportion of the driving population and the that Police Department is still in the process of implementing recommendations related to bias in traffic enforcement from the Department of Justice 2016 assessment of the Police Department.

There are opportunities to expand the City's red light camera program (if funding is identified) to detect red light violations, but other automated enforcement, such as using speed and parking cameras, requires a change in State law. A bill pending in the California State Legislature would allow for the use of speed cameras and allow civilians to issue citations for speeding violations detected by those cameras. To transfer most traffic enforcement activities to civilians, State law must be changed.

Policy Options

3. The Board of Supervisor could work with the Mayor and MTA Board of Directors to increase funding for Automated Enforcement
4. The Board of Supevisors could work with Mayor, Police Commission, and Police Chief to provide policy guidance to the enforcement priorities of low-level traffic violations.
5. The Board of Supervisors could request an update from the Chief of Police regarding the implemetation status of the traffic enforcement bias recommendations from the 2016 Department of Justice assessment.

Civilianizing Response to Calls for Service

We reviewed 2019 calls for service for 911 calls and self-initiated activities related to behavioral health crisis and homelessness, as requested by the Budget & Appropriations Committee, as well as for wellness checks and noise complaints, two other high-volume calls for service identified by the Police Department for potential diversion for an alternative civilian response. Calls for service are typically responded to by car patrol Officers.

Exhibit 14 below shows the number of these calls dispatched in 2019. Calls in 2020 were similar except that homeless-related dispatched and self-initiated calls decreased from 37,167 in 2019 to 16,755 in 2020 and we do not have information on the number of noise complaint calls in 2020. Trends in 911 calls and self-initiated activities during 2020 were likely influenced by pandemic-induced changes to behavior.

Calls that are responded to by Police are categorized by Department of Emergency Management dispatchers into priorities A, B, and C as follows:

- **Priority A** calls include immediate danger to life or damage to property, suspects in the area of a crime involving serious injury or death, and vulnerable missing persons.
- **Priority B** calls refer to situations that have the potential for physical harm, crime suspects that may be in an area, or a crime that has just occurred but does not meet the definition of a Priority A call.
- **Priority C** calls refer to situations where there is no danger to life or property, suspects are not in the area, and/or a crime scene is protected.

Exhibit 14: Mental Health, Homeless, Wellness Check, and Noise Compliant Calls in 2019

Radio Code	Description	A	B	C	Total
800/800 CR	Mentally Disturbed Person	4,625	11,461	89	16,175
801/801 CR	Person Attempting Suicide	3,991	14	2	4,007
5150	Mental Health Detention	41	604	3	648
806	Juvenile Beyond Parental Control	142	204	9	355
915	Homeless Related	2	3	37,162	37,167
910	Wellness Check	9,304	19,351	27	28,682
415	Noise Complaint	0	323	21,750	22,073
Total		18,105	31,960	59,042	109,107

Source: BLA Analysis of Police Department dispatch data, Police Department Calls for Services Analysis and Diversion Recommendations. Calls include dispatched and self-initiated activities.

As shown above, the Police Department responded to 109,107 calls (dispatched and self-initiated) related to mental health incidents, homelessness, wellness checks, and noise complaints in 2019. Of those, 18,105 were Priority A calls; 31,960 were Priority B calls; and 59,042 were Priority C calls. This call volume represents approximately 15 percent of the total number of calls and self-initiated activities in 2019, which totaled 762,723.

Police Workload

According to a Department of Emergency Management presentation to the Human Rights Commission Steering Committee on Alternatives to Policing, the total average time Police spend responding to a Priority A call is 310 minutes; 61.1 minutes for Priority B calls; and 22.8 minutes for Priority C calls. We applied these average response times to the number of calls in 2019, by priority, to calculate the total hours of Police work. We then derived full-time equivalent (FTE) staff required to work those hours, assuming that Police Officers spent 30 percent of their time responding to calls for service, per Police Department policy. Exhibit 15 below shows the derived FTE and associated costs we estimate were required to respond to the call types under review. Wellness Checks call durations were adjusted to 40 minutes for Priorities A and B calls based on our review of 2019 dispatch data.

Exhibit 15: Derived Police Staff and Costs Required to Respond to Mental Health, Homeless, Wellness Check, and Noise Compliant Calls by Priority Level

Radio Code	Description	Priority A Calls (FTEs)	Priority B Calls (FTEs)	Priority C Calls (FTEs)	Total Calls (FTEs)	Total Cost
800/800 CR	Mentally Disturbed Person	47.28	23.09	0.07	70.44	\$12,923,779
801/801 CR	Person Attempting Suicide	40.80	0.03	0.00	40.83	7,490,976
5150	Mental Health Detention	0.42	1.22	0.00	1.64	300,597
806	Juv. Beyond Control	1.45	0.41	0.01	1.87	342,991
915	Homeless Related	0.02	0.01	27.94	27.97	5,131,264
910	Wellness Check	12.27	25.52	0.02	37.82	6,938,609
415	Noise Complaint	0.00	0.65	16.35	17.00	3,119,693
Radio Code	Total Calls	102.24	50.93	44.39	197.55	
	Total Cost	\$18,758,857	\$9,344,316	\$8,144,735		\$36,247,909

Source: BLA Analysis of Police dispatch data

Note: Full time equivalent positions (FTEs) were derived based on 2019 call volume and assumed duration of each priority type, discussed above, to an assumed 30% of available Police Officer time spent on calls. Costs are calculated based on the FY 2021-22 cost of 1.0 Police Officer III, \$183,485.

As shown above, the derived full-time equivalent Police staff to respond to mental health, homeless related, wellness checks, and noise complaints were 102.24 FTEs for Priority A calls, 50.93 FTEs for Priority B calls, and 44.39 FTEs for Priority C calls. Actual Police staff that responded to these calls is lower than presented because a portion of the response time is done on overtime.

Street Crisis Response Team (SCRT)

In FY 2020-21, the City began to deploy the Street Crisis Response Team to respond to Priority B calls coded as 800, (800-B calls), Mentally Disturbed Person. Between Nov 30, 2020 and March 7, 2021, the Street Crisis Response Team responded to 624, or 25 percent, of the 2,501 calls coded as 800-B (Mentally Disturbed Person).

Each SCRT team has a Paramedic, Behavioral Health Clinician, and a Peer Counselor, with additional case management support within the Public Health Office of Coordinated Care. As of the writing of this report, three SCRT teams are active and respond to 800-B calls in the Tenderloin, the Bayview, and in the Castro-Mission area. The budget for FY 2021-22 includes funding for a total of six teams with the intention to respond to all 800-B calls throughout the City 24 hours per day, seven days per week. All teams are expected to be active in July 2021. The effectiveness of this program and outcomes of individuals served by the program are being evaluated through two parallel evaluations, with early results from full implementation of this program expected in fall 2021. While the diversion takes place, the Police Department will continue to respond to these calls and may co-respond even if the calls are primarily responded to by the SCRT.

Expansion of SCRT to Respond to Other Mental Health Calls

According to Street Crisis program documents, the team could potentially be expanded to respond to 801 calls (persons attempting suicide), as well as calls for 5150 (mental health detention). Calls coded

806 (juvenile beyond parental control) may be suited to a similar behavioral health team. Further study is needed to determine whether these calls would be suited to the Street Crisis Response Team. However, if they are suited to the SCRT model, based on 2019 call volume, this would be a 42 percent increase² in the planned workload for the Street Crisis Response Team, which, as of the writing of this report, is intended to respond only to Priority B 800 (mentally disturbed person) calls. We estimate it would cost an additional \$4 million annually to hire additional field clinicians, peer counselors, and paramedics to accommodate the additional call volume, which could be partially offset by \$7.8 million we estimate was spent by the Police Department on those call types in 2019 if some or the majority of calls are fully diverted. The program may incur other costs beyond expansion of the field teams if it is expanded, such as additional vehicle purchases and other ongoing costs for materials and supplies.

Other Potential Diversions to Civilian Response

As noted above, the Police Department has identified other call types that could potentially be diverted to civilians, including calls related to homelessness (code 915), wellness checks (code 910), and noise complaints (code 415). These call types may not be suited for the Street Crisis Response Team because they do not involve individuals in acute mental health crisis.

The City does not currently have funded civilian alternatives that could respond to homeless, wellness checks, and noise complaint calls. Homeless-related 911 calls are currently responded to by Healthy Streets Operations Center Police staff. Although the Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing has a Homeless Outreach Team (HOT Team), the Department does not consider them first responders because the team does not operate 24 hours a day, does not have paramedic skills that may be necessary to respond to 911 calls, and the mission of the program is to engage and stabilize unhoused residents. Wellness check calls may also benefit from paramedic and behavioral health clinicians, but a portion of them may require a less staff-intensive response. Similarly, noise complaints may contain a variety of situations, some or many of which may not require paramedics or behavioral health clinicians. Further analysis is needed to determine the appropriate composition of civilian staffing to respond to these calls.

Police Staffing

In June 2020, the Police Department reported it had 1,828 full duty sworn staff in the City. We estimate that the Department has 1,788 full-duty sworn staff going into FY 2020-21 (40 fewer Police Officers), based on historical attrition and the cancelation of the Spring 2021 Police Academy. As noted above, the Police Department required approximately 23.09 FTEs to respond to Radio Code 800 Priority B calls (mentally disturbed persons), which are scheduled to be fully diverted to the Street Crisis Response Team in FY 2021-22. If other call types are diverted to civilians, the Police Department's workload related to these calls would continue to decrease, allowing the Police Chief to increase staffing levels for other assignments. Alternatively, the Board of Supervisors could

² Total calls 801 calls (all Priorities) were 4,007 in 2019. We include Priority A calls in the 801 call total because a civilian response may be the most appropriate response to all calls pertaining to persons attempting suicide. Priority B and Priority C calls for 5150 and 806 were 827 in 2019.

consider reducing funding for Police Academies in future years to align the Police Department's hiring with expected workload.

As noted above, there are no General Fund Police Academies in the FY 2021-22 budget that was approved by the Board of Supervisors in August 2020. The Police Department's sworn staffing will continue to decrease in FY 2021-22 by approximately 80 Officers due to retirements and separations unless the Board of Supervisors approves funding for Police Academies in that year.

Policy Options

6. The Board of Supervisors could request the Mayor, Police Chief, Department of Public Health, and Fire Department conduct further analysis to determine if a civilian behavioral health team is suited to respond to other mental health related calls, including persons attempting suicide, mental health detention, juvenile beyond parental control, wellness checks, and noise complaints and report back to the Board by May 1, 2022.
7. The Board of Supervisors could request the Mayor, Police Chief, and Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing to develop a plan for a civilian response to homeless-related 911 calls and report back to the Board by May 1, 2022.

Police Services to Other Departments

The Police Department provides law enforcement services to other City departments, the Transbay Joint Powers Authority, and Treasure Island Development Authority. Exhibit 16 below summarizes projected revenue from these services in FY 2020-21 and the budgeted revenue for FY 2021-22. The FY 2021-22 revenues may be adjusted in the Mayor's proposed budget for FY 2021-22.

Exhibit 16: Work Order Revenues for Police Services

Dept	Work Order	FY 2020-21 Projected Revenue*	FY 2021-22 Budgeted Revenue	Change
TJPA	Transit Center Security	\$2,497,401	\$2,588,670	\$91,269
MTA	Muni	2,616,981	3,638,035	1,021,054
Port	Port Bike Patrol	517,128	918,816	401,688
Port	Port Community Engagement	305,349	383,182	77,833
MTA	Taxi Commission Services	35,337	300,000	264,663
MTA	MTA Garage - Central	39,019	284,219	245,200
MTA	MTA Garage - Southern	50,773	284,219	233,446
TIDA	Treasure Island Security	104,856	129,846	24,990
City Administrator	Moscone Convention Center	0	86,765	86,765
Public Works	Graffiti Abatement	0	60,000	60,000
Public Health	Illegal Sales to Minors	0	33,000	33,000
District Attorney	First Offender Prostitution	0	30,000	30,000
Public Health	Public Health	No data	19,100	No data
MTA	MTA - Safe Path of Travel	No data	6,000	No data
Library	Library Security Work Order	18,995	0	(18,995)
Port	Port Cruise Security	4,700	0	(4,700)
Total		\$6,190,539	\$8,761,852	\$2,571,313

Source: Financial System

*: FY 2020-21 Projected Revenue is based on straight-line projections from actual revenues as of March 2021, adjusted based on discussions with City departments.

As shown above, budgeted work order revenues for FY 2021-22 are \$2.6 million more than our projected revenues for work order activities in FY 2020-21. Of the \$8.8 million in budgeted revenues for FY 2021-22, \$60,000 is General Fund and the remaining are enterprise department revenues or special revenues, both of which have restricted uses.

Description of Major Police Work Order Services

Exhibit 17 below summarizes the services the Police Department provides to other public entities.

Exhibit 17: Description of Police Work Order Services & Potential Alternatives

Dept	Work Order	FY 2022 Budgeted Revenue	Service	Potential Alternative	Policy Consideration
City Administrator	Moscone Convention Center	\$86,765	Overtime to provide security for large events	Civilian security	Moscone operator prefers Police presence at large events
District Attorney	First Offender Prostitution	30,000	Overtime for undercover operations	No recommendation	N/A
MTA	Muni	3,638,035	\$3.4 million: 15 sworn to respond to 911 calls on Muni \$200,000: Nighttime parking enforcement	Rely on regular patrol for Muni response Replace nighttime parking enforcement with Parking Control Officers (PCO)	Lack of dedicated unit may decrease response time to Muni-related calls PCO night-time coverage appears to be more expensive than Police coverage
MTA	Taxi Commission Services	300,000	Traffic enforcement overtime dedicated to taxis	Focus enforcement on TNCs	TNCs contribute to congestion, reduced use of public transit, reduced taxi revenues, and disproportionately violate traffic laws
MTA	MTA Garage – Central	284,219	Patrol overtime for garage security	Reduce patrols due to decrease in vehicle break-ins	Risk for temporary increase in property crime
MTA	MTA Garage – Southern	284,219	Patrol overtime for garage security	Reduce patrols due to decrease in vehicle break-ins	Risk for temporary increase in property crime
MTA	MTA – Safe Path of Travel	6,000	Monthly training for Muni staff	No recommendation	N/A
Port	Port Bike Patrol	918,816	Up to 4 sworn to patrol northern waterfront	Rely on regular Police patrol	Lack of dedicated patrol may increase risk of crime
Port	Port Community Engagement	383,182	2 sworn to patrol all Port property	Rely on regular Police patrol	Lack of dedicated patrol may increase risk of crime

Dept	Work Order	FY 2022 Budgeted Revenue	Service	Potential Alternative	Policy Consideration
Port	Port Cruise Security	0	Overtime for crowd and vehicle control	Rely on Parking Control Officers	May reduce security at cruise loading/unloading events
Public Health	Illegal Sales to Minors	33,000	Overtime to prevent illegal tobacco sales	No recommendation	N/A
Public Health	Public Health	19,100	Deemed Approved Ordinance	No recommendation	N/A
Public Works	Graffiti Abatement	60,000	Accompany juvenile offenders during graffiti clean-ups	Discontinue service	Suspended since March 2020
TJPA	Transit Center Security	2,588,670	Patrol & Investigation at Transbay Terminal	Amend MOU to eliminate homeless & mentally ill from scope and direct Street Crisis Response Team	May require expansion of Street Crisis Response Team and/or Homeless Outreach Team
TIDA	Treasure Island Security	129,846	Civilian security guard	No recommendation	N/A

Source: BLA Analysis

Municipal Transportation Agency

The Police Department's work orders with the Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) fund four major programs: (1) the Muni Response Team, consisting of 15 sworn staff dedicated to responding to 911 calls on Muni and investigating crimes; (2) parking enforcement between 12:00AM and 6:00AM; (3) overtime for additional patrol at large parking garages; and (4) dedicated traffic enforcement for taxis.

Muni

According to SFMTA, the Agency does not wish to reduce the work order for the Muni Response Team. Reducing this work order, which is funded by SFMTA operating revenues, would mean that SFMTA would no longer have a Police unit dedicated to responding to calls and investigating crime on Muni and would instead have to rely on general patrol and investigations staff to do so. According to SFMTA, having a dedicated Police unit for Muni provides a level of service and security that is critical to the safety of Muni passengers and Muni transit operators and the Agency does not intend to request a reduction in these services in the upcoming fiscal year.

Parking Garage Security

SFMTA reports that it discontinued the extra patrol at its parking garages in November 2020 due to a sustained decrease in vehicle break-ins relative to the two prior years. According to SFMTA, given this trend, it may be appropriate to reduce the work order for garage patrol from a combined \$584,219 in FY 2021-22 to \$100,000, which would leave sufficient funding to re-activate garage patrol if crime trends reverse. Reducing work this work order would free up SFMTA operating revenues.

Night-time Parking Enforcement

SFMTA is responsible for enforcing parking violations, which include blocked driveways, double parking, parking on a sidewalk, and other illegal parking. During the daytime, SFMTA deploys Parking Control Officers to enforce parking rules and to respond to 311 calls related to parking. However, between 12:00AM and 6:00AM, SFMTA's Parking Control Officer deployment is limited to accompanying street cleaning operations and the Agency relies on the Police Department to respond to 311 parking calls that are urgent (typically a blocked driveway). The Police response in this is to accompany the towing operator while they remove the illegally parked vehicle and write parking tickets.

Based on our review of 311 call data from 2019, the City receives an average of 1,280 parking-related calls per day between 6:00AM and 12:00AM and 80 calls per night between 12:00AM and 6:00AM. Of those, in 2019 there were an average of 442 daytime calls related to blocked driveways and 34 nighttime calls related to blocked driveways, though the true number of blocked driveway calls may be higher due to inconsistent coding of 311 calls.

The work order with the Police Department for nighttime parking enforcement is budgeted at \$200,000 in FY 2021-22. The purpose of the work order is to have a Police presence at vehicle towing operations between 12:00AM and 6:00AM, which may be less safe than daytime towing operations. According to SFMTA, in order to respond to the approximately 34 blocked driveway calls per night, the Agency would need to assign a minimum of two Parking Control Officers to nighttime parking enforcement, which would cost \$417,227.³ While a Parking Control Officer may be a more appropriate job classification than a Police Officer to respond to nighttime blocked driveway calls, it would cost the SFMTA approximately \$217,227 more annually than it spends on the work order with the Police Department to do so.

The nighttime parking enforcement work order is funded by SFMTA operating revenues.

Taxi Enforcement

SFMTA maintains a work order with the Police Department for traffic enforcement related to taxis, which is budgeted at \$300,000 in FY 2021-22. According to SFMTA, in the prior two fiscal years, the enforcement has focused on ensuring transit-only lanes remain free of private

³ One Parking Control Officer costs \$112,764 in FY 202-22, including salary and benefits. According to SFMTA, the Agency's overhead rate is 85%, bringing the total cost of one Parking Control Officer to \$208,613. Two Parking Control Officers would therefore cost \$417,227.

vehicles. SFMTA is evaluating where to focus this additional traffic enforcement in the upcoming fiscal year and is considering a focus on electric scooter traffic violations. Because, as noted above, moving violations may only be enforced by law enforcement, SFMTA reported that this work order with the Police Department is critical to implementing its policy goals for taxis.

As noted in our July 2020 performance audit of SFMTA, Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) have contributed to increased traffic congestion, reduced taxi related revenues, and likely contributed to reduced use of public transit. The audit also noted that TNCs comprised a disproportionate share of moving violations. Although the City is prohibited from regulating the TNC operations, it may nevertheless still enforce parking and traffic violations and may organize dedicated units to do so, but to date has not. The Board of Supervisors could request that SFMTA use this additional traffic enforcement to focus on parking and moving violations committed by TNCs to ensure they are obeying parking and moving regulations designed to protect human life and ensure efficient traffic flow.

This work order is funded by SFMTA operating revenues.

Port

The Port has work orders with the Police Department that total \$1,301,998 in revenues in the FY 2021-22 budget. These revenues are distributed to Bike Patrol, Community Engagement, and Cruise Security. According to the Port, the Police law enforcement presence from its Bike Patrol and Community Engagement staff is a necessary complement to its contracted security guards on Port property and the Department does not wish to rely on sector patrol for this service. However, Port management stated that, in the past, SFMTA Parking Control Officers were used for Cruise Security, which involves managing the flow of people embarking/disembarking cruise ships and related traffic control, and therefore that job class may be an appropriate civilian alternative to Police for this service in future years, if SFMTA can guarantee consistent and appropriate levels of service. If this shift were to occur, the Port might continue to retain some level of SFPD service at the cruise terminal to ensure passenger safety. Budgeted expenditures for Cruise Security in FY 2021-22 are \$580,701, funded by Port operating revenues.

Public Works

Public Works maintains a \$60,000 work order with the Police Department for Police Officers to accompany juvenile offenders during graffiti clean-ups, funded by the General Fund. According to Public Works, Police Officers provide security during the clean ups and allow for graffiti offenders to build a relationship with Police. The program has been suspended since March 2020 due to the pandemic. Reducing this work order would free up General Fund revenues.

Moscone Convention Center

The City Administrator maintains a work order with the Police Department to provide Police overtime for large events at the Moscone Center, which is budgeted at \$86,765 in FY 2020-21. According to City Administrator staff, although the Moscone Center operator relies primarily on contract civilian security staff for public safety, some clients prefer to supplement that with Police Officers at large events. This work order is funded by Moscone revenues.

Transbay Transit Center

The Police Department has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) to provide law enforcement services to that TJPA property, which primarily consists of the Transbay Transit Center. Under the MOU, TJPA pays for Police Department law enforcement services with TJPA revenues. Section 3.2 of the MOU states that the scope of Police services include enhancing public safety, preventing crime, detecting criminal activity, attending to the homeless and mentally ill, and working with the TJPA Chief Security Officer.

As noted above, the City is piloting a transition to a civilian response to 911 street crisis calls, the Street Crisis Response Team, and also funds a Homeless Outreach Team that provides outreach to individuals experiencing homelessness (but is not a first responder program). As noted above, the Street Crisis Response Team is in its first year of operation and currently focused on the Tenderloin.

According to the TJPA FY 2020 Annual Financial Report, the City does not bill TJPA for homeless or mental health related services.⁴ The Board of Supervisors could work with the Mayor, Police Commission, Police Chief, and TJPA Board of Directors to reduce the scope of Police Department services at the Transbay Transit Center (removing the references to the homeless and mentally ill) and enter into new agreements with Public Health and Homelessness & Supportive Housing to fund the work of the Street Crisis Response and Homeless Outreach Teams at the Transbay Transit Center. Directing resources to HSH's contracted Homeless Outreach Team for committed homeless outreach teams at the TJPA may not necessarily reduce homelessness in the area as the team is already providing their services on and around the site.

The Police Department stated that its TJPA patrol operation has a fixed-post staffing, so removing homeless- and mentally ill-related incidents from the scope of its services may not reduce the cost of its TJPA operation.

Funding Considerations

If a work order is canceled, the work would have to be funded by an alternative revenue source or not be carried out. Reducing work orders for Police overtime would not impact Police staff levels. However, if work orders that fund full-time positions were reduced, alternative funding sources would need to be identified for those positions or the positions would need to be deleted, which could result in layoffs.

⁴ According to the TJPA FY 2020 Annual Financial Report, the following City Departments provided services to TJPA in FY 2019-20: City Attorney, Public Works, Public Health, Technology, Municipal Transportation Agency, Police, Fire, Public Utilities Commission, Library, and Arts Commission.

Policy Options

8. The Board of Supervisors could work with the Mayor, City Administrator, SFMTA Board of Directors, Port Commission, and Police Commission to evaluate the ongoing need for Police Department work orders for SFMTA Garage Security, Taxi Enforcement, Nighttime Parking Enforcement, Port Cruise Security, and Public Works Graffiti Abatement.
9. The Board of Supervisors could work with the Mayor, Police Commission, Police Chief, and TJPA Board of Directors to reduce the scope of Police Department services at the Transbay Transit Center (removing responses to homeless and mental illness incidents) and enter into new agreements between TJPA, the Department of Public Health, and the Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing to fund the work of the Street Crisis Response Team and Homeless Outreach Team at the Transbay Transit Center.

Sheriff Work Order Services for Department of Public Health

The Sheriff has a work order with the Department of Public Health (DPH) to provide law enforcement services at Zuckerberg General Hospital, Laguna Honda Hospital, and San Francisco Health Network clinics. The Sheriff maintains fixed-post security stations; conducts foot, bike, and vehicle patrols; responds to public safety emergencies and calls for service; and proactively searches for missing persons. Exhibit 18 below shows the cost of this work order in the current fiscal year and in the FY 2021-22 budget.

Exhibit 18: Sheriff Costs & FTEs for Public Health Facility Security

	FY 2020-21		FY 2021-22	
	Cost	FTEs	Cost	FTEs
Clinics	\$2,552,596	12.59	\$2,663,388	12.92
Laguna Honda	4,407,232	23.49	4,625,556	24.19
General Hospital	14,350,323	92.10	14,942,713	95.13
Total	\$21,310,151	128.18	\$22,231,657	132.24

Source: Financial System data

Note: Clinics refers to San Francisco Health Network clinics

As shown above, the Sheriff provides 128.18 FTEs for these services at a cost of \$21.3 million in FY 2020-21 for Public Health hospitals and clinics. Sheriff staff are primarily sworn but also include cadets, a civilian position. Cadets are supervised by sworn staff or senior civilian staff and are generally responsible for maintaining site control and administrative tasks.

Exhibit 19 below shows the serious crimes that were reported at DPH hospitals and clinics in the prior two fiscal years.

Exhibit 19: Serious Crimes at DPH Facilities

	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
	General Hospital		Laguna Honda		Clinics	
Property Thefts (>\$900)	5	6	3	3	0	1
Burglary	6	9	0	0	2	6
Battery	64	55	6	23	7	3
Sexual Offense	3	4	0	1	0	0
Assault	12	20	3	1	4	1
Robbery	0	2	0	0	3	0
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0
Patient Abuse reporting	Not Reported	Not Reported	274	468	Not Reported	Not Reported
Total	90	96	286	496	16	11

Source: Department of Public Health

Note: Patient abuse refers to threats or acts of violence, theft of property, or inappropriate staff behavior.

As shown above, between FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20, reported crimes at General Hospital increased from 90 to 96, at Laguna Honda from 286 to 496, and reported crimes decreased at DPH clinics from 16 to 11. In FY 2019-20, the highest number of reported crimes was battery at General Hospital, patient abuse at Laguna Honda, and burglary at the DPH clinics. According to DPH staff, the increase of reported patient abuse at Laguna Honda from 274 to 468 was due to a change in reporting criteria by DPH. Patient abuse refers to threats or acts of violence, theft of property, or inappropriate staff behavior.

Civilianization of Security DPH Facilities

During the Board of Supervisors’ review of the Department of Public Health’s FY 2020-22 budget, members of the Budget & Appropriations Committee requested that the Department explore civilian alternatives to the Sheriff to provide security services at the public hospitals and clinics. Other counties in California rely on civilians for security at public health facilities.⁵ In response to the Committee, along with internal DPH concerns and advocacy from staff and community groups, DPH developed a proposal to partially civilianize the public safety services. Exhibit 20 below summarizes DPH’s proposed change in staffing.

⁵ In Santa Clara County, the Sheriff oversees civilian staff that provide security at public health facilities.

Exhibit 20: Proposed Civilianization of DPH Security

	Current	Proposed	Proposed Change*
<u>General Hospital</u>			
Sheriff Sworn	52.21	42.81	(9.40)
Sheriff Cadet	42.92	40.92	(2.00)
Subtotal, Sheriff General Hospital	95.13	83.33	(11.40)
DPH Clinicians	0.00	27.90	27.90
DPH Care Experience Workers	0.00	2.50	2.50
DPH Contract Security	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtotal, DPH Security General Hospital	0.00	30.40	30.40
Total, General Hospital	95.13	114.13	19.00
<u>Laguna Honda</u>			
Sheriff Sworn	15.74	11.54	(4.20)
Sheriff Cadet	8.45	16.85	8.40
Subtotal, Sheriff Laguna Honda	24.19	28.39	4.20
DPH Clinicians	0.00	3.00	3.00
DPH Care Experience Workers	0.00	0.00	0.00
DPH Contract Security	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtotal, DPH Security Laguna Honda	0.00	3.00	3.00
Total, Laguna Honda	24.19	24.19	7.20
<u>Clinics</u>			
Sheriff Sworn	12.92	8.72	(4.20)
Sheriff Cadet	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtotal, Sheriff Clinics	12.92	8.72	(4.20)
DPH Clinicians	0.00	0.00	0.00
DPH Care Experience Workers	0.00	0.00	0.00
DPH Contract Security	0.00	4.40	4.40
Subtotal, DPH Clinics	0.00	6.40	6.40
Total, DPH Clinics	12.92	13.12	0.20
Total, All Facilities	132.24	151.44	26.40

Source: Public Health

Note (*): Proposed Change FTEs reflect annualized ongoing FTEs starting in FY 2022-23.

As shown above, DPH proposes to reduce Sheriff sworn staffing who are currently assigned to patrol duties at General Hospital by 9.40 FTE and add 27.90 FTEs of clinicians (nurses and psychiatric technicians) to respond to patients in crisis and 2.50 FTEs of Care Experience Workers to replace 2.00 FTE of Sheriff cadets to provide information to visitors. At Laguna Honda, DPH proposes swap 4.20 FTEs of Sheriff Deputies with 8.40 FTEs of Sheriff Cadets for in-building patrol and administrative assignments. Finally, DPH proposes to reduce Sheriff sworn staff at DPH clinics by 4.20 FTEs and instead rely on 4.40 FTEs of contract security for security at certain clinics. DPH intends to procure

contract security from a non-profit organization that will provide ambassador services, provides staff with similar life experiences to patients, and is trained in verbal de-escalation. Sheriff sworn staff will continue to provide vehicle patrol services at all DPH facilities, provide security at certain clinics, and respond to crimes and emergencies.

According to the Sheriff’s Department, Sheriff staff currently assigned to DPH will be absorbed by the Department into other fixed-post staffing assignments at other City facilities, which would allow the Department to reduce its overtime.

Policy Considerations

Reduction in Sheriff Staffing

The proposed changes would reduce General Hospital Sheriff staffing from five to three staff per shift and from two to one patrol staff per shift at Laguna Honda. According to the Sheriff’s Department, this may reduce response time, though certain calls currently responded to by the Sheriff will be directed to DPH clinical staff.

Cost Increase

Based on the staffing indicated in Exhibit 20 above, we estimate that the DPH’s civilianization proposal will cost \$2.7 million more per year than the work order service provided by the Sheriff. The cost increase is due to a net increase in staffing of 26.40 FTE.

Use of Force Demographic Patterns

Replacing sworn staff with clinicians and other civilians may reduce instances of uses of force against patients, which typically include restraining and removing patients and visitors. As shown in Exhibit 21 below, according to DPH data, more instances of use of force were recorded against Black patients than those for any other racial or ethnic group in FY 2017-18, FY 2018-19, and FY 2019-20. In FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20, uses of forces against Black and White patients were disproportionate relative to their share of the overall patient population. According to DPH, nearly all use of force incidents occur in response to a call for service from DPH staff, not from self-initiated activity.

Exhibit 21: Use of Force Incidents by Race at General Hospital

	FY 2017-18	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2019-20
	Use of Force	Population	Use of Force	Population	Use of Force	Population
Asian	3%	No data	3%	22%	2%	21%
Black	43%	No data	42%	15%	48%	15%
Latino	22%	No data	11%	38%	14%	37%
White	32%	No data	41%	19%	29%	18%
Other	0%	No data	3%	6%	7%	9%
Total	100%	No data	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: Department of Public Health

Summary

DPH’s civilianization proposal is a pilot project that involves the creation of a new clinical team to respond to patients in crisis at General Hospital and replacing Deputy Sheriffs currently performing patrol and fixed-post security at General Hospital, Laguna Honda Hospital, and San Francisco Health Network clinics with civilian security. The Board of Supervisors could request that the Mayor, Director of Public Health, and Sheriff define measures of success to the civilianization effort, including timeline for implementation, uses of force demographic patterns, and impact on public safety. Depending on the outcome of the pilot, the Board of Supervisors could then request an expansion of civilian security at DPH facilities.

Policy Options

10. The Board of Supervisors could request that the Mayor include the civilianization of security at Public Health hospitals and clinics in the FY 2021-23 two-year proposed budget.
11. The Board of Supervisors could request that the Mayor, Director of Public Health, and Sheriff define measures of success to the civilianization effort, including timeline for implementation, demographic patterns for uses of force, and impact on public safety. Depending on the outcome of the pilot, the Board of Supervisors could then request an expansion of civilian security at DPH facilities.

Police & Sheriff Department Administrative and Contract Costs

Exhibit 22 below shows the change in administrative costs at the Police and Sheriff Departments.

Exhibit 22: Police & Sheriff Administrative Costs

	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21	Change
Police	\$105,961,829	\$122,853,228	\$132,873,322	\$120,392,456	\$14,430,627
Sheriff	20,721,168	22,201,393	19,241,120	20,211,933	(509,235)
Total	\$126,682,997	\$145,054,621	\$152,114,442	\$140,604,389	\$13,921,392

Source: Financial System data

As shown in Exhibit 22 above, between FY 2017-18 and FY 2020-21, administrative costs increased by \$14.4 million at the Police Department and by \$3.8 million at the Sheriff’s Department. Administrative costs include executive management and support functions such as accounting and information technology. Between FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21, Police Department administrative costs decreased from \$132.9 million to \$120.4 million, primarily due to deleting vacant positions and reducing vehicle purchases.

We will review administrative costs for the Police and Sheriff Departments as part of our annual budget review and will provide recommendations for budget adjustments, as appropriate.

Contracts

For the Police Department, we were asked to review contracts for website development and for behavioral health. The Police Department does not have any contractor for website development but has a contract with a \$50,000 annual cost for website support, according to the Police Department's list of contracts. We requested the website support contract but were not provided it. In addition, the Police Department has a contract for \$200,000 per year with Managed Health Network for behavioral health services for staff, as required by the City's agreement with the Police Officers Association. The Department is in the process of soliciting new vendors for this service.

In addition, the Police Department has a contract with a non-profit, San Francisco Safe, Inc., for \$910,000 per year. The scope of the services provided by the non-profit include coordinating and participating in community events, facilitating neighborhood watch groups (block safety), providing security assessments to businesses, providing personal and workplace safety seminars, and bicycle registration. The services are carried out by civilian non-profit workers.