

**2004-05 Civil Grand Jury Report:
Compensation Issues in the San Francisco Police Department**

California Penal Code Sections 933.05(a) and (b) requires the responding party to report for each recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury **one** of the following actions:

1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action	2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation	3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe (Not to exceed six months from date of publication of grand jury report)	4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation
---	---	---	---

For each recommendation below, indicate which action you have taken or plan to take and provide the required information.

Recommendation	Responses Required From:	Response: 1, 2, 3, or 4
----------------	--------------------------	-------------------------

(The Civil Grand Jury indicated that the named departments should reply to those recommendations that are within their jurisdictions.)

<p>1. The City should negotiate with the Police Officers Association for elimination of Over Time (OT)/Compensatory Time (CT) benefits for top managerial staff and consider less costly alternatives such as limited administrative leave as provided by other jurisdictions and City departments.</p>	<p>SFPD Department of Human Resources Board of Supervisors Mayor [and for all recommendations below]</p>	<p>The Board of Supervisors' Government Audits Committee conducted a public hearing June 27, 2005 to discuss the findings and recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury and the Police Department's response to the Report. Police Chief Heather Fong and Philip Ginsburg, Director, Department of Human Resources presented at the hearings. The item was continued to the call of the chair so that any members of the Civil Grand Jury or members of the Committee may check in and see how various findings and recommendations that have been concurred to with the Police Department are being implemented over time. Pursuant to Board rules, the item was filed in January 2006.</p>
<p>2. If top managerial staff continue to be eligible for CT accrual, the City should negotiate limits in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on their accrual comparable to rank and file officers.</p>		<p>See above response.</p>

**2004-05 Civil Grand Jury Report:
Compensation Issues in the San Francisco Police Department**

California Penal Code Sections 933.05(a) and (b) requires the responding party to report for each recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury one of the following actions:

1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action	2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation	3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe (Not to exceed six months from date of publication of grand jury report)	4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation
---	---	---	---

For each recommendation below, indicate which action you have taken or plan to take and provide the required information.

Recommendation	Responses Required From:	Response: 1, 2, 3, or 4
3. The City should negotiate to pay CT balances prior to the effective date of promotions to limit the inflationary effect of carrying CT balances for long periods of time.		See above response.
4. The SFPD should manage the CT banks with the objective of minimizing the long-term liability of large CT balances. Such management must include enforcement of CT caps. The law allows that such management may include requiring officers to use their accrued CT.		See above response.
5. Given that rank and file officers will have had four years to reduce their CT balances to 480 hours by the end of the current MOU, the City should negotiate for the next MOU, some penalty for continuing to maintain a CT balance greater than 480 hours, such as forfeiture of hours above 480.		See above response.
6. The SFPD must manage their vehicle fleet in accordance with Administrative Code 4.11 as well as optimize the use of this valuable resource for police protection.		See above response.
7. The City should negotiate to include all forms of premium pay available to all officers in comparisons for the purposes of salary setting.		See above response.
8. The Board of Supervisors should request that the Budget Analyst update the management audits of 1996 and 1998 regarding SFPD policies and practices and make recommendations for opportunities for cost savings.		See above response.