

A Report of the 2002-2003 Civil Grand Jury  
For the City and County of San Francisco

**IMPROVING SFPD'S COOPERATION WITH  
THE OFFICE OF CIVILIAN COMPLAINTS:  
BEATING THE ONE YEAR CLOCK**

Released May 28, 2003

Reports of the Civil Grand Jury do not identify the individuals interviewed, pursuant to California Penal Code sec. 929. The California Legislature intended this provision to encourage full candor and cooperation by City and County personnel.

Parties identified in this report must respond to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court within the number of days specified, with a copy sent to the Board of Supervisors. As to each finding of the Grand Jury, the response must either (1) agree with the finding, or (2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why. Further, as to each recommendation made by the Grand Jury, the responding party must report either (1) that the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation of how it was implemented; (2) the recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation; (3) the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of that analysis and a timeframe for the officer or agency head to be prepared to discuss it (not exceeding six months from the release of this Report); or (4) the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation of why that is. (Cal. Penal Code, secs. 933, 933.05.)

# **IMPROVING SFPD'S COOPERATION WITH THE OFFICE OF CIVILIAN COMPLAINTS: BEATING THE ONE YEAR CLOCK**

## Summary of Recommendations

1. SFPD must adopt procedures to ensure compliance with the City Charter requirement that it cooperate with the OCC and minimize the number of meritorious citizen complaints dismissed as a result of SFPD delays.
2. The SFPD should identify those documents which can be routinely released to OCC so as to speed up OCC investigations.
3. The SFPD should institute better tracking of OCC investigations so as to minimize the number of complaints dismissed for not being completed within one year, and the Police Commission should exercise more oversight to enforce this.

## **GLOSSARY**

MCD – Management Control Division of the San Francisco Police Department

Member – A sworn officer of the San Francisco Police Department

MRF – Member Response Form

OCC – Office of Civilian Complaints

SFPD – San Francisco Police Department

## **OVERVIEW**

The Office of Civilian Complaints (OCC) receives and investigates citizen complaints regarding alleged misconduct by on-duty sworn officers of the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD). When a complaint is found to be valid, OCC forwards a summary of its findings to the Management Control Division (MCD) of SFPD with a recommendation regarding discipline. There is a one-year time limit within which the officer must be notified that discipline is being considered (with some exceptions), according to state law. After this statutory time limit, no sanction of any kind may be imposed on the officer regardless of the nature of the misconduct. Meritorious citizen complaints have been dismissed during the past three years because of delays in the OCC investigation process caused by SFPD personnel, and by MCD's processing of complaints sustained by OCC.

The 2002-2003 Civil Grand Jury investigated the procedures followed by SFPD in responding to OCC requests for information and documents, and the manner in which sustained complaints recommending discipline are handled within SFPD. The Grand Jury concluded that the SFPD procedures unnecessarily delay processing of some OCC requests and sustained complaints. Better tracking of OCC-sustained complaints and modification of existing procedures could eliminate the need to dismiss meritorious complaints.

The Grand Jury also concluded that the Police Commission has not exercised its power over both OCC and SFPD to ensure that meritorious citizen complaints are not dismissed because of delays caused by SFPD procedures. After all, the Police Commission has “the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage” the SFPD.

To reduce the dismissal of such citizen complaints, the SFPD should exercise greater supervision over its officers and supervisors to ensure that officers respond promptly to OCC requests for information and interviews; identify documents that can be routinely released to OCC when requested in connection with an ongoing investigation; maintain adequate records of pending OCC sustained complaints and ensure that those complaints are processed within the statutory time limits. Both the Chief of Police and the Police Commission should receive reports of citizen complaints pending in SFPD, reports that alert the Chief and the Commission to the dates on which the pending complaints were filed and the statutory date by which the Chief must give notice to the officer that disciplinary proceedings are to be initiated. If necessary, the Police Commission should exercise its supervisory powers to ensure that these recommendations are implemented.

## **BACKGROUND**

OCC was created by a voter-initiated amendment of the San Francisco City Charter in 1983. (Now, Article IV, section 4.127.) Although OCC was placed under the direct supervision of the Police Commission, it appears to be unique among civilian review agencies in that it is entirely independent of the police department and has a civilian staff, none of whose members may be former SFPD employees. OCC receives and investigates approximately 1,000 civilian complaints each year. Some 80 percent of its investigations are completed in less than six months. On average, each year 100 complaints are sustained, which is to say that the allegations are found to have merit and are sent to MCD for review.

OCC investigates and makes findings on civilian complaints alleging on-duty misconduct by SFPD officers.<sup>1</sup> If, after investigation, an allegation in a complaint is found to be meritorious, the sustained complaint and investigative file are routed to MCD with a recommendation regarding appropriate discipline. If, after review of the file, MCD believes that more evidence is necessary or does not agree that the officer’s conduct was improper, it may discuss its concerns with OCC staff, undertake additional investigation itself, or pass the matter on to the Chief of Police with its own recommendation. If, however, MCD agrees with the OCC findings and recommendation, the file is forwarded to the Chief for further action.

---

<sup>1</sup> Off-duty misconduct is not within the purview of OCC. Off-duty misconduct complaints are investigated by MCD.

### The Role of the Chief In Initiating Disciplinary Proceedings

Only the Chief may initiate imposition of discipline on a sworn SFPD officer. The Chief has broad discretion in imposing lesser discipline of sworn officers, but is limited by the San Francisco City Charter to imposition of no more than a ten-day suspension without pay. For serious misconduct, the Police Commission may impose greater discipline after the officer is afforded a public evidentiary hearing. If the Chief does not follow an OCC recommendation that charges of misconduct be filed with the Commission, OCC may file a complaint with the Police Commission, which then decides whether to proceed. The Police Commission may also order the Chief to file charges with it, but again, only the Chief can initiate disciplinary proceedings.

### The Citizen Complaint Process: The Clock Begins To Tick

When a complaint is filed with OCC, that office notifies the officer of the complaint and his or her right to be heard by the OCC, the right to be represented by outside counsel during the investigation, and the right to receive notice of the outcome. The investigation must be completed within one year, as discussed below. The officer is required by law to appear, on written notice, for an interview with an OCC investigator and to respond to a Member Response Form (MRF) sent by OCC. SFPD General Order 2.04 provides that the officer must complete a MRF and return it to his or her commanding officer within 21 calendar days of the notice. If an officer is unable to meet the deadline, or is unable to appear for a scheduled interview with an OCC investigator, the officer must contact the OCC investigator prior to the due date to reschedule. Commanding Officers must forward completed MRFs to OCC by the next business day. They also are to maintain copies of Citizen Complaint forms to ensure that OCC receives them and to maintain statistical records.

It is SFPD policy that the officer is responsible to return a MRF to the Commanding Officer within 21 days and the Commanding Officer is responsible to receive and log the completed MRF, deliver it to OCC on the next business day (SFPD Bulletin, January 4, 2001). Failure of an officer to complete and return a MRF within 21 days or to appear for an interview when requested, of Commanding Officers to serve the MRF on the officer, or of a Commanding Officer to ensure timely delivery of a completed MRF to OCC is itself misconduct for which the officer or Commanding Officer may be disciplined. Pursuant to an agreement between OCC and SFPD, OCC does not add this misconduct to a pending OCC complaint. Instead, the matter is handled internally by SFPD.

### California's One-Year Limit on Misconduct Investigations: The Clock is Ticking

California's Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights precludes imposing any punishment on an officer if the investigation of a charge of misconduct is not completed within one year of the filing of a complaint with OCC (Government Code, section 3304, subdivision (d), hereafter called "Section 3304(d)"). An OCC investigation is not complete until the Chief of Police gives formal notice to the officer that imposition of discipline is contemplated. Notice to an officer that OCC has sustained a complaint and recommended imposition of discipline does not constitute the notice required by

statute.<sup>2</sup> The required notice to the officer must come from the Chief of Police and thus the statutory time within which an investigation must be completed runs until the Chief of Police gives the officer notice that disciplinary proceedings have been initiated. Because of uncertainties regarding the proper interpretation of the statute, the Police Commission policy does not normally apply any of the exceptions that would extend the one-year time limit for notice of disciplinary action.

#### Consequences of Delays: The Clock Expires and Complaints are Dismissed

During and before 2000, a backlog of civilian complaints built up in OCC and MCD leading to dismissal of proceedings in which OCC had sustained a complaint and recommended imposition of discipline—for no other reason than the one-year period for investigation had elapsed. While that backlog has been eliminated, some meritorious complaints continue to be dismissed because the officer had not received notice of contemplated discipline within the year. This Grand Jury report addresses procedures in SFPD that may contribute to the dismissal of meritorious complaints without imposition of disciplinary sanctions for misconduct.

### **INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS**

Members of the Grand Jury interviewed Police Commission members, staff members of OCC, and SFPD personnel. They also reviewed:

- San Francisco City Charter, article IV, section 4.127, and A8.343
- Government Code, section 3304
- Penal Code, section 832.7
- SFPD General Orders 2.04, 2.07, and Bulletin A 01-15
- OCC 2001 Annual Report
- OCC Officer Failures to Comply reports (redacted) for 01/01/2002-12/31/02
- OCC Statistical Report – Second Quarter 2002
- Opinion of the First District Court of Appeal in *San Francisco Police Officers Association v. City and County of San Francisco*, A097433
- Opinion of the San Francisco Superior Court in *San Francisco Police Officers Association v. City and County of San Francisco*, No. 324365
- OCC 11/14/02 correspondence with SFPD Chief Prentice E. Sanders re: protocol for release of investigative materials
- Memorandum of Understanding between City & County of San Francisco and San Francisco Police Officers' Association July 2, 2002-June 30, 2003

---

<sup>2</sup> The San Francisco Superior Court held this in *San Francisco Police Officers Association v. City and County of San Francisco*, No. 324635, and the First District Court of Appeal has affirmed this interpretation (in *San Francisco Police Officers Association v. City and County of San Francisco*, No. A097433).

## **FACTS, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **1. THE INVESTIGATIVE CLOCK IS TICKING: ELIMINATING DELAYS IN INVESTIGATIONS OF CIVILIAN COMPLAINTS**

#### **FACTS**

- In the investigation of a civilian complaint, OCC uses a Member Response Form (MRF) to obtain information from the accused officer about the allegations of the complaint. OCC also interviews the officer, and reviews documents related to the incident that are in the custody of SFPD. Some of those documents are held in district stations.
- From January 1, 2001 through December 31, 2002, in almost 150 instances, OCC investigative delays were caused by the failure of Commanding Officers to serve accused officers with a MRF within the time limits specified on the face of the notice, failure of accused officers to complete and return a MRF (or to notify the OCC of inability to do so), or failure of accused officers to appear for a scheduled interview or reschedule the interview at OCC. Three of those cases could not proceed because of the one-year time limit imposed by Section 3304(d). Others are still pending and may have to be dismissed because of the delays occasioned by officer failure to comply with the command of General Order 2.04 (see below), which sets for SFPD procedures for handling civilian complaint matters.
- SFPD General Order 2.04 mandates that a MRF sent to an accused officer be completed and returned to the officer's Commanding Officer within 21 calendar days of the notice to respond. The Commanding Officer must ensure delivery of the form to OCC on the next business day.
- OCC notifies SFPD (by sending a "Blue Folder" file to MCD) when an officer who has been served with a MRF or an order to appear for an interview fails to complete and return the MRF on time or fails to comply with the order to appear. OCC also notifies MCD when a Commanding Officer fails to serve an order on an accused officer promptly.
- The sanction SFPD customarily imposes on Commanding Officers for failure to serve an OCC order and on officers for late or incomplete MRFs and missed interviews is a simple admonishment. That sanction is not equivalent to sanction generally imposed for analogous misconduct such as failure of an officer to appear at the firearms range or for a physical examination— suspension without pay for one or more days.

#### **FINDINGS**

- Although the Chief of Police has imposed responsibility on Commanding Officers to ensure that personnel under their command promptly serve OCC notices, track the officer's response, and ensure that MRFs are returned to OCC within the specified time limits, insufficient emphasis has been placed on the importance of doing so. The consequence of this lack of emphasis is investigative delays.

- SFPD tolerates officer failure to comply with the General Order concerning prompt return of MRFs. It does not impose discipline for such failures promptly and consistently, and thus SFPD internal practices provide no incentive for officers to comply with an OCC investigation.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1a. SFPD should provide additional training at the Police Academy regarding General Order 2.04 and the prompt handling of MRFs. Additionally, department bulletins should regularly discuss that General Order and potential sanctions for failure to comply.
- 1b. Regular tracking of the status of OCC requests should be instituted.
- 1c. Unless excused for good cause, failure to comply with the time limits of General Order 2.04, to serve OCC notices, and to appear at scheduled OCC interviews should be treated as misconduct that is subject to discipline equivalent to that imposed for failure to appear for scheduled firearm range training or physical examination, namely, suspension without pay for one or more days.

### **REQUIRED RESPONSES**

Chief of Police – 60 days  
 Police Commission – 60 days  
 OCC – 60 days  
 Board of Supervisors – 90 days

## **2. THE CLOCK IS STILL TICKING: ELIMINATING NEEDLESS DELAYS OVER ROUTINE DOCUMENTS**

### **FACTS**

- The City Charter mandates that OCC receive prompt and full cooperation and assistances from all City departments and employees (section 4.127). SFPD General Order 2.04 implements that mandate by establishing as a policy that officers cooperate fully with OCC and provide full assistance in the investigation of citizen complaints.
- All documents released to OCC by SFPD must remain confidential. (Government Code, section 832.7.) Personnel records released to OCC may only be obtained from OCC by court order.
- No SFPD General Order, bulletin, policy, or guidelines currently exists to specify the documents that may routinely be released to OCC upon its request.

- OCC staff state that some district station commanders have cooperated in the past by providing documents, but the level of cooperation changes whenever there is a command change.
- OCC has attempted to obtain SFPD cooperation in drafting a protocol covering treatment of routine document requests. It has proposed a list of almost 100 such documents. SFPD administrators have not adopted the protocol proposed by OCC counsel.
- SFPD delays action on many routine OCC document requests by routing them to its Legal Unit for review.

### **FINDINGS**

- SFPD is not complying with the Charter mandate that it provide full cooperation and assistance to OCC in the investigations of citizen complaints (Charter section 4.127).
- Delays in OCC investigations are caused in part by delays in prompt receipt of needed documents from SFPD. These delays contribute to the eventual dismissal of valid citizen complaints because the investigation could not be concluded within one year (Section 3304(d)).
- In some cases, an ongoing SFPD crime investigation might be affected if an OCC investigator were to interview a witness and disclose SFPD investigative material, and that is a legitimate concern. However, many categories of documents that OCC sometimes needs in the course of an investigation of a citizen complaint do not present that threat and can be routinely – and promptly – released to OCC. For example, search and arrest warrants, ballistic reports, forensic reports, crime scene photographs, diagrams, DMV traffic accident report forms and suspension orders, reports of Vehicle Code violations (such as driving without a license or with suspended or revoked license) appear to fall within this category.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2a. SFPD should promptly review the list of documents OCC has proposed to it for routine release and issue a Bulletin to all district station Commanders and other personnel specifying those documents that it agrees should routinely be released to OCC.
- 2b. SFPD administration should meet with OCC representatives within 60 days of the receipt of this report to consider other documents that may be routinely released, establish guidelines governing situations in which further review of an OCC document request may be warranted, and establish time limits within which such review should be completed and the document request acted upon. The action taken in response to this recommendation should be noted in the departmental response to the report.

## **REQUIRED RESPONSES**

Chief of Police – 60 days  
Police Commission – 60 days  
OCC – 60 days  
Board of Supervisors – 90 days

### **3. THE CLOCK IS RUNNING OUT: INCREASING EFFICIENCY AND OVERSIGHT OF MCD'S PROCESSING OF SUSTAINED COMPLAINTS**

#### **FACTS**

- OCC sustains a complaint when it believes that a preponderance of the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred and that the conduct violated SFPD policy or procedure (General Order 2.04). Before a complaint is sustained, it undergoes several levels of review within OCC to ensure that all available evidence has been obtained and considered, including evidence that may exonerate an accused officer.
- OCC currently disposes of 80% of the complaints it receives within six months. Only five percent of its investigations take more than ten months. From July 1, 2001 to June 30 2002, the OCC sent to MCD 106 sustained cases in which no statutory exception applied. Two months or more remained for MCD for processing before the statutory time limit in 71 of those cases. In 36 of the cases, six months or more time remained. In only 15 was there less than one month available to MCD for processing. More recently, a case that reached MCD on the statutory deadline involved a prolonged investigation of a complaint against 28 officers involving 119 charges of misconduct.
- OCC endeavors to forward sustained complaints to MCD within ten months of the date the complaint was filed. General Order 2.04 mandates that the Chief of Police or his designee complete a review of the case and make an action recommendation within 60 days of receipt of an OCC case, or, if the deadline cannot be met, seek an extension of time from the Police Commission.
- During the first six months of 2002, OCC closed 422 cases. Of these, 201 had been filed in 2001 and 219 had been filed in 2002. Of those cases, 47 of the complaints were sustained and sent on to MCD.
- During the first six months of 2002, nine cases in which OCC had sustained a civilian complaint of officer misconduct and sent the matter on to MCD within the statutory one year time limit were dismissed by MCD after that one-year statutory limit expired.
- During the second quarter of 2002, OCC received 280 complaints, involving 373 SFPD officers and 1,113 total allegations. Of those, 60 allegations were sustained, 661 allegations were not sustained, and 259 allegations were found to involve conduct that was proper.

- MCD acts as the representative or staff of the Chief of Police in reviewing sustained citizen complaints routed to it by OCC. Its role is not to conduct an independent investigation. MCD review is for the purpose of deciding whether the evidence summarized in the OCC report is sufficient to support the complaint and the recommended discipline.
- Delays in the handling of a complaint sustained by OCC occur when MCD concludes that further evidence is needed and either conveys that opinion to OCC or undertakes its own investigation prior to making a recommendation to the Chief of Police regarding disposition of the sustained complaint. These delays in some cases leading to dismissal of the complaint for not being concluded within the one-year period.
- OCC report reports quarterly to the Police Commission on the status of pending cases. It is unable to include cases pending in MCD in that report as MCD does not advise OCC of the status of cases until it reaches its final conclusions. When it does report to OCC, MCD does not advise OCC of the date discipline was imposed on an officer nor the date on which the officer was notified that disciplinary action would be taken. Although requested to require such reports, the Police Commission has not required that MCD provide that information. MCD has the ability to advise OCC of the relevant dates.
- MCD does not produce for itself, for the Chief of Police, or for the Police Commission a list of pending civilian complaints that sets forth the date each pending civilian complaint was filed with OCC, the date on which each sustained complaint was sent to MCD, and the date on which the one-year deadline expires and the complaint must be dismissed. The Police Commission has not required that it do so. As a result, the Chief of Police and the Police Commission do not have the information necessary to monitor the processing of civilian complaints to ensure that they are disposed of on the merits.
- Some sustained complaints reach MCD with less than two months of statutory time remaining for MCD review. In those cases, OCC endeavors to alert MCD when a pending case will be sent on. Because of current Police Commission policy, some of those cases are dismissed on statutory grounds when MCD does not complete its review within the one-year time limit even though an exception may apply.
- Although OCC forwards only 100 cases each year to MCD for review, currently MCD also investigates approximately 500 office- involved matters that do not arise from citizen complaints about on-duty conduct of SFPD officers. That responsibility may interfere with processing of some OCC cases. Nevertheless, MCD does not comply with General Order 2.04 by seeking an extension of time from the Police Commission when it is unable to complete its review of a sustained OCC complaint within 60 days.

- SFPD personnel acknowledge that MCD presently has the ability, using its current database and tracking system, to produce a monthly report of sustained complaints pending in that division. That database has not been maintained and does not contain current information. If maintained, that system could be adapted to reflect the time limit for each case's investigation. Because of MCD failure to maintain its database, that information can be produced only by a hand search of MCD records. Because of MCD's failure to maintain its database and its failure to notify OCC of the dates on which disciplinary action is taken or an officer notified of pending disciplinary action, the Grand Jury was unable to determine how many, if any, sustained complaints of officer misconduct were dismissed on statutory time limit grounds while pending in MCD from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002.
- Tracking the status and disposition of citizen complaints through the OCC and MCD processes is made more difficult by the failure of the two offices to use the same language in identifying charges and reporting their conclusions.
- SFPD personnel state that new software capable of tracking the status of all pending complaints would be prohibitively expensive. Software programs used for legal practice management, which are capable of performing these tasks and of alerting staff to upcoming dismissal dates, are available for under \$500.00.
- Currently, MCD and OCC personnel do not meet on a regular basis to discuss problems each has in processing civilian complaints and procedures by which those problems might be solved.
- The Police Commission has the authority to establish rules or guidelines for OCC and MCD that would enable the Commission to monitor and ensure timely completion of the OCC/MCD processes and avoid dismissals. To date, however, the Police Commission has not exercised this authority.

### **FINDINGS**

- Prompt, unbiased, and thorough investigation of civilian complaints of improper conduct by on-duty law enforcement officers, and the sure and swift imposition of appropriate sanctions, are crucial to public confidence in and cooperation with peace officers. When meritorious complaints do not result in imposition of discipline, public confidence in its police force and the disciplinary process is eroded.
- The dismissal of sustained, presumably meritorious, civilian complaints for untimeliness is due in part to MCD's handling of OCC's requests for documents and of sustained complaints.
- Although SFPD recognizes the importance of the civilian complaint process, SFPD and the MCD unit have not made and are reluctant to make changes in their procedures that would avoid the need to dismiss many sustained complaints for untimeliness.

- The failure to apply apparently applicable exceptions to the statutory one-year time limit results in unnecessary dismissals of meritorious complaints and to a consequent erosion of public confidence in the civilian complaint process.
- The failure of MCD to generate for itself and the Chief of Police a monthly list of OCC sustained complaints pending in MCD and/or before the Chief for action, with the one-year time limit highlighted, might contribute to inadvertent or intentional delays in acting on those complaints within the time limits, leading to their dismissal.
- OCC must maintain its independence from SFPD if the public is to have confidence in the impartiality of its investigations. Nonetheless, cooperation and mutual trust between OCC management and MCD in the handling of sustained complaints are essential to their shared goal of maintaining public confidence in SFPD officers. Any adversarial relationship between OCC and MCD might interfere with the prompt, impartial process of sustained complaints.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3a. MCD should immediately bring its database of pending cases up to date.
- 3b. MCD should produce a monthly list of all investigations of alleged officer misconduct pending in MCD, and forward it to the Chief of Police and Police Commission. The list should include both matters involving on-duty misconduct referred by OCC and those alleging off-duty misconduct that are being investigated by MCD. Those reports should reflect the date each pending complaint or report of officer misconduct was made, the date each OCC-sustained complaint was sent to or received by MCD, and the date on which the one-year deadline would preclude imposition of disciplinary sanctions.
- 3c. The officer in charge of MCD should schedule monthly meetings with the director of OCC to discuss matters of mutual concern in the investigation and processing of sustained civilian complaints. The first of these discussions should include how to establish a merged data base in which charges, current status of pending cases, and dispositions are uniformly described (to the extent permitted by OCC confidentiality requirements).
- 3d. The Police Commission should revise its policy governing recognition of exceptions to the one-year time limit established by Section 3304(d), particularly as it applies to complaints involving multiple officers. To ensure that on-duty misconduct by SFPD officers does not go unpunished, OCC and MCD should be given the advantage of any arguably applicable exceptions.
- 3e. The Police Commission should exercise greater oversight of the civilian complaint procedures of OCC and SFPD to ensure that meritorious complaints alleging misconduct by on-duty SFPD officers are not dismissed for untimeliness.

3f. The Commission should adopt rules and procedures mandating the preparation of the reports recommended in 3b, above, review these reports before each Commission meeting, and require the Chief of Police and his management staff to justify any delays in the processing of complaints of officer misconduct that threaten to preclude imposition of sanctions because of the time limits imposed by Section 3304(d).

**REQUIRED RESPONSES**

Chief of Police – 60 days.

Police Commission – 60 days.

Mayor San Francisco – 60 days

OCC – 60 days

Board of Supervisors – 90 days

**The Members of the 2002-2003 Civil Grand Jury  
For the City and County of San Francisco**

Jane R. Brady

William J. Bush

Jess Centeno

Henry Cohen

Clement D. DeAmicis

Rosemary DeGregorio

Patricia Glynn

Susan Hirsch

Ross W. Hoffman

Stephen T. Jacobs

George E. Kloves

Richard P. Matthews

Jack L. McNulty

Susan M. O'Connor

Mary A. Powell, Foreperson

Inez K. Scourkes

Arlene K. Singer

Joanna B. Warrens

Pauline Walker