



## **Joint Response to Public Comment Pursuant to DGO 3.01.04(D)**

### **DGO 6.07 Dog Complaints**

February 20, 2025

SFPD Department General Order (DGO) 3.01 requires that all policies under development be posted publicly to provide members of the public thirty (30) business days to submit policy recommendations.

Pursuant to DGO 3.01.04 (D), the Department and the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) jointly prepare a public response, which shall be posted on the Department's website, outlining the recommendations included and not included in the DGO draft submitted to the Police Commission.

Joint responses are captured in the following recommendation grid which captures the original recommendation, whether the recommendation was included or not included in the draft DGO, and the explanation relating to the decision to include or not include the recommendation into the draft DGO.

The Department reserves the right to remove or not respond to comments if they are:

- Unrelated to the subject of the DGO.
- Include private personal information (whether the commenter's or someone else's), including home address, home or cell phone number, personal e-mail address, or personal identification.
- Include profanity or obscene language.

The Department received nine recommendations for DGO 6.07, *Dog Complaints* from the public and reached a consensus with the DPA on five of the responses; DPA had no comment on three of the responses.

The Department and DPA extend gratitude to all who took the time to contribute recommendations to this policy.

DGO 6.07 Public Comment Joint Responses  
Public Review Period: 9/26/24 - 11/08/24

#	Public Comment	Date Received	SFPD response	SFPD Explanation	DPA Explanation
<b>R1</b>	6.07.02B-Dog bite on human is reportable, regardless of whether the skin is broken. 6.07.02 P1 change to "shall" attend. VDDU hearings are quasi-judicial. 6.07.04: Photos- Take photos of the dog's owner, if owner is available. [6.07.02 B; 6.07.02 P1; 6.07.04]	9/27/24	Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO	6.07.02(B) - Definitions have been modified. The procedures section has been clarified so that all accounts of biting dog have an incident report completed. 6.07.02(O)(1)- Vicious and Dangerous Dog Hearing section is 6.07.04 F; the department will change the language from "will" to "shall" attend the hearing if requested. 6.07.04 - this comment refers to 6.07.04(B)(4). The department has amended sub-section (a) to now begin, "Where possible, members should take photos of the dog's owner..."	Agree w/ addition of IR requirement for dog bites. However, updated version does not include requirement to attend hearings.
<b>R2</b>	Form 573. Name it SFPD 573 (letterhead w/email; fax; tel)Animal Bite Rpt Reporting Facility/Person/Date rept/owner/animal/gender/altered/vax?/particulars of incident/loc/date/vic/hospital/MD&vetname #Vet/prev restrictions? [DGO 6.07.02 F (following review of numerous CA counties) Form 573 requires extensive revision]	9/27/24	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	The form will be updated to maintain compliance with any reporting requirements and this DGO.	No DPA comment.
<b>R3</b>	more and more entitled dog owners are walking around with their unleashed dogs on City streets. Often the owners are looking at their phones and not paying attention to their dogs which are pooping on the streets and peoples property. [Unleashed Dogs: SF Health Code 41 and 41.12(a)}	9/28/24	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	The Health Code for unleashed dogs is cited in 6.07.02(B), and direction is given to members regarding this in section 6.07.04(A).	No DPA comment.
<b>R4</b>	All dog complaints, unless an immediate danger is present, should be handled by ACC. They are NOT police issues. THE vDDU should be transferred to the Sheriff, like every other County. SFPD are not dog cat hers. Nor do they have any training in this area.	9/29/24	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	The Health Code outlines several requirements of this department to act upon and enforce various complaints regarding dogs; including dog bites, unleashed dogs, and barking dogs.	Dog complaints are police issues per S.F. Health Code. This was a policy choice by the S.F. Board of Supervisors. VDDU has training in this area.

DGO 6.07 Public Comment Joint Responses  
Public Review Period: 9/26/24 - 11/08/24

#	Public Comment	Date Received	SFPD response	SFPD Explanation	DPA Explanation
R5	In the draft, it states under the definitions section for "Incident reports - the standard SFPD report shall be completed for all incidents." ALL incidents of what?... Dog barking? Dog biting only? This should be clarified. [6.07.02 Definitions - I. Incident Reports]	10/10/24	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	The definition for incident reports has been removed. Per 6.07.04 (C) and (D), members are expected to complete an incident report for dog bites and vicious and dangerous dogs.	Agree w/ clarification.
R6	Under "Unleased Dog" - ".. Members SHALL enforce the leash laws.." I disagree. Language should be changed to : "Members SHOULD enforce the leash laws." Discretion should be given, like all other infraction violations. [6.07.04 Procedure - Unleased Dog]	10/10/24	Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO	6.07.04(A) has been amended to state "Members should cite or admonish and educate the owner or guardian of the dog regarding San Francisco leash laws"	Agree w/clarification.
R7	"Unleased Dog" - Shouldn't officers be given the autonomy, instead of citing the dog owner, to admonish or educate the person about the leash laws? A violation should not result it an automatic citation in all situations. DISCRETION. [6.07.04 Procedure - Unleased Dog]	10/10/24	Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO	Please see the response to R6.	Agree with commenter.
R8	Section B1 Medical Treatment - States that "physician shall complete bite report".. how are officers supposed to know if Dr completes this form? Instead, it should state "officers should inform the victim to remind their treating dr to complete the form." [6.07.04 Procedure - B1 Medical Treatment -]	10/10/24	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	6.07.04(C)(1) has been amended to clarify "Arrange for medical treatment. If medical treatment is refused, member shall complete the Animal Bite Report form..."	No DPA comment.
R9	Section B2 section - instructs members to "Cite owner" for unprovoked bites. Are officers supposed to do this even if not committed in their presence and victim does not want to press charges? This should be clarified. [6.07.04 Procedure - B2 Citation]	10/10/24	Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO	6.07.04 C(2) has been modified to direct members to DGO's 5.04 (Citation Release) and 5.06 (Arrest by Private Persons). Members will follow those policies for citation as appropriate.	Health Code states that "...the Police Department shall issue a citation to the owner or guardian of said dog..." (Sec. 41.5.1.)