

DGO 6.09 DRAFT Working Group Recommendation Grid

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation (as of 9/3/25)	Open/ Closed
1	An officer noted that there are no car seats at the stations which limits the ability to transport children involved in DV calls.	7/15/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	Upon review it was found that officers can obtain a booster seat from their assigned station or, if one is unavailable, from a neighboring station to ensure safe transportation of children. This information will be included in the manual so there is not confusion among responding officers.	Open
2	A working group member asked if Body worn camera (BWC) footage is being reviewed by AI in order to assist with translation or transcription.	7/15/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	The SFPD is currently piloting an AI based transcription tool that can transcribe body-worn camera footage but have no timeline for department wide implementation as of now.	Open
3	The working group coordinator asked the working group members if they were interested in seeing DV stats: data for calls that were restraining order violations vs other DV calls; The working group is interested in data from the District Attorney's Office relating to how many cases were prosecuted - might be on SF public data; calls for service that no officer showed up to; response times (can we see if it is by priority A, B, C?); How many calls were CAD vs led to incident reports, etc.	7/15/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	Staff submitted a request for DV statistics from the data teams and will provide to the working group asap.	Open
4	There was discussion about combining the multitudes of forms required for officers to give the victims.	7/15/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	The department agrees that there is an opportunity to streamline the information provided to victims of DV. The forms will be reviewed as a result.	Open
5	Can we italicize or bold the part telling people they have to Request something	7/15/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	Will be included in the final forms/handouts	Open
6	A working group member asked if the forms can be online for community members to access.	7/15/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	Final forms/handouts will be placed online	Open
7	A working group member asked if the department should check with Orgs to make sure they are properly categorized	7/15/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	Final forms/handouts will be checked with involved organizations	Open
8	Put on card how to get GVRO	7/15/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	Information on obtaining a GVRO will be included on the handouts.	Open
9	It says cases are assigned, but that isn't always true. Needs clarification that not all cases are assigned, may need to be proactive to request a case be assigned	7/15/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	The handouts will be edited for clarity so a victim knows whether to reference a case number or a CAD number.	Open
10	If it is just a CAD report and not an incident report - some sort of information about the difference/how they can follow-up	7/15/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	Information will be included in final forms/handouts	Open
11	More information for male victims	7/15/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	Information will be included in final forms/handouts	Open
12	Restraining Order Violation - if there is a RO violation and someone comes into the station to file a complaint, officers would like to NOT have to fill out all the DV information. Current policy states that officer HAS to, and get another EPO. Also - every	7/15/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or	Current policy is unclear on procedure if someone reports a RO violation NOT as part of a DV call (i.e., comes into the station). Procedure for restraining order violations not part of an emergency call will be clarified in the DV manual so officers do not need to do a completely new report for each offense.	Open
13	sometimes all the requirements on the form that officers have to fill out aren't even relevant because there isn't any physical violence	7/15/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	Forms will be streamlined so irrelevant portions do not need to be completed.	Open
14	The Forms and DGO predates the BWC, and also a lot of the form information is captured in regular report writing	7/15/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	Forms/handouts will be streamlined to decrease duplicity in accordance with SF Admin Code 96I.	Open
15	An officer asked if there is another way to notify CPS? Sometimes have to wait for them to let you know if can leave the scene with the kids there	7/15/25	Recommendation requires further discussion w/ other city departments. Outside scope of working group.	Dept. will work to contact CPS to get clarity on their procedures when receiving calls from officers.	Open
16	Remove requirement that each previous incident is summarized in the report - it can just be noted if there were previous incidents (how many) and if any were in SF.	7/15/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Language amended in the manual to provide clarity and include this information.	Open
17	Is there a reason some text is bold?	7/15/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	All formatting will be standardized in the documents.	Open

DGO 6.09 DRAFT Working Group Recommendation Grid

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation (as of 9/3/25)	Open/ Closed
18	Ofcr wished there was a carbon copy because need to copy for Dominant Aggressor, Victim, and scan for ID bureau. Can ofcr email the form to ID Bureau? Would help to make it so they can do it in the field	7/15/25	Recommendation requires further discussion w/ other city departments. Outside scope of working group.	Dept. will look into ability of sending digital copies	Open
19	redundancy of forms might help in case BWC footage is lost. Is there a way to upload temporarily to car or something so that the information is not lost?	7/15/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	The Department will inquire whether this process can be modified to alleviate the administrative burden on officers in the field.	Open
20	Do officers have to do the lethality screening? Can it be done by advocates?	7/15/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	Lethality screening, while not required by any penal code, is a best practice for first responders and recommended by POST.	Open
21	A working group member suggested including more resources on the SFPD SVU webpage	7/29/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	SVU webpage will be updated to reflect information in the DGO, the victim handouts, and will direct people to the County Court and DA's Office pages.	Open
22	Working group members requested to review the draft manual in addition to the Department General Order (DGO)	7/29/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	As this working group is designated by the Police Commission Resolution #XXX to review the DGO, the manual is outside of the scope of this activity. However, the policy writing lead staffs the working group and makes adjustments to the manual as the DGO progresses and information from this working group will be included in the draft manual (or moved from the draft manual to the DGO) as appropriate.	Open
23	A working group member requested to see the published manual.	7/29/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	The requested manual was formally submitted to the Police Commission in 2021. Manual submitted to Commission in 2021	Open
24	There was a consensus that the policy writers should prioritize limiting the amount of times an officer has to switch between the DGO and the manual for procedural guidance.	7/29/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	SFPD staff agrees.	Open
25	Officers stated that they want a DGO that they can reference when there may be a case that is in the grey area and they need to reference something quickly. Don't necessarily need the "why" - need the 'what to do', because they are trained in the why and all the legal definitions, etc.	7/29/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	Staff will use this recommendation as a policy writing guideline.	Open
26	There was a suggestion to reorganize the draft DGO so it is more in order so it can read more like a checklist. EG - F.4 (docs to provide victim) could be moved to end of DGO since it is near the end	7/29/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	Sections of the draft have been moved to make more chronological sense	Open
27	Working group members suggested hyperlinks to Penal Codes when possible instead of adding the penal code language in the policy.	7/29/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	SFPD staff have and will continue to hyperlink any reference to codes throughout the policy.	Open
28	Checking for active court orders - does the manual go into more detail about what types of orders to check for?	7/29/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	There is only one system officers query; all orders will pop up when it is searched.	Open
29	A working group member asked for more information on identifying Dominant Aggressor	7/29/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Language has been included in the draft DGO	Open
30	A working group member asked if there can be a threshold for determining when an EPO is requested? Can there be some sort of officer judgement call? What would the risks of that be?	7/29/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Draft DGO has been amended to include thresholds and a statement that the member will request an EPO where there is doubt about the victim's safety.	Open
31	Would be helpful for people to know when they call, that officers are looking for a dominant aggressor so that a victim is not deterred from calling again just because maybe they also participated in physical acts.	7/29/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Language included in the DGO to inform the victim of their legal right to self defense.	Open
32	Does the penal code need to be cited in the definition of Dominant Aggressor? (PC 13701)	7/29/25	Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO	The Penal Code does not need to be cited. For better clarity, it has been included in the section about identifying the dominant aggressor.	Open
33	Section B.3(a) - more context on what a weapon is, and refer to "property for safekeeping". Change more closely to Penal Code? Add a line "evaluation if there are other weapons of concern. Officer can determine whether it should be booked for safekeeping" Want to provide discretion for the officers without making it too broad. Want to make sure no guns are left on property.	7/29/25	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	Discussion about weapon confiscation has moved in the order of the DGO and some clarifying language has been included in addition to this recommendation.	Open
34	A member requested that in the EPO section a statement is included that children can be added to the EPO as well	7/29/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	This information has been included in the DGO	Open
35	Add PC 18250 to weapons possession	7/29/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	This information has been included in the DGO	Open

DGO 6.09 DRAFT Working Group Recommendation Grid

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation (as of 9/3/25)	Open/ Closed
36	Lethality Assessment Screening - should not HAVE to call a counselor if they trigger the protocol but the victim is insistent that they do not want to speak with an advocate in that moment. Still need language to provide privacy if they do want to speak with an advocate.	7/29/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Language has been included in the DGO to have the member contact a DV advocate for the victim if they are willing to speak with them at that time.	Open
37	There can be a safety issue if the EPO doesn't have the address listed confidential	7/29/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Language has been included under the EPO section about not including contact information if the victim wants it to remain confidential.	Open
38	Why do you need to add an EPO if there is already a protective order? This is redundant	7/29/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Language has been included so EPOs are only added to a court order if appropriate.	Open
39	Victim referral card - remove redundancies	7/29/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	Will be included in the final forms/handouts	Open
40	restraining order - protected party is not legally required to follow their own RO (they can't violate their own order). Need to know this doesn't make their RO less powerful	7/29/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or evidence document	This information was added to the draft manual.	Open
41	Do officers have to try to make victims speak with advocates?	7/29/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	No, there is no requirement that says officers have to try and make victims speak with an advocate at the scene.	Open
42	DPA Found policy failure because victim wanted their address confidential but it had to be an address on an EPO and then it was served to the aggressor	7/29/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Language has been included in the draft DGO to address this.	Open
43	language about court order violations could be helpful	7/29/25	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	Language already included under warrantless misdemeanor.	Open
44	there could be a downside of not requesting an EPO. A case could be made in family court or other places that this couldn't be too bad if an EPO wasn't requested. EPO could also place stricter rules on the aggressor	7/29/25	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	Language has been clarified to state "1. Member shall request an EPO if there are reasonable grounds to believe a person is in immediate and present danger of DV, based on the person's allegation of a recent incident of abuse or threat of abuse (California Family Code §6250). When in doubt, member will request the EPO. Refer to DV Manual for procedure on requests. a. EPO's do not need to be requested if victim has an active court order against the dominant aggressor, unless more restrictions are needed to ensure safety of the victim. b. EPO's can also include children and pets. c. Check with victim regarding address confidentiality prior to completing the EPO."	Open
45	A member requested restraining violation order data	8/14/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	DV by incode 15151 - Stay Away Order Violation, DVU related. 2022 - 145 calls; 2023 - 126 calls; 2024 - 126 calls	Open
46	Can we put data on a heat map?	8/14/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	This is not something the Department already has, and making this is outside the scope of the working group.	Open