

## DGO 6.09 DRAFT Working Group Recommendation Grid

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation (as of 10/30/25)	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.	7/15/2025	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.	7/15/2025	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	There was a request for DV stats: calls that were restraining order violations vs other DV calls; data from the District Attorney's Office relating to how many cases were prosecuted; 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.; restraining order violations; data on SFDA cases prosecuted (to see how effective they are)	7/15/2025	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	Information was provided to working group members	Open
4	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.	7/15/2025	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	The 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. This clarification will be made in training.	Open
5	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	7/15/2025	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
6	Forms - the working group recommended combining forms where possible to reduce duplicity for the officer; making the forms available online; checking that all numbers are accurate and properly categorized; making it more readable for victims; and including how to get a gun violence restraining order. There was also discussion about providing resources for men where possible.  Update 9/9 - (142 form) The working group discussed reformatting the handout to make it more clear: - Highlight the main 24-hr resources, Casa de las Madres and W.O.M.A.N. - Move CalBCV above DA's office resources - Include language that DA are mandated reporters  <b>Update 10/7 - The working group recommended changes to the 142 form -</b> - <b>Replace National Human Trafficking with the SF Coalition Against Human Trafficking.</b> - <b>Use CROC instead of Court ACCESS for restraining orders information.</b> - <b>Include SF WAR (Women Against Rape) in 'Primary 24-Hr Victim Services' section.</b> - <b>Add web address in addition to QR codes</b> - <b>Add DeafHOPE to form</b> <b>There was discussion about keeping the 142 form as small as possible so it fits in officer's pocket.</b>	7/15/2025	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The department agrees that there is an opportunity to streamline the information provided to victims. The forms will be available online and all of the information on them will be checked for accuracy	Open
7	An officer recommended there was a carbon copy of the EPO 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	7/15/2025	Recommendation requires further discussion w/ other city departments. Outside scope of working group.	Dept. will look into ability of sending digital copies	Open
8	A working group member recommended removing the 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.	7/15/2025	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Language amended in the manual to provide clarity and include this information.	Open
9	A working group members asked if officers have to do the lethality screening or if it can it be done by advocates	7/15/2025	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
10	A working group member suggested including more resources on the SFPD SVU webpage  <b>Update 10/7 - webpage recommendation - consult with SF WAR to see if there are other resources they would like added onto the site</b>	7/29/2025	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
11	Working group members requested to review the draft manual in addition to the Department General Order (DGO)	7/29/2025	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

## DGO 6.09 DRAFT Working Group Recommendation Grid

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation (as of 10/30/25)	Open/ Closed
12	A working group member requested to see the currently published manual.	7/29/2025	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	<a href="https://www.sf.gov/sites/default/files/2022-04/PoliceCommission010522-DVMManual_0.pdf">The requested manual was formally submitted to the Police Commission in 2021 and is available here (https://www.sf.gov/sites/default/files/2022-04/PoliceCommission010522-DVMManual_0.pdf)</a>	Open
13	There was a recommendation 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. - Officers want a DGO that they can reference. Don't necessarily need the "why", they need the 'what to do'.	7/29/2025	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	SFPD staff agrees and will use this recommendation as a policy writing guideline.	Open
14	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.  <b>Update 10/7 -The working group recommends changing the workflow in the DGO to better match reality: 'Medical aid', 'interviews', 'investigation', 'arrests', 'notification'</b>	7/29/2025	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	Sections of the draft have been moved to make more chronological sense	Open
15	Working group members suggested hyperlinks to Penal Codes when possible instead of adding the penal code language in the policy.  Update 8/14 - A working group member recommended referencing and citing all penal codes for the strangulation definition (criminal threat, bodily harm, false imprisonment, attempted murder, assault with great bodily harm)	7/29/2025	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	SFPD staff have and will continue to hyperlink relevant references to codes throughout the policy. However, not every single point of discussion needs to be referenced, as officers are trained and aware of penal codes and potential violations relating to strangulation. Officers are trained to cite all appropriate violations.	Open
16	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? There was robust discussion about the pros and cons of always requesting an EPO.  Update 8/14 - There was discussion among the working group about what to do if the victim says they do NOT want an EPO.  Update 9/9 - The working group had a discussion about requesting an EPO if the victim meets the threshold outlined in the government code. The working group recommends including the language in the government code for clarity.  <b>10/7 - The working group had a discussion about the updated language for requesting an EPO - citing the law was unclear; recommends it be changed to the previous version from the last meeting, but keep the language that requires officers to inform the victim of their rights and include the ability for officers to request an EPO if they determine there is a need (regardless of what victim says). They also recommended including language that an officer needs to provide rationale if they do not request an EPO.</b>	7/29/2025	Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO	The draft DGO has been clarified and requires officers to seek an EPO if they believe the victim is in danger.	Open
17	A working group member inquired if there is more information available for checking for active court orders - does the manual go into more detail about what types of orders to check for?	7/29/2025	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. This information is in the draft DGO.	Open
18	A member requested that in the EPO section a statement is included that children can be added to the EPO as well	7/29/2025	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	This information has been included in the draft DGO.	Open
19	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; a working group member recommended making it more clear that addresses are not legally required on the EPO.  9/9 - a working group member recommended making the language more permissive.	7/29/2025	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Language has been included in the draft DGO that clarifies addresses are not legally required on an EPO and the officer needs to check with the victim if they want their address to remain confidential.  Update 9/9 - this recommendation was not included. Officers have to inquire whether victims want their address to be confidential.	Open
20	The working group members made points that language about court order violations could be helpful; 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	7/29/2025	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	Language was already included in the draft DGO under warrantless misdemeanor.	Open

## DGO 6.09 DRAFT Working Group Recommendation Grid

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation (as of 10/30/25)	Open/ Closed
21	A working group member asked for more information on identifying Dominant Aggressor and whether the Penal Code (13701) should be included in the definition.	7/29/2025	Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO	Language about the purpose of identifying a dominant aggressor has been included in the draft DGO. The Penal Code citation was included in the section about identifying the dominant aggressor, instead of in the definition section.	Open
22	A working group member stated it would be helpful for victims 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.	7/29/2025	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Language included in the draft DGO to inform the victim of their legal right to self defense.	Open
23	The working group members agreed that for Lethality Assessment Screening - a member 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.	7/29/2025	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, but it is not required.	Open
24	Preserve the scene and collect evidence (Section B.3(a)) - more context on what a weapon is, and refer to "property for safekeeping". Change more closely to Penal Code (18265) and add PC 18250.  Update 8/14 - A working group member suggested guidance for members concerning confiscating deadly weapons and what could be considered a deadly weapon (PC 18250).	7/29/2025	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. The hyperlinks have been included.  Update 8/14 - Language has been included in the DGO that states "e.g. something that the member reasonably feels could be a weapon based on the incident."  Update 9/9 - The draft DGO has included "inherently" in the discussion about deadly weapons to provide more clarity to	Open
25	A working group member wanted to know if all calls that come in are labeled independently, and if officers can sort calls to tell how many come from a person/address.	8/14/2025	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	Yes - each call received by the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) receives its own unique code. However, officers can see a history of calls associated with a person, address, etc. when they are doing their investigation.	Open
26	A working group member requested that in the manual, expand on what is/not a deadly weapon	8/14/2025	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	Some language was included in the draft manual to expand on the language included in the DGO.	Open

Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO

Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO

Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis

Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document

Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO

Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO

Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO

Recommendation requires further discussion w/ other city departments. Outside scope of working group.

Recommendation included in draft form

Recommendation will be modified and included in draft form

Recommendation will not be included in the draft form

Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO

Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO

Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis

Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document

Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO

Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO

Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO

Recommendation requires further discussion w/ other city departments. Outside scope of working group.