

DGO 6.09 DRAFT Working Group Recommendation Grid

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation (as of 11/18/25)	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	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)	7/15/25	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.	7/15/25	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	7/15/25	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
6	<p>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.</p> <p>Update 9/9 - (142 form) The working group discussed reformatting the handout to make it more clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Highlight the+B7 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- Include language to advise the victim to follow-up with SVU if they haven't been contacted within a certain amount of time <p>Update 10/7 - The working group recommended changes to the 142 form -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Replace National Human Trafficking with the SF Coalition Against Human Trafficking.- Use CROC instead of Court ACCESS for restraining orders information.- Include SF WAR (Women Against Rape) in 'Primary 24-Hr Victim Services' section.- Add web address in addition to QR codes- Add DeafHOPE to form <p>There was discussion about keeping the 142 form as small as possible so it fits in officer's pocket.</p> <p>Update 11/4 -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- A working group member provided clarifying edits for CROC in the 142 form- There was discussion about amending the language of the lethality assessment so as not to continue to traumatize victims in the field.- There was a recommendation from the working group to remove the checkboxes for	7/15/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	<p>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.</p> <p>Update 9/9 - Changes have been made to reflect recommendations of the working group.</p> <p>Update 11/4 - Changes were made for clarification of CROC in the 142 form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The language of the lethality assessment was loosened so as not to re-traumatize the victim at the scene. The checkboxes were also removed for safety reasons.- Upon discussion with the SME and other officers, it was determined that the 480a and b forms are not being used in the field - they are being filled out after the fact at the station along with the incident report. As such, there is no benefit to keeping them as separate documents that duplicate the information being put into the narrative of the incident report, and then requiring officers to upload the separate documents and then book them as evidence.- Language included about escalation from previous incidents; removal of summary of previous incidents.	Open

DGO 6.09 DRAFT Working Group Recommendation Grid

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation (as of 11/18/25)	Open/ Closed
	<p>yes and no in the lethality assessment.</p> <p>- There was discussion about eliminating the 480a and b forms and making them a checklist resource in the manual and whether that makes it more difficult for officers in the field to make sure they get consistent information across incidents. Also whether the DA uses the forms to assist with assigning cases.</p> <p>- There was a recommendation for the incident checklist to include a note of if there was any escalation from previous incidents, and to remove the summary of previous</p>				
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	7/15/25	Recommendation requires further discussion w/ other city departments. Outside scope of working group.	Dept. will look into ability of sending digital copies	Open
9	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.	7/15/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Language amended in the manual to provide clarity and include this information.	Open
10	A working group members asked if officers have to do the lethality screening or if it 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
11	A working group member suggested including more resources on the SFPD SVU webpage Update 10/7 - webpage recommendation - consult with SF WAR to see if there are other resources they would like added onto the site	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
12	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
13	A working group member requested to see the currently 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 and is available here (https://www.sf.gov/sites/default/files/2022-04/PoliceCommission010522-DVManual_0.pdf)	Open
14	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'.	7/29/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	SFPD staff agrees and will use this recommendation as a policy writing guideline.	Open
15	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. Update 10/7 -The working group recommends changing the workflow in the DGO to better match reality: 'Medical aid', 'interviews', 'investigation', 'arrests', 'notification'	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
16	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)	7/29/25	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

DGO 6.09 DRAFT Working Group Recommendation Grid

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation (as of 11/18/25)	Open/ Closed
17	<p>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.</p> <p>Update 8 /14 - There was discussion among the working group about what to do if the victim says they do NOT want an EPO.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	7/29/25	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
18	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?	7/29/25	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. This information is in the draft DGO.	Open
19	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 draft DGO.	Open
20	<p>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.</p> <p>9/9 - a working group member recommended making the language more permissive.</p>	7/29/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	<p>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.</p> <p>Update 9/9 - this recommendation was not included. Officers have to inquire whether victims want their address to be confidential.</p>	Open
21	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	7/29/25	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	Language was already included in the draft DGO under warrantless misdemeanor.	Open
22	A working group member asked for more information on identifying Dominant Aggressor and whether the Penal Code (13701) should be included in the definition.	7/29/25	Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO	Langauge 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
23	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.	7/29/25	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
24	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.	7/29/25	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, but it is not required.	Open

DGO 6.09 DRAFT Working Group Recommendation Grid

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation (as of 11/18/25)	Open/ Closed
25	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).	7/29/25	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. 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
26	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.	8/14/25	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
27	A working group member requested that in the manual, expand on what is/not a deadly weapon	8/14/25	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
28	A working group member had formatting suggestions: number or bulletize the definitions, instead of using letters, bold section titles	8/14/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	The formatting of policy documents is handled internally by the policy development division, who follow a set standard to ensure uniformity between policies.	Open
29	A working group member recommended including a statement in procedures that officers play a critical role in family safety	8/14/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	DGOs are policy documents that are meant to include guiding and enforceable language. This information is included in training.	Open
30	A working group member questioned whether the DGO needs to reference LEP, Hard of Hearing, LGBTQ in the Notification section?	8/14/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	No. Officers are trained and aware of appropriate steps to take for all instances listed. Additionally, the Manual refers to LEP access considerations.	Open
31	A working group wanted to know if there is a DGO to reference E(1)a (When possible, inform the victim of their legal right to self-defense)	8/14/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	There is no existing DGO to cite for this. This language was included in the draft under the section identifying the dominant aggressor.	Open
32	A working group member wanted to know if DGO 6.15 needs to be cited in 'Preserve the scene and collect evidence' in addition to 6.02?	8/14/25	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO	While DGO 6.15 (Property Processing) discusses evidence, it speaks to what an officer needs to do after the scene, and not directly relevant to the actions discussed in this policy.	Open
33	A working group member inquired if stats can be put 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
34	A working group member recommended adding language under Request an EPO (a) to clarify it doesn't just have to be more restrictive, but can be more expansive	8/14/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	This has been included in the draft DGO.	Open
35	a working group member recommended adding under 'request an EPO' include "contact on-call superior court judge/give EPO to victim/suspect - remove weapons from suspect property"	8/14/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	This information is included in the draft manual.	Open
36	Warrantless Misdemeanor section - A working group member recommended including all parties in PC 836(d) be listed in the DGO.	8/14/25	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	The most common relationships have been included in the draft DGO. All of the parties listed in PC 836(d) are listed in the draft manual.	Open
37	A working group member recommends the DGO provides more information about strangulation and the relationship between that and a Dominant Aggressor	8/14/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Language was included in the draft DGO about considering strangulation when determining the Dominant Aggressor. A section is also included in the draft while interviewing the victim that requires the officer to ask about strangulation and stalking.	Open
38	a working group member recommended adding to the handout that victims should take pictures of injuries in the coming days	8/14/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	This is included in the draft manual.	Open
39	A working group member recommended including direction informing victim NOT to block the aggressor's number(s), delete texts/voicemails, and to track/report violent/stalking behavior	8/14/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	This is beyond the purview of the department, but is something that can be discussed during training so officers have awareness of what may help victims in the future.	Open
40	142 form - A working group member recommended adding a section for resources if there is no arrest.	8/14/25	Recommendation will not be included in the draft form	If there is no probable cause for arrest, there is no reason for an officer to provide them resources. Doing so could create a dangerous environment for a potential victim or offend people who are not actually victims.	Open

DGO 6.09 DRAFT Working Group Recommendation Grid

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation (as of 11/18/25)	Open/ Closed
41	A working group member recommended that under 'interview the victim', remind victims that injuries can show up later.	8/14/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	This language is included in the draft manual.	Open
42	A working group member recommended adding examples under 'Interview the Victim' 'consider the following factors during the interview: the nature and extent of DV' (e.g. physical, verbal, emotional)	8/14/25	Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO	This information was included in the draft DGO as things to consider during the interview.	Open
43	A working group member inquired if there is a training or DGO reference for interviewing the victim and suspect	8/14/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	There are no policy documents to reference.	Open
44	A working group member recommended under 'interview the suspect' add #3 "Remind suspect of EPO or restraining order in place"	8/14/25	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO	If a restraining order is violated, the person who violated the order will be arrested, they do not get a reminder.	Open
45	A working group member recommended under 'Moving Locations' include "for victim safety" at the end of the last sentence.	8/14/25	Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO	The language has been amended.	Open
46	A working group member recommended referencing USC 2265 with regards to "members will provide civil standby..."	8/14/25	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO	This is a reference to Unites States Code 2265 (Full Faith and credit given to protection orders). The department will not cite this code, as it is a requirement that California state laws have incorporated into their laws	Open
47	Reference the state mandate in the Policy statement that says members have to make an arrest instead of mediating where possible.	8/14/25	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO	The Penal Code (13701) requires law enforcement agencies to write policies that "encourage the arrest of domestic violence offenders...". As such, this code doesn't need to be cited in the policy statement	Open
48	A working group member recommended under 'Shelter' list the available shelters	8/14/25	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO	Shelter access changes regularly. The victim handout will lead victims to WOMAN and casa de las madres, who can provide assistance in finding shelters.	Open
49	Mention AFS Weapons check under 'Check for Active Court Orders'	8/14/25	Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO	"registered firearm" check has been added under G(2) 'Check for Active Court Orders'	Open
50	A working group member wanted to know what happens to the draft after the working group ends and if they get a chance for rebuttal	9/9/25	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	The completed working group draft will be posted online for public review. Anyone may comment on it at that time. The final draft will be posted on the Commission website prior to it being voted on by the Commission. Members of the public may provide comments on the final draft to Commission members.	Open
51	DGO - moving locations - remove the option to keep the location confidential. Just default to not including it in the incident report and provide it directly to SVU.	9/9/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	This language is included in the draft DGO.	Open
52	EPO section - there was a recommendation to include where the officer is supposed to provide rationale if they do not request an EPO.	11/4/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The section now directs officers to provide rationale in the incident report if they do not request an EPO.	Open