

# SFPD Member Survey Results: 10.11, Body Worn Cameras, 2026

Recommendation #	Recommendation	PDD Response
1	The activation section states that BWC must be turned on when, "Issuing on-scene traffic or parking citations when the driver is not present." Currently, SFPD members do not turn their BWC on when issuing parking citations when a driver is not present. This verbage seems to suggest that now SFPD members are required to have their BWC on during these instances. Is this correct or does this only apply to driverless vehicles? Can we change the language to say driverless vehicles then?	The language has been modified to, "Issuing parking citations to or taking enforcement action on driverless/Autonomous Vehicles (AV)" and the language, "when the driver is not present" has been removed.
2	The activation section states that, "Members assigned to 'front desk', or station keeper duties are required to wear a BWC and are required to activate in accordance with section 10.11.05(B)." Section 10.11.05(B) does not reference any station keeper duties. Does this mean that station keepers need to have their BWC while receiving reports in-person, over the phone, or both?	The language, "Members assigned to 'front desk', or station keeper duties are required to wear a BWC and are required to activate in accordance with 10.11.05(B)" has been removed. The language has been modified to, "[The BWC may be deactivated in the following circumstances:] In district stations, unless a mandatory activation incident occurs". If any mandatory activation incident occurs, including for reports, station keepers shall activate their BWC.
3	The guidance and wording about whether or not station keepers need to have their BWC on in booking areas or during cell checks, including when they are occupied, is very confusing. This is currently in a memo and we are waiting for information about what to do.	The language has been modified to, "[The BWC may be deactivated in the following circumstances:] In district stations, unless a mandatory activation incident occurs." If any mandatory activation incident occurs, including in booking areas or during cell checks, station keepers shall activate their BWC.
4	The activation section states, "Unless exigent circumstances exist, activation must occur when the member is enroute, prior to arriving on scene or immediately before making contact on traffic/pedestrian stops or detention/arrests." What does enroute mean? Does this mean as soon as the Dispatch call is received? Does this mean right before arrival?	The language has been modified to, "all members dispatched or actively participating during any of the below-listed incidents shall activate their BWC. Unless exigent circumstances exist, activation must occur...upon arriving on scene or upon making contact" and "enroute" has been removed.
5	This section states, "The BWC may be temporarily moved from the mounted position to facilitate recording in furtherance of a police objective." What does "in furtherance of a police objective" mean? How can officers know when to move their BWC from its mounted position when this is the criteria?	This language has been modified to, "The BWC may be temporarily moved from the mounted position to facilitate recording during any mandatory activation incident" and the language, "in furtherance of a police objective" has been removed.
6	This section states, "Members assigned to 'front desk', or station keeper duties are required to wear a BWC and are required to activate in accordance with section 10.11.05 (B)." None of the activation requirements in 10.11.05 (B) refer to any station keeper duties. So, in what instances does a station keeper need to activate their BWC in the police station that are specific to the station keepers' duties?	See R2 and R3.
7	SEC 10.11.04 states, "When a member discovers their BWC is broken, damaged, lost, or otherwise unavailable for use, the member shall notify their supervisor. As sson as practical, the supervisor shall issue a replacement BWC, which are available at each station." Now that all members of SFPD are required to wear BWC in uniform, including Command Staff, who does Command Staff go to when their BWC is broken? To the Chief, who then is required to find BWC replacements, the BWC Unit, Technology as per 10.11.12(C) of this DGO?	This language has been modified to, "Command Staff members have the option to notify the Technology Division directly."
8	This section states that when a BWC is broken, damaged, or lost, that a member's supervisor is in charge of replacement from the bank at district stations. But, in section 10.11.12(C) of this DGO, it states that Technology is in charge of all BWC replacement. So who is responsible for replacement of BWC?	This language has been modified to, "Tracking, maintenance, issuance, and replacement of BWC is the responsibility of the Technology Division. When a member discovers their BWC is broken, damaged, lost, or otherwise unavailable for use, the member shall notify their supervisor and the Technology Division and complete the necessary memorandum regarding damaged/lost equipment."
9	This section states, "Non-Uniformed officers' use of BWC shall be governed by Department General Order 5.08 <i>Non-Uniformed Officers</i> ." DGO 5.08 was issued in 1996 when BWC were not used by SFPD. Therefore, DGO 5.08 currently does not outline ANY information about BWC, so, while SFPD waits for DGO 5.08 to be updated, what should non-uniformed officers do?	DGO 5.08 was updated and issued on 5/6/26 per DN 26-051 and has guidance for BWC usage for plainclothes, non-uniformed, and undercover officers.

10	This section states, "Members must ensure the BWC is in the On Position and in Buffering Mode after leaving a police, detention, or medical facility." This assumes that the BWC is off while in a police or detention facility, so does this mean that station keepers can never have their BWC on since they are in a police or detention facility?	See R3.
11	The activation section states that all participating parties in any of the activation requirement instances must activate their BWC. Does this mean that any time an investigator or DOC or RMO gets a notification that they are required to activate their BWC otherwise they are subject to discipline?	The language has been modified to, "all members dispatched or actively participating during any of the below-listed incidents shall activate their BWC. Unless exigent circumstances exist, activation must occur...upon arriving on scene or upon making contact." All members shall activate for the mandatory activation incidents.
12	The activation section states, "At the direction of the Event Commander during a public assembly. Nothing precludes members from activating their BWC if any other incident on this list occurs during a public assembly." BWC activation during public assembly is at the discretion of the Event Commander? But in 10.11.08, BWC activation during large protests is required. Also, the language "nothing precludes", suggests that members have the option to activate their BWC when a required activation incident happens at a public assembly. Aren't members required to turn on BWC during any of the activation requirement incidents? This language does not say this.	The language has been modified to, "[Unless exigent circumstances exist, activation must occur as outlined below:] At a public assembly: when a mandatory activation incident occurs or when directed by the Event Commander" and the language "nothing precludes" and "During incidents that require a large scale activation of the Department's members (such as large protests, natural disasters, mutual aide, etc.), the incident commander may approve delayed information entry. Such approval shall be documented in the Incident Commander's After Action Report."
13	This section states, "Issuing on-scene traffic or parking citations when the driver is not present." Does this apply to driverless vehicles? If so, state that. Right now, this procedure is not standard practice; was this language meant to require BWC activation when issuing a parking ticket to a car where the driver is not present?	See R1.
14	This section states when BWC can be deactivated including, "when the use of BWC would impede or limit the cooperation of a victim or witness." How is this determined? Without guidance, this language could become a disciplinary issue.	The language, "When respect for an individual's privacy or dignity outweighs the need to record an incident. Such circumstances may include natural death scenes, child, or sexual assault victim interviews, and when the use of BWC would impede or limit the cooperation of a victim or witness" has been removed.
15	Why is this section (shall deactivate) not included in section A (may deactivate)? They are the exact same circumstances, times when BWC can be deactivated unless a mandatory event spontaneously occurs, and separating them is confusing. Also, the language in this section makes it unclear if whether the instances listed below require or do not require BWC activation.	These sections were separated to distinguish between when officers may deactivate their BWC and when officers shall deactivate or power off their BWC.
16	The deactivation section states, "When directed by a supervisor, members shall document the supervisor's order and reason in an incident report and/or CAD update." Under what circumstances is a supervisor authorized to do so?	Supervisors may direct officers to turn off BWC at their discretion or to align with the deactivations in this DGO. When there is, "no activation...members should note in an incident report, statement or CAD, including the reasons and approvals and any orders given during deactivation, if applicable."
17	This section is unclear as to whether or not BWC should be activated in holding cells and booking areas. If activation is required, as one can assume, this should be in the required activation section to reduce confusion.	See R3.
18	This section states, "Instances where members may use body-worn cameras as an alternative to written documentation will be identified in applicable Departmental policies." Which policies? How are officers to know in what instances?	This is allowable per SF Admin Code 96I and provides opportunities for officers to move away from written reports. The Department has captured instances when this can be done in DGOs such as DGO 5.01, 5.06, etc. This is also captured in several Department Notices and will continue to be announced in policy revisions. There is no way to provide a static list of policies for officers to reference as this changes frequently.
19	sec 10.11.08 uploading and documentation states, "Members on an outside assignment...are permitted to download all recorded evidence no later than during their next regularly assigned on-duty shift unless involved in a use of force, an arrest, or directed by a supervisor." So if a use of force, arrest, or supervisor direction occurs, when or how is a member supposed to download their recorded evidence?	The language, "unless involved in a use of force, an arrest" has been removed.
20	This section 10.11.08 (F) does not mention BWC, so why is it in this DGO and how does it apply to BWC procedures?	The language, "For incidents that do not result in incident reports, members will document the reasons for the delay or non-activation in a memorandum or in CAD" has been removed.

21	The ownership and distribution section states, "Distribute in any manner body worn camera recordings without proper authorization, including posting recordings on social media for personal use." What is proper authorization and who provides it? Can DPA provide authorization as they do for Legal in section 10.11.12 (D) of this DGO?	This language has been modified to, "Distribute BWC recordings without proper authorization from the Chief of Police or designee, including posting recordings on social media" and "When requested by the DPA, members of the Legal Division, as the Chief's designee for this purpose, shall provide the BWC recordings consistent with all applicable laws, and MOUs."
22	This section allows supervisors to watch BWC footage when conducting administrative or criminal investigations, but aren't administrative and criminal investigations conducted by RMO and the investigator, and not the supervisor and therefore it should RMO and the investigator who watch this BWC footage?	The language, "conducting an administrative or criminal investigation" has been removed to clarify that the listed duties are specific to supervisors and not RMO.
23	Remove that Command Staff are required to wear BWCs.	Although Command Staff are still required to wear BWC to reflect an SFPD leadership that leads by example, a new section has been added which reads, "C. Captain and Command Staff Activation 1. If responding to or initiating enforcement action. 2. When issuing commands while on scene during an active incident."
24	Thank you again for taking the time to speak with me regarding body-worn camera activation by CSI personnel during crime scene processing. I understand that our current policy does not provide an exemption for investigative units; however, I am concerned that continuous BWC recording at crime scenes introduces unintended consequences such as significant legal and operational risks, including potential California Public Records Act exposure, privacy concerns, and uncontrolled evidentiary records that may compromise case integrity. BWCs have proven valuable for transparency and accountability in patrol and enforcement settings but I believe using them to indiscriminately record hours upon hours of crime scene processing creates unnecessary legal exposure and undermines the clean evidentiary records and scientifically accepted practices of crime scene documentation such as forensic DSLR photography, videography, sketches and diagraming. Standard forensic documentation is already controlled, deliberate, and evidentiary in nature, and adding live BWC footage creates unnecessary liability without meaningful investigative value. BWC footage is uncontrolled and could be seen as an "alternate record"- creating conflicting versions of the scene. BWCs may capture irrelevant items that defense can exploit to build alternative theories, distracting from the central evidence and creating avoidable delays when cases go to court. Having two parallel records such as official crime scene photos vs. BWC footage can create inconsistencies, undermining the chain of custody. As the policy comes up for review, I would respectfully request that command staff consider creating an exemption for CSI crime scene processing. I would be more than happy to provide additional insight or supporting material at the appropriate time.	PDD proposed this to leadership. Leadership declined the inclusion of this exception based on the mandatory activation incident of where there is a belief that, "recording would likely be valuable for evidentiary purposes."
25	BWC should not be buffering or activated during bomb searches or threats. This is clear in axon guidelines but not SFPD policy!	The language has been modified to, "[Exceptions to wearing a BWC:] Any member responding to a suspicious package or potential Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) situation for the entirety of the incident shall power off and remove their BWC (secure in vehicle trunk per DGO 10.02)"
26	DGO 10.11.05.B - The list is far too long, and it keeps growing with every update to the DGO. There is a lot of administrative stuff in the DGO that could be removed. Give us the nuts and bolts. Nine pages about a camera is overkill.	The DGO has been shortened from 9 to 8 pages and mandatory activation incidents have been clarified. Although the mandatory activation incidents have increased from 15 to 17, it was necessary to clarify these incidents.
27	how it relates to the investigations bureau	When members are not in uniform, they are not required to wear their BWC, including Investigation Bureau members but, when members are in uniform, including Investigation Bureau members, they are required to wear BWC and follow BWC requirements in the DGO.
28	Tactical Briefings. At the tactical command post, where tactical information is discusses its off, but briefings include that information.	Briefings have been removed as a mandatory activation incident and the language, "During Department briefings, meetings, roll calls, and command briefings" still exists in the mandatory deactivation incidents section.
29	When Officers have discretion to choose whether or not to record. Why DPA can make their own interpretations to what DGO's intent is	The mandatory activation incidents section provides guidelines for officers that does not specifically lean on an officer's discretion. Clear DGOs minimize opportunities for DPA interpretation.

30	when to use "NONE" vs non evidentiary	The language has been modified to, "The Department uses Auto-Tagging to categorize and label BWC by filling in CAD, Case # and retention period. Members shall review the auto-tagging for accuracy and correct when necessary". Specificity on tagging categories is too specific for a DGO and is outlined in corresponding Department Notices.
31	Be more specific on en route. I can be en route for 5-20 mins depending on the priority, traffic, time of day etc. do I really need 20 mins of me driving to a scene on bwc because it's part of the enroute or can't it just be prior to arriving on scene like most officers do.	See R4.
32	Fewer shalls. Less vague on terms such as "activity with a potential to require law enforcement activity"... Every situation has potential law enforcement activity.	The number of "shalls" has been reduced from 35 "shalls" to 28 "shalls". The language, "activity with a potential to require law enforcement action" has been removed.
33	It's not part of the policy but members should be given a grace period of 96 hours to dock their BWC which would coincide with four "H" days.	The language has been modified to, "Members shall upload all BWC footage prior to the end of their shift. Members who meet one of the following exceptions must begin uploading all BWC footage at the start of their next scheduled shift." The allowance to upload BWC footage by the beginning of an officer's next shift aligns with the national standard as supported by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF). It becomes harder to justify including upload exceptions by hours.
34	Needs to consider the real-world application	To impact the DGO, recommendations should include suggested language for incorporation.
35	The requirement to activate when dispatched to a call is excessive, unnecessary, and a takes away a patrol officer's time to decompress between calls.	See R4.
36	Less words	The number of words has been reduced from 3,159 to 2,377.
37	A member should not activate when en route to a call, a member should activate camera upon arrival	See R4.
38	Make it fit one page. I really believe that the most important policies should be the shortest. Nine pages is too long for a device that is so important.	The DGO has been shortened from 9 to 8 pages.
39	There are a lot of exceptions that seem to contradict each other with the new BWC policy, such as investigating child abuse cases, sexual assaults, etc.	See R14. Other contradictions in the DGO have been removed.
40	be more specific as to when it needs to be turned on	Mandatory activation incidents have been clarified.
41	Less generalizations and more definitive terminology (Definitions section)	The language has been modified to, "A. Off Position - When powered off, the camera cannot record audio or video. B. Buffering Mode - When BWC is powered on and display says 'ready'. This is the mode between activation and deactivation. In Buffering Mode, the BWC captures video but not audio. The video is not stored in permanent memory until BWC activation. C. Activate - When members start the audio and video recording functions by double tapping the event button. D. Deactivate - When members stop the audio and video recording functions by holding the event button until there is a single beep."
42	Clarify station keeper. They need to record when they are taking a report just like they would on the street. Also recording is ok at hospitals.	See R2. The language has been modified to, "[Unless exigent circumstances exist, activation must occur...when a qualifying incident arises during an existing contact [for] mandatory activation incident or safety risk in a medical, psychiatric, detention, or jail facility or during psychological evaluations".
43	Booking counter and prisoner searches inside facility	See R3.
44	While issuing parking tickets? This would mean we would need to generate a CAD for every parking ticket we write, and tie up the air with needless traffic.	See R1. In response to community member complaints, the language has been modified to require activation when, "issuing parking citations when a driver is present".
45	A 9-page order for BWC seems excessive.	See R38.
46	clarify the term "enroute"	See R4.
47	Define and clarify the BWC tags on evidence.com, such as "non-evidentiary" and "none" vs "relevant to a case". I had a sustained DPA BWC complaint where a definition of the tags in the DGO could have positively assisted my case	See R30.
48	Less "shalls" and make it shorter/simpler	The number of "shalls" has been reduced from 35 "shalls" to 28 "shalls". The DGO has been shortened from 9 to 8 pages and clarified throughout.
49	Remove the requirement for end of shift upload for units that have take home cars and don't always sign off at their "home" station	The language has been modified to, "Members who meet one of the following exceptions must begin uploading all BWC footage at the start of their next scheduled shift. The member has a take-home car and does not go back to their home station at the end of shift".

50	If this surveys finds that the majority of members do not understand the DGO's as written or find it confusing, any member who has been disciplined under this current BWC policy should be reviewed or exonerated from any discipline.	Discipline is outside the scope of PDD.
51	BWC inside the stations should not be activated due to the numerous cameras that are already recording the activities there.	See R3. District station cameras only record video and not audio.
52	Should prioritize evidence collection first, liability mitigation second, and transparency/accountability last. The current priority order is inverted.	This recommendation does not provide a clear edit to the DGO.
53	enroute	See R4.
54	Activation requirements for responding to calls for patrol units	See R4.
55	Describe better when we can turn off our camera...example, on a crime scene with no evidentiary value and waiting for investigative units	The language has been modified to, "When on a perimeter post or static post of an initial incident or that is actively part of an investigation."
56	The policy is written in such a way, that members will inadvertently violate some aspect of this DGO throughout their work period. Make the policy more general and easier to follow.	The DGO has been made clearer by removing contradictions and clarifying language.
57	Don't activate during parking tickets, DPT does not.	See R1 and R44.
58	Clarification for specialized units (CSI, Investigations, etc.)	See R24 and R27.
59	Clarify enroute and explain if we're covered if a consensual encounter turns criminal	See R4. The language has been modified to, "[Unless exigent circumstances exist, activation must occur...[when] consensual encounter where a person is believed to have knowledge of criminal activity, or any encounter that turns criminal or becomes violent".
60	Less requirements, we need flexibility and not reasons for DPA to tie us up with complaints	See R26 and R29.
61	fewer shalls	See R48.
62	Fewer shalls	See R48.
63	Does that mean the supervisor is collecting the BWC of all members at a crit incident as potential witness of covered incident	The language has been modified to, "A supervisor shall take possession of a member's BWC under the following circumstances: The member is a potential or confirmed subject or witness to a Covered Incident."
64	Clarify the notice that BWC unit sends out when members do not "tag" or "upload" videos. Is the notice a warning, admonishment. If the members completes the task on teh notice then it should not be used for discipline. Also, since the tagging is automatic now, remove all disciplinary cases from members who have had IA cases for not tagging.	See R30 and R50.
65	reduce the instances that camera activation is required. (like the previous policy)	See R26.
66	Less shall's. More time to upload(if theres no arrest).	See R48. PDD was unable to address this request during this update.
67	The SHALL to activate prior to exiting your vehicle	See R4.
68	Not to turn on when issuing a parking ticket to an unoccupied vehicle.	See R1.
69	the areas which a BWC recording would be used instead of a written report	See R18.
70	Fewer shalls and input the human factor that at times make mistakes.	See R48.
71	Relieve the officer from making sure the BWC footage is coded (CASE, CAD, type) correctly. This is on the department and Technology.	See R30.
72	i do not believe capt's and above should wear bwc's. Far too many conversations contain sensitive information. Does COP activate when commission meeting is hostile??	See R23.
73	More discretion to when the officer activates the BWC.	See R29.
74	dumb it down and make a clear printable bullet list for exceptions/shalls.	See R48.
75	A nine page DGO regarding when to turn on a camera is one of the most ridiculous examples of SFPD's prior policy dysfunctionality. I don't think I could ever read the entire policy without passing out and my head hitting the keyboard.	See R38.
76	Booking areas are not considered "private areas". Does this mean we SHALL record BWC in the booking/holding cell areas at the stations?	See R3.
77	I would like to know if this same policy applies to Investigative units or is this specifically for patrol?	See R27.

78	10.11.05(12) The fact the officer must activate for a parking violation even the drive is NOT present is in direct contrast with of reducing the amount of administrative barriers to law enforcement. The officer needs to request a CAD in order to index the BWC properly. This will significantly impact any future parking enforcement.	See R1.
79	make when one should record, not record and not allow DPA to sustain complaints based on when a bwc is activated, use of foul language in certain instances (verbal judo), etc.	DPA's criteria for complaints is outside the scope of PDD. PDD is planning on updating DGO 2.01 to address language.
80	Get rid of "shall activate" requirements and allow Officers to use discretion in most circumstances.	See R29 and R48.
81	There should not be a severe consequence for failing to activate	See R50.
82	There should be more leeway for when officers are required to turn their BWCs on. For example, if an officer responds to a non-emergency call for service, especially one with no 909, they should not be required to activate their camera until on scene and evaluating the appropriateness/need to activate their camera. Merely responding to the call in itself should not require members to activate. Additionally, supervisors responding to a scene after it is rendered "code-4" by officers should not require a BWC activation by the supervisor unless certain situations. For example, if a supervisor drives by a scene to check on officers of a routine call for service and does not exit their vehicle, they shouldn't be required to activate. Especially considering all interactions which occur at the vehicle would be captured by the officers on scene. The activation of BWC for EVERY possible situation for officers and supervisors creates unnecessary work. We can be better with this policy and more proficient. There should be greater flexibility regarding when officers are required to activate their BWCs. For example, when responding to a non-emergency call for service—particularly one without a 909—officers should not be required to activate their cameras until they arrive on scene and assess whether activation is appropriate or necessary. Simply driving to ANY call should not mandate activation. Similarly, supervisors responding after officers have already determined the scene is "Code 4" should not be required to activate their BWCs unless specific circumstances warrant it. For instance, if a supervisor merely drives by to check on officers during a routine call and does not exit their vehicle, activation should not be required, especially since any interaction occurring at the scene would already be captured by the officers' cameras. Requiring BWC activation for every conceivable situation involving officers and supervisors adds unnecessary workload. We can improve this policy to make it more practical, efficient, and aligned with operational needs.	The listed incidents are covered in the mandatory activation incident grid.
83	Clarify when to specifically activate when "enroute"	See R4.
84	Stop generalizing and use specifics. Things like static post/perimeter with no contact to public do not exist.	See R55. DGOs are meant to general in nature.
85	enroute	See R4.
86	BWC recordings for sexual assaults and child abuse have changed from shall not record to may record and terminate recording for some privacy concerns. Seems like this puts us in a difficult situation where we will be second guessed no matter which route we choose. I think it was better to just make it a shall not record for sexual assaults, child abuse etc. As the new DGO is written, I'm afraid it's going to be a "damned if you do & damned if you don't" kind of situation. Just make it a shall not record to protect us. There will be follow up with the SVU and recorded interviews later.	See R14.
87	Remove activating BWC when "issuing on scene traffic or parking violation citation when driver is not present."	See R1.
88	Change activation requirement from enroute to on scene	See R4.

89	I think officers should be granted a little bit of leniency on BWC activations and many of the "shalls" could be changed to should. Days off for late activations, especially on a first offense, seem like harsh punishments.	See R48 and R50.
90	Allow turning off BWC to protect 909s who want to cooperate but are afraid of being recorded.	Requiring officers to activate BWC with 909s is important for protection of officers and accountability.
91	Give members a break, allow exception for mistakes or unintended errors so they are not given days off on a technicality. If there is no damage done, why punish a member that is likely working hard, trying to keep tons of policies straight, feel less than supported by the Department in general (lack of staffing, etc) but still get disciplined for minor infraction on a BWC ERROR.	See R50.
92	10.11.05(B) - Section does not specify when/how to activate cameras at the "front desk" and does not adequately address the inadvertent recording inside a police facility. (i.e. should it be only activated while interviewing someone in the lobby, but not inside?)	See R2.
93	Because the times of activation and deactivation are so specific, it actually is unclear for every other situation not covered in those sections and who those sections apply to and under what circumstances and when to activate or deactivate. Therefore, make it more general like activate BWC in all law enforcement activity except in these circumstances or vice versa...	See R26.
94	more clear on roles and terms	See R41.
95	Both: clarify the term "enroute" and define SK activation requirement	See R2, R3, and R4.
96	Eliminate the administrative information in the policy. Section 10.11.12 belongs in an RMO Unit Order. Your average officer doesn't need to know that information. Section 10.11.11 could be condensed. Those duties are generally covered under DGO 1.04.I.A.1.c.	The language has been modified to, "RMO is the BWC program administrator. For details, see RMO Unit Order XX-XXX" and removed language specific to RMO duties. The duties of supervisors relating to BWCs are not covered in DGO 1.04.
97	issuing on-scene traffic or parking citations when the driver is not present, No contact should not be needed unless the department is saying they don't trust the officers	See R1.
98	Clarify the term enroute and clarify the term "NONE" for tagging footage	See R4 and R30.
99	On scene vs en route, DGO needs to be streamlined and thinned down	See R4.
100	I apparently didn't know there was a new one or it changed	
101	I would write it in a manner that would not unreasonably expose our members to sustained DPA Complaints and frivolous IAD cases.	See R50.
102	Define what "A response to any call for service, or activity with a potential to require law enforcement action" means. DPA interprets this to mean officers have to activate their camera for all calls for service as every call or activity has the potential for "law enforcement action". DPA loosely interprets "law enforcement action" as anything law enforcement does.to be anything offices do	The language, "activity with a potential to require law enforcement action" has been removed.
103	Not to penalize someone for inadvertently forgetting to activate their BWC immediately on scene. Also not requiring a bwc activation for issuing parking citation to unoccupied vehicles on unoccupied vehicles.	See R1. The language has been modified to, "If there were delays in activation, no activation, or early deactivation, members should note in an incident report, statement or CAD, including the reasons and approvals and any orders given during deactivation, if applicable." As long as the member notes delayed activation in an incident report, they should not be open to discipline.
104	It would be easier to say, "You're expected to have your BWC activated any time you are conducting police services (calls for service, detentions, arrests, searches, seizures, transportations), except in the following circumstances. Then list those circumstances.	See R29.
105	define station keeper and station duty activation requirements	See R2 and R3.
106	Clarify BWC activation for front desk and having BWC activated while taking a report for a member of the public but still inside the police facility.	See R2.
107	Enroute , keeper	See R2, R3, and R4.
108	Give a little more leeway in terms of when to activate. Keep it simple such as investigations, detentions, arrests, searches, and code 3 response/pursuit driving.	See R29.

109	Clear instructions for activation and deactivation, Activation for any parking citations is not necessary, and Captains (and above) should not be required to use BWCs	See R1, R23, and R44.
110	Captains and above don't wear them.	See R23.
111	The requirement to activate when dispatched to a call should be removed. Officers are already required to activate prior to arrival on scene, and if they are responding code 3. Patrol Officers at busy stations are often at calls or dispatched to their next calls for the majority or entirety of their shift. They should not be required to have their BWCs activated while driving from call to call. Patrol Officers are humans who need down time between calls when they can relax and speak to their partners without their every word being recorded and transcribed by a BWC. This policy is harmful to hard working patrol officers and this footage has absolutely no value.	See R4.
112	Some station keepers are inside the station and some have separate areas. Central and tenderloin are inside the station, so how are keepers supposed to activate when they catch everything going on inside the station where bwc is supposed to be off.	See R3.
113	Lessen the shalls. Members have proved time and time again we are not doing anything wrong while on scene. BWCs have helped officers in more instances than not.	See R48.
114	Reduce activation requirements to those that actually matter to document inter-personal interactions. For instance, there is no value added by having a BWC activated while driving since it will not capture the driver's view, there is no value in having the BWC activated when towing or citing an unoccupied vehicle, and there is no value in activating while taking a counter report as district station lobbies already capture video recording.	See R1, R2, R4, and R51.
115	Too many SHALL's	See R48.
116	Clarify what the circumstances are for deactivation. If I am on scene and NOT involved in collecting evidence or statements, or managing a scene giving orders, when can I deactivate?	See R55.
117	Clarify the term route.	See R4.
118	define station keeper activation requirements	See R2 and R3.
119	Clearer directive	See R56.
120	Use of BWC still frames in investigations currently requires a written Lt. approval- it should only require a Sgt along with a notation in a Chron or police report	The use of still frames in investigations is not specified in this DGO.
121	Typo at 10.11.12.E.1 "The Department shall retain BWC recordings for a minimum of two (3) years..."	The language has been modified to, "The Department shall retain evidentiary BWC recordings for a minimum of two (2) years".
122	DGO 10.11 requires more detailed information that is applicable to specialized units and investigations. As it stands now, the policy is detrimental to Crime Scene Investigations and the integrity of the accepted standards for documenting crime scenes.	See R24 and R27.
123	Change 10.11.04(E)(2)(b) to read any patrol officer responding to a suspicious package or something that could be potentially related to EOD duties, do not wear BWC	See R25.
124	Airport officers need BWCs ASAP.	The language has been modified to, "The Department shall issue BWCs to all members, including at the Airport Bureau" and "Airport Bureau members shall comply with this DGO. The Chief's authorization, in accordance with 10.11.10(A), shall be designated through any executed Memorandum of Understanding between the Department and agencies working at, through, or for the Airport. All Airport Bureau members, including those temporarily assigned to the Airport, shall review Airport Bureau Order 26-XX, which outlines the procedures specific to Airport facilities."
125	I recommend that the Department amend DGO 10.11.12(E). The current policy does not allow for us to delete accidental activations (IE: Accidental activations while in the bathroom, etc.) until after 60 days. This does not give RMO any leeway to evaluate and take appropriate action in cases where an accidental activation.	The language has been modified to, "Consistent with Penal Code Section 832.18, the Department shall retain all BWC non-evidentiary recordings for a minimum of sixty (60) days, except for accidental recordings, after which recordings may be erased, destroyed, or recycled."

126	Consistent with state law, the Department shall retain all BWC recordings for a minimum of sixty (60) days, after which recordings may be erased, destroyed, or recycled. Which state law is being utilized for this statement? 832.18(b)(5)(A) PC states: "Unless subparagraph (B) or (C) applies, non-evidentiary data including video and audio recorded by a body-worn camera should be retained for a minimum, after which it may be erased, destroyed, or recycled." I believe should be used instead of shall and should have a carveout stating that the Commanding Officer of the RMO should have the ability to evaluate and take appropriate action should a request to delete videos be made.	See R125. This language allows the Commanding Officer of RMO to evaluate and take appropriate action for non-evidentiary BWC footage but requires RMO to follow state law regarding evidentiary BWC footage.
-----	---	--