

#	DPA Recommendations for DGO 3.01	SEC or p. #	Date Submitted	SFPD response	SFPD explanation	Open/Closed
R1	Have you discussed 3.01.05 with the City Attorney? I'm wondering whether consulting with the President conflicts with the Commission's Charter obligation to approve goals, objectives, plans, and set policies.	3.01.05	12/11/25	Recommendation requires further discussion	The Department received City Attorney review and comments.	closed
R2	Will the Department be able to provide an approval deadline for a DGO at the outset? The 3.01.05.B.1 "Determine Timeline(s)" only provides a Stage I timeline and does not provide a deadline for approval. This was an issue in previous iterations of 3.01, leading to discussions of whether there is "unlimited time" that a DGO can sit in progress. Does this document also contain undefined periods, or can we count how many days are in the development timeline and state that at the outset? I'm wondering if this was a mistake because 3.01.05.C includes a section on "requests for extension" includes the term "original deadline." Is this the original deadline of each stage? And can separate stages receive a 29 day extension from the Chief?	3.01.05.B.1	12/11/25	Recommendation will not be included in draft DGO	The proposed draft not only includes deadlines for each stage, it also provides deadlines for the transition to the next stage which is missing from the currently active DGO. We have removed all opportunities for non-designated timelines throughout the proposal. PDD staff will map out & communicate the timelines once the start date is determined for each DGO and will track accordingly. The original deadline is the deadline for each stage. Separate stages can receive a 29 day extension from the Chief.	Closed
R3	I'm going to propose moving the public review to stage II and the Stakeholder feedback as Stage III, but include the POA (to provide officer feedback). This would provide the POA with an opportunity to comment before Meet and Confer, potentially smoothing the process. The current public review period has become the point with the largest amount of change, effectively nullifying work done in Stage II to unnamed public commenters. This hinders transparency and accountability for policy decisions and was not the original intent of the section, which was modeled after Federal Government and NYPD notice and comment period.	Stage II & Stage III	12/11/25	Recommendation will not be included in draft DGO	Meet and Confer is the formal process to discuss policy language with the bargaining units including SFPOA. Individual members' opinions do not represent the position of the SFPOA. As members will have had the opportunity to provide feedback in Stage I, providing feedback in Stage II is redundant. Moving the Public Review to an earlier stage could negatively impact member's ability to provide substantive feedback, as they would no longer have an opportunity to operationalize recommendations from DPA or working group members. Additionally, the stakeholders in Stage II are provided the opportunity to respond during Stage III as well. As it relates to "transparency", the department responses to public comment are publicly posted on the department website. All comments are clearly addressed, and the responses are sent to the commission as well. PDD has also begun to update the working group grids to reflect the changes made after concurrence (leadership review). This is publicly posted as well which works in opposition of the assertion that this "hinders transparency".	Closed
R4	For 3.01.07.A, is it the Department's intention to remove an officer's ability to write a member to request a revision of a DGO or manual? If so, I would recommend the Department retain the members ability to request revisions to DGOs and DNs and actively solicit more feedback through station Captains and lineup.	3.01.07.A	12/11/25	Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO	Language has been added into the draft that allows members to make recommendations as to which DGOs should be updated. Members also provide input on which DGOs should be on the Annual Review List. This will not be done through Captains or through line-up but instead direct communication from PDD to members and vice versa.	Closed

#	DPA Recommendations for DGO 3.01	SEC or p. #	Date Submitted	SFPD response	SFPD explanation	Open/Closed
R5	I noticed that you removed the ability of DPA to meet and confer with the Chief on policy impasses. I believe eliminating the M+C will require the Police Commission to rescind or amend Resolution 27-06 at a public meeting.		12/11/25	Recommendation will not be included in draft DGO	<p>Meet and Confer is the formal process for negotiations between bargaining units, the Department, and the Commission. DPA does not have meet and confer entitlements but the DPA's Executive Director is permitted to meet with the Chief for any reason at any time, including policy development issues.</p> <p>Resolution 27-06 does not define a meeting between the "Chief" and DPA but does require an exchange between the "department and OCC" before requesting the commission to resolve any issues. Now with the PDD infrastructure in place, RMO discussions with DPA about policy failures and DGO 3.01 requiring DPA access to SMEs/policy writers/leadership throughout the entire development process, the proposed DGO 3.01 remains in full compliance with Reso 27-06 as written. As an example, concurrence meetings can be considered an opportunity to exchange views with leadership and relevant parties as stated in Reso 27-06. The removal of the DPA ED and the Chief meeting in 3.01 will not require Reso 27-06 to be rescinded.</p>	Closed