DGO 6.09 Public Comment Joint Responses
Public Review Period: 11/25/25 - 1/12/26

#	Public Comment	Date Received	SFPD response	SFPD Explanation	DPA Explanation
R1	This new online format is confusing. Switch to old or match with how the DGO actually looks.	**11/26/25**	Administrative Question and Answer-not for inclusion in DGO	The change was made to comply with San Francisco's Digital Accessibility and Inclusion Standard.	No additional comment.
R2	Cite the DM number in the Purpose Statement. Under the Policy Section lists definitions and the actual Policy Section is missing	**11/26/25**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	The format has been updated to meet our current style guide standards. Definitions are now in a separate section.	DPA concurs with the revision.
R3	What are the procedures for entry at a public place?	**11/26/25**	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO	Public places may include parks, restaurants, or vehicles parked on public streets. Each requires a different approach depending on the location and circumstances. These entry procedures are more appropriately addressed through training and procedural guidance than in the DGO.	No additional comment.
R4	Make the term members and officers consistent throughout	**11/26/25**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	"Member" is now used throughout.	DPA concurs with the revision.
R5	Procedures B 2 about language access should not be here but in the language access DGO...This is not specific to DVs	**11/26/25**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	Language access guidance has been moved to the department DV manual.	DPA concurs with the revision.

DGO 6.09 Public Comment Joint Responses
Public Review Period: 11/25/25 - 1/12/26

#	Public Comment	Date Received	SFPD response	SFPD Explanation	DPA Explanation
R6	It says if SVU is notified, under what circumstances should officers notify SVU or not?	**11/26/25**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	Section now reads " E.DOC and SVU Notification – Notify Department Operations Center (DOC) and Special Victims Unit (SVU) if the victim is strangled or has major physical trauma, a firearm was involved, the crime is ongoing or falls into a category in DGO 8.01 Major and Critical Incident Evaluation and Notification, the victim is pregnant, a homicide has occurred, there is a violation of any DV court order, or the incident is a high media profile case."	DPA concurs with the revision.
R7	What does "for not than less than 48 hours"? Can you keep it for more than or less than 48 hours?	**11/26/25**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	Section has been moved to the Department DV Manual and now reads: "If the weapon is seized as evidence of a crime or the owner of the firearm is subsequently prohibited from possession by a restraining order, the firearm will not be returned (PC 33850, 33855, 34000). If the person does not file the receipt with the court within 48 hours after being served with the protective order it is a violation of the protective order. "	DPA concurs with the revision.

DGO 6.09 Public Comment Joint Responses
Public Review Period: 11/25/25 - 1/12/26

#	Public Comment	Date Received	SFPD response	SFPD Explanation	DPA Explanation
R8	How do you know if notifying DOC, SVU, or CSI is necessary? "If an EPO is not requested, members shall provide rationale in the incident report" moved from 2 to 1 because in the 2 section, EPOs are always given.	**11/26/25**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	The DGO now requires members to notify DOC and SVU when the victim is strangled, has major physical trauma, or is pregnant; a firearm was involved; the crime is ongoing; the incident falls within a category under DGO 8.01, Major and Critical Incident Evaluation and Notification; a homicide has occurred; any domestic violence court order has been violated; or the incident is a high media profile case. The policy clarifies when an existing protective order provides sufficient protection without an additional EPO. This change addresses instances in which EPOs were requested even though an existing, served stay-away order already provided the needed protection.	DPA concurs with the revision.
R9	Of K2 first bullet, this is already stated, no need to repeat. Is BWC on during Lethality Assessment? Does Lethality Assessment go into incident report?	**11/26/25**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	The redundant language has been removed. BWC recording is governed by DGO 10.11, Body-Worn Cameras. The completed lethality assessment is booked into evidence and listed as evidence in the incident report.	DPA concurs with the revision.
R10	So the entire time you are securing the scene and interviewing the victim, there is no information about what to do with the suspect, especially if they are violent...	**11/26/25**	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO	Securing the scene includes securing and controlling anyone who is violent, including the suspect. The Domestic Violence Manual provides procedural guidance on separating the parties during the investigation.	No additional comment.

DGO 6.09 Public Comment Joint Responses
Public Review Period: 11/25/25 - 1/12/26

#	Public Comment	Date Received	SFPD response	SFPD Explanation	DPA Explanation
R11	Section 1 Notify DOC, SVU, and/or CSI if necessary is too vague. It should include a summary of the specific notification criteria established in the SFPD DM#26 DV Manual on pg. 23. Officers should not have to look in multiple places for this information.	**11/27/25**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	The Department agrees. The section now reads: "DOC and SVU Notification – Notify Department Operations Center (DOC) and Special Victims Unit (SVU) if the victim is strangled or has major physical trauma, a firearm was involved, the crime is ongoing or falls into a category in DGO 8.01 Major and Critical Incident Evaluation and Notification, the victim is pregnant, a homicide has occurred, there is a violation of any DV court order, or the incident is a high media profile case."	DPA concurs with the revision.
R12	Proposed 6.09.04 appears to require recording only the Suspect Interview. (6.09.04.E) Clarify that officers should record when they arrive at the scene, including the victim interview, see current DGO 6.09.04B.	**12/27/25**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	References to body-worn cameras have been removed. DGO 10.11, Body-Worn Cameras, governs recording requirements. This policy does not create any exceptions to those requirements.	DPA concurs with the revision.
R13	Order should also include recording calls with the victim prior to arrival on the scene. 6.09.04.B	**12/27/25**	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO	Dispatch communicates with the victim before officers arrive at the scene, and those calls are recorded.	No additional comment.
R14	In 6.09.04, the dominant aggressor analysis should be conducted prior to the victim interview.	**12/27/25**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	Identifying the dominant aggressor is now listed before interviewing the victim.	DPA concurs with the revision.

DGO 6.09 Public Comment Joint Responses
Public Review Period: 11/25/25 - 1/12/26

#	Public Comment	Date Received	SFPD response	SFPD Explanation	DPA Explanation
R15	Suggest adding a fourth step to proposed order section 6.09.04(B) Secure the Scene that states, “Identify the Dominant Aggressor (See Section G1)” so it is imbedded in procedure.	**12/27/25**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	Identifying the dominant aggressor is now listed before interviewing the victim.	DPA concurs with the revision.
R16	In 6.09.04.E.5, Documentation of the incident is critical. The proposed order omits all details related to incident reports. Given the importance of the incident report, adopt current DGO 6.09.04.N to include directives related to incident reports.	**12/27/25**	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO	The incident report narrative requirements have been moved to the Department’s Domestic Violence Manual, which provides procedural guidance on documenting domestic violence investigations.	No additional comment.
R17	The procedures should be moved to the manual and the policies should be moved tot he DGO.	**12/30/25**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	The Department agrees. Most procedures have been moved to the Domestic Violence Manual, while policy remains in the DGO.	DPA concurs with the revision.
R18	This policy is confused. It is straddling the line between being a policy document and a procedures manual. Move procedures out of this document and make it a clean easy to follow policy. Procedures shouldn't be locked in like policy is.	**1/6/26**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	“The Department agrees. Most procedures have been moved to the Domestic Violence Manual, while policy remains in the DGO.”	DPA concurs with the revision.
R19	In 6.09.02.C, the "Dominant Aggressor" definition is too broad, focusing on the one "who poses the most serious, ongoing threat." This suggests that future speculative criminal culpability in the officer's view should determine present criminal culpability.	**1/9/26**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	The Definition has been changed to match the Penal Code definition. The Domestic Violence Manual also provides detailed instructions for applying that definition, including 34 factors to consider and an additional section on distinguishing offensive from defensive injuries.	DPA concurs with the revision.

DGO 6.09 Public Comment Joint Responses
Public Review Period: 11/25/25 - 1/12/26

#	Public Comment	Date Received	SFPD response	SFPD Explanation	DPA Explanation
R20	In 6.09.02.C, delete the vague, open-ended phrase and stick to the how state law defines "dominant aggressor": "The dominant aggressor is the person determined to be the most significant, rather than the first, aggressor."	**1/9/26**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	The Definition has been changed to match the Penal Code definition.	DPA concurs with the revision.
R21	In 6.09.04.A.3, the draft language lowers the standard for warrantless entry to a "reasonable basis to believe the safety of an occupant may be in jeopardy." The correct legal standard is whether a reasonable officer would believe entry is necessary to prevent harm not a theoretical harm that "may" exist. A California Court of Appeal, citing US Supreme Court precedent, explained the exception that allows police to enter a home without a warrant "when they have an objectively reasonable basis for believing that an occupant is seriously injured or imminently threatened with such injury." (People v. Smith (2020) 46 Cal.App.5th 375, 384). Changing this standard may confuse officers, lead to unnecessary violence, and expose the City to needless lawsuits.	**1/10/26**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	The Department agrees. The revised guidance will simply acknowledge that exceptions to the warrant requirement exist.	DPA concurs with the revision.
R22	In 6.09.04.F, the policy leaves questioning children in an "age-appropriate manner" undefined. To the extent it is defined elsewhere in a DGO or manual, that reference should be included here. To the extent that the policy is directing officers to make best efforts to question children this way, it should not. Instead, the policy should follow best practices to avoid conducting forensic interviews in the field, conduct interviews in a private, safe, neutral space, and have a supportive adult nearby if necessary.	**1/10/26**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	This section has been moved to the Department's Domestic Violence Manual and revised to include California POST's recommended techniques for interviewing children.	DPA concurs with the revision.

DGO 6.09 Public Comment Joint Responses
Public Review Period: 11/25/25 - 1/12/26

#	Public Comment	Date Received	SFPD response	SFPD Explanation	DPA Explanation
R23	In 6.09.04.F, questions should be open-ended and ideally never be leading. Provide brief, scripted instructions that empower kids not to guess. Stop questioning the child when the child isn't volunteering information.	**1/10/26**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	See R22 above.	DPA concurs with the revision.
R24	In 6.09.04.G, whether a party "will be in greater danger if nothing is done" has little bearing on whether there is probable cause to arrest an individual. Moreover, adding this allows an officer to speculate on future criminal conduct in a subjective non-reviewable manner. Delete the phrase. Future speculative criminal conduct is not a basis for arrest.	**1/10/26**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	The guidance on determining the dominant aggressor has been moved to the Domestic Violence Manual, which provides more comprehensive procedures for making that determination.	DPA concurs with the revision.
R25	In 6.09.04.G.4, the clarifying example of an inherently deadly weapon does not convey the meaning of that phrase. If something is "inherently deadly weapon," it is not something that could be weaponized. It is the ordinary use for which it was designed.	**1/10/26**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	Inherently deadly weapon is now defined as: "Inherently Deadly Weapon: An item that is deadly or dangerous in the ordinary use for which it was designed.(Firearm, Sword, Dagger.) Ordinary objects are not inherently deadly weapons. If ordinary objects were used or threatened to be used as weapons during the incident, then they can be considered weapons for that specific incident. For example, a hockey stick would be considered an ordinary object if found at the scene. If the hockey stick was used as a weapon, it should then be considered a weapon and seized. "	DPA concurs with the revision.

DGO 6.09 Public Comment Joint Responses
Public Review Period: 11/25/25 - 1/12/26

#	Public Comment	Date Received	SFPD response	SFPD Explanation	DPA Explanation
R26	In 6.09.04.G.4, the definition in the draft DGO seems to include empty bottles, broken glass, sporting equipment, or objects of decoration since it could be something a member may "reasonable feel[] could be weaponized." Delete the e.g. section.	**1/10/26**	Recommendation has been included in draft DGO	Section has been rewritten and moved to the department Domestic Violence Manual.	DPA concurs with the revision.