DGO 6.09 Working Group Recommendation Grid (Final)

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	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.	Closed
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. Update 11/18 - Officers updated the group that the pilot has been paused until technology advances further.	Closed
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	Closed
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	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.	Closed
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 has been partially included in draft DGO	Dept. will work to contact CPS to get clarity on their procedures when receiving calls from officers. Update 11/18 - the working group had a Q&A with CPS (FCS). There was robust discussion. The WG DGO has been amended to include more details for officers when to call FCS. Further details have been included in the DV manual that provide guidance to officers on what to expect from FCS depending on the situation.	Closed
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+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 Update 10/7 - The working group recommended changes to the 142 form - - 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 There was discussion about keeping the 142 form as small as possible so it fits in officer's pocket.	7/15/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	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. Update 9/9 - Changes have been made to reflect recommendations of the working group.	Closed

DGO 6.09 Working Group Recommendation Grid (Final)

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/ Closed
7	- 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 'yes and 'no' in the lethality assessment. - 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. - 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 incidents. Update 11/18 - - SFPD 142 form - There was discussion about services CROC provides. A gap was realized and there was discussion about re-including SF Access Center. - SFPD 142 form - the Mayor's office emailed to provide edits for MOVR. - Lethality Assessment - there was discussion between WG members about the benefit to outside agencies of having forms that aren't part of the officers narrative in the incident report. There was discussion about the most important questions to ask that will help victims realize the danger of the situation they are in. A WG member recommended including an action statement at the end of the Lethality Assessment.	7/15/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	Update 11/4 - Changes were made for clarification of CROC in the 142 form. - 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. Update 11/18 - - Lethality Assessment questions were amended to match the language discussed in the WG. - An admonition was included in the Lethality Assessment to advise the victim when they should call an advocate. - Based on resources now available to officers (i.e. BWC), to reduce duplicity, and to adhere to Admin Code 96I, the lethality assessment will stay as a required form but the 480a and 480b forms will be streamlined and become optional forms which will provide officers with report narrative guidance.	Closed
8	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 officers email the form to ID Bureau? Would help to make it so they can do it in the field	7/15/25	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO	The request was brought to Id Bureau. They are aware of this issue and are actively looking for a solution.	Closed
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 included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	This recommendation has been incorporated in to the manual.	Closed
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. Update 11/18 - the Lethality Assessment questions have been reworded so as to not retraumatize victims at the scene, based on recommendations from the WG. The Lethality Assessment screening has also been moved to the 142 Form (Resource Guide). Officers will maintain POST best practice by asking the victim the questions and asking if they would like the officer to call an advocate, but victims will be able to take the questions home to think about at a later time. The interaction will be recorded via BWC per DGO 10.11.	Closed
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.	Closed
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 Police Commission Resolution 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.	Closed
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)	Closed

DGO 6.09 Working Group Recommendation Grid (Final)

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/ Closed
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.	Closed
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	Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO	Sections of the draft have been moved to make more chronological sense.	Closed
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	Recommendation has been partially included in draft 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.	Closed
17	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. 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.	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 or if the victim requests it and they meet the threshold. The officer must also provide rationale in the incident report if they do not request an EPO.	Closed
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. There is an extensive section in the manual about protective orders.	Closed
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.	Closed

DGO 6.09 Working Group Recommendation Grid (Final)

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/ Closed
20	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.	7/29/25	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.	Closed
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 been added to the EPO section addressing this concern.	Closed
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	Language about identifying a dominant aggressor has been included in the draft DGO including the Penal Code citation. The manual has an extensive section about determining the dominant aggressor.	Closed
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 partially included in draft DGO	The right of self defense is included in the language of this draft DGO. Providing victims with safety information and referrals is now one of the steps in the policy section.	Closed
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 only have the member contact a DV advocate if the victim is willing to speak with them at that time.	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). Update 9/9 - There was a discussion about the term "deadly weapon" in the section about removing all deadly weapons from the property. The working group recommended adding "inherently".	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 officers in the field.	Closed
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.	Closed
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	New language was added to the manual about "Inherently Deadly Weapons."	Closed
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.	Closed

DGO 6.09 Working Group Recommendation Grid (Final)

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/ Closed
29	A working group member recommended including a statement in procedures that officers play a critical role in family safety	8/14/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	This language is now included in the policy section.	Closed
30	A working group membered 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.	Closed
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	Penal Code § 692, 693 (Self Defense) are referenced in the DGO. The policy section now includes language about providing victims with safety information and referrals, which could include victims rights information.	Closed
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	Referencing DGO 6.15 or 6.02 inside this DGO is not necessary.	Closed
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, making this is outside the scope of the working group.	Closed
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.	Closed
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.	Closed
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.	Closed
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. The draft manual includes an extensive section on strangulation.	Closed
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	Arranging follow-up photos is handled by the assigned investigator.	Closed
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.	Closed
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 Draft DGO	The resource form is extensive and the advocates listed could help a victim even if an arrest is not made.	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.	Closed
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 has been completely included in draft DGO	This information was included in the draft DGO as things to consider during the interview.	Closed
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.	Closed
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.	Closed
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 in this section has been amended for clarity.	Closed

DGO 6.09 Working Group Recommendation Grid (Final)

#	Recommendation/Feedback	Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/ Closed
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	Closed
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 information is included in the policy, just without the reference.	Closed
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.	Closed
49	Mention AFS Weapons check under 'Check for Active Court Orders'	8/14/25	Recommendation will be modified and included in the draft DGO	The weapon check requirement has been included in the draft DGO.	Closed
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.	Closed
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.	Closed
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.	Closed