



Request to Rescind Pursuant to DGO 3.01.04

Request to Rescind 8 Department General Orders

September 2, 2026

Pursuant to Department General Order 3.01.04, DGOs remain in effect until amended, superseded, or rescinded by the Police Commission. As such, the Department is requesting Police Commission consideration of a proposal to rescind Department General Orders.

The Department proposes eight (8) Department General Orders to be rescinded and the justifications are captured in the following grid. The justifications fall into one of the following categories:

- Procedures have been consolidated into a more recently revised Department General Order
- Procedures do not fall under this Department's authority or are dictated by law
- Procedures are no longer used as they are outdated relative to current practice
- Procedures should exist in a different written directive type
- Procedures are solely administrative and should be updated to align with Prop E

The Department proposes rescinding these eight (8) Department General Orders to develop a more unified policy, reduce redundancy, improve efficiency, modernize guidelines, eliminate outdated practices, and deconflict written directives.

The Department of Police Accountability has reviewed the list and associated justification and provided its feedback in the attached document.

Request to Rescind Department General Orders

DGO #	DGO Name	PDD Justification	DPA Response
1.02	District Boundaries (2015)	Because the current DGO is so detailed and the Department's policy process is not nimble, it is more efficient for the Police Commission to approve district boundaries by way of Resolution per SF Admin Code Section 2A.86 and for the Department to notify the public of the boundaries through updates on the SFPD website. Additionally, the DGO provides no visual representation of police districts which would be most helpful for officers and the public. If rescinded, the Department will notify members of the new boundaries via DN and maps.	DPA: No objection.
3.04	Purchasing Policy & Procedures (1994)	Issue: DGO 3.04 outlines a standard business process that is solely administrative. This DGO is also from 1994 when officers used to be in such administrative roles. Therefore, this DGO is unnecessary. Analysis: Operational Efficiency- Removing DGO 3.04 reduces administrative burden and streamlines SFPD procedures. Recommendation: PDD recommends rescinding DGO 3.04 and allow Fiscal to determine whether a written directive is needed.	DPA: No objection.
5.09	Absentia Bookings & Prisoner Security (2005)	DGO 5.09 was updated through Department Notice 18-033 in 2018 and the DGO is now functionally obsolete. After consulting with the Sergeant responsible for the Department's ongoing report writing system, PDD was advised that the new report writing system will require a substantial revision of the absentia booking process. Additional refinements are expected as the system is implemented and operational issues are identified. Because periodic changes to these procedures are expected during the rollout of the new report writing system, absentia booking procedures are not well suited for the permanence of a Department General Order. PDD recommends that DGO 5.09 be rescinded and that the absentia booking procedures be maintained and periodically updated through Department Notices.	DPA: No objection.
6.08	Aggressive Soliciting (1994)	Issue: Municipal Police Code Section 120-1, which is cited throughout DGO 6.08, has since been repealed and replaced in 2003 by Proposition M. Proposition M created procedures outlined in Police Code Section 120-2 defining and creating procedures for enforcement of aggressive soliciting. All of DGO 6.08's guidelines and policies are exact citations from Police Code Section 120-1, which no longer exists. DGO 6.08's Procedures (A) describe questions for officers to consider. Considerations in a Department General Order do not align with what a DGO is: the most authoritative policy document of SFPD. DGO 6.08's Procedures (B) describe procedures repeated in DGO 5.04, Arrests by Private Persons. Having a DGO that cites non-existent law (Police Code 120-1), repeats current law (Police Code 120-2), provides suggested considerations, and repeats procedures outlined in another SFPD DGO (5.04) creates inefficient and redundant policy. Analysis: Legal Consistency- DGO 6.08 cites Police Code that no longer exists, which creates legal inconsistency. Operational Efficiency- Removing DGO 6.08 reduces administrative burden and streamlines the SFPD collection of policies. Equity Considerations- As the procedures in this DGO cite outdated law and provide guidance, aggressive soliciting cannot be enforced equitably. Recommendation: PDD recommends rescinding DGO 6.08 and replace with a DN that defers to Police Code 120-2 as the governing authority for aggressive soliciting. A DN would allow SFPD to update procedures according to new legal updates, while a DGO would not. This action ensures SFPD's alignment with law and future legal update.	DPA: There is no objection to converting this DGO to a DN given the current state of the law and existing department policy. However, the impact of this and related policies should be noted as they have had a particular impact on vulnerable communities and enforcement has been a point of contention in prior discipline cases.

Request to Rescind Department General Orders

DOGO #	DOGO Name	PDD Justification	DPA Response
6.11	Obstruction of Streets and Sidewalks (1994)	Issue: California Penal Code Section 647c establishes a definition of obstruction of streets and sidewalks, which is repeated in Guidelines E of DOGO 6.11. Police Code § § 22, 23, and 24 establishes prohibitions and enforcement of obstruction of streets, which is repeated in Guidelines A and B of DOGO 6.11. DOGO 5.06, Citation Release, has language about issuing citations, which is repeated in Guidelines D of DOGO 6.11. DOGO 8.03, Crowd Control, has is simply cited in this DOGO. The entire policy section of DOGO 6.11 requires officers to know and enforce law, as is their job. Having a DOGO that repeats current law (Penal Code 647c and Police Code 22, 23, and 24), repeats procedures outlined in other SFPD DOGOs (5.06 and 8.03), and requires officers to "enforce the law" creates redundant policy. Analysis: Legal Consistency- State and local laws govern obstruction of streets; duplicating it in DOGO 6.11 adds no legal value. Operational Efficiency- Removing DOGO 6.11 reduces administrative burden and streamlines the SFPD collection of policies. Equity Considerations- As the procedures in this DOGO only repeat Penal and Police Code and outline crowd control procedures, these statutes work to ensure equitable access to public space and maintain order, which protects all groups including vulnerable groups. Without this DOGO, these statutes still are applicable and work to protect the public. Recommendation: PDD recommends rescinding DOGO 6.11 and replace with a DN that defers to Penal and Police Code as the governing authority for obstruction of streets and sidewalks. A DN would allow SFPD to update procedures according to new legal updates, while a DOGO would not. This action ensures SFPD's alignment with the law.	DPA: There is no objection to converting this DOGO to a DN given the current state of the law and existing department policy. However, the impact of this and related policies should be noted as they have had a particular impact on vulnerable communities and enforcement has been a point of contention in prior discipline cases.
6.12	Arrests of Persons on Parole or Probation (1994)	Issue: The procedures in DOGO 6.12 are highly specific and not general, as a Department General Order requires. Therefore, transitioning and updating the procedures in DOGO 6.12 into a Manual, the Booking and Detention Manual, makes the most sense. Also, as changes in searching someone's status occur frequently, having these procedures in a policy that is easier to update and is more flexible allows for SFPD to align with legal and best practice updates. Analysis: Legal Consistency- State law does not govern the specifics of searching someone's status before arrest, and therefore expands the procedural burden on officers. Operational Efficiency- Removing DOGO 6.12 reduces administrative burden and streamlines the SFPD collection of policies. Equity Considerations- As the procedures in this DOGO are extremely outdated and conflict with current practices, having a DOGO that requires non-existent procedures could lead to inequitable enforcement of this DOGO. Recommendation: PDD recommends rescinding DOGO 6.12 and transition the procedures into a Manual. This action allows SFPD to align with best and current practices and for officers to equitably enforce the law.	DPA: This DOGO should not be rescinded. It should instead be updated to reflect current law. This is a Fourth Amendment discipline issue that has led to prior Commission cases involving officers conducting warrantless searches on persons they believed to be on supervised release, only to learn that their status had expired because they did not check. There have been previous efforts to update this DOGO for the express purpose of stopping this practice and ensuring DPA does not receive more complaints of this nature. Those efforts should be renewed. Including the information in a manual is a valid idea, but an updated DOGO is needed as well. SFPD PDD Counterpoint: The policy team understands the concern about officers not confirming the status of an arrestee on parole or probation, however SFPD is suggesting maintaining this language in a written directive that is much easier to update when state law and up-to-date practices change. Right now, DOGO 6.12 is in direct conflict with current practices. This could be a discipline issue for officers, as they are being asked to comply with an outdated policy. DOJ search queries outline the most up to date procedures for officers to follow, which will be updated again. Therefore, having more up-to-date policies in a more flexible written directive that can be more easily updated is prudent, instead of an inflexible and outdated DOGO that causes discipline issues for officers.

Request to Rescind Department General Orders

DGO #	DGO Name	PDD Justification	DPA Response
6.18	Warrant Arrests (1994)	California Penal Code §§815 & 816 already establish the authority, form, and issuance of arrest warrants statewide. SFPD DGO 6.18 largely duplicates these statutes, adding local requirements such as documentation of warrant checks. In 2024, Prop E mandated that SFPD reduce documentation when not required by law, creating a directive to streamline policies. Issue: DGO 6.18 is redundant as it restates state law without adding substantive protections. The documentation requirement is not mandated by Penal Code §§815–816 and conflicts with Prop E’s directive to reduce unnecessary paperwork. The procedural safeguards (identity verification, reasonable time limits, juvenile checks) are either already covered by broader departmental policies or can be incorporated elsewhere without maintaining a standalone order. Analysis: Legal Consistency- State law governs warrant arrests; duplicating it in DGO 6.18 adds no legal value. Operational Efficiency- Removing DGO 6.18 reduces administrative burden and streamlines the SFPD collection of policies. Equity Considerations- Vulnerable communities gain no substantive protections from DGO 6.18; diversion and relief remain court functions. Transparency- Accountability is preserved through state law, judicial oversight, and existing booking/reporting systems. Recommendation: PDD recommends rescinding DGO 6.18 and replace with a DN that defers to Penal Code 815 and 816 as the governing authority and to include the juvenile protection and reasonable time limits. This action modernizes SFPD’s warrant arrest procedures, ensuring they remain legally sound, operationally efficient, and aligned with voter approved mandates.	DPA: This DGO should not be rescinded. It should instead be updated to reflect current law. SFPD PDD Counterpoint: This policy is primarily a restatement of CA Penal Code 815, 816 and related statutes and does not expand on protections or create new pathways for vulnerable populations to avoid the cycle of warrant-based arrests. The verification requirement in DGO 6.18 is a restatement of CA PC 815. The reasonable time limits in DGO 6.18 are not specified in PC 815 or 816. Documentation in DGO 6.18 are not required or specified in PC 815 or 816. SF Prop E directs SFPD to reduce or streamline documentation that is not explicitly required by law. PC 815 & 816 do not mandate documentation so SFPD must consider removing this requirement to comply with Prop E's mandate. Documentation does not provide a safeguard against arrest. To reiterate, the policy team plans to issue a written directive that focuses on PC 815 & 816 procedures, juvenile protections, verification and reasonable time limits.
9.03	Mandatory Blood Tests for Drivers Under the Influence (1998)	Issue: California Vehicle Code already establishes strict guidelines for the procedures in DGO 9.03. SFPD DGO 9.03 largely duplicates all applicable statutes in the Vehicle Code and procedures included in SFPD’s DUI and FTO Manuals as well as 12 Department Notices. These Department Notices, unlike the outdated procedures in DGO 9.03, are required to keep up with updates in law on drawing blood, obtaining approval, and search warrants for testing. DGO 9.03 is redundant and outdated as it restates or directly contradicts current law and best practices in California Vehicle and procedures from SFPD Manuals and DNs. Analysis: Legal Consistency- State law governs blood tests for DUIs and current practices are outlined in other updated written directives; duplicating or prescribing conflicting procedures in DGO 9.03 adds no legal value. Operational Efficiency- Removing DGO 9.03 reduces administrative burden and streamlines the SFPD collection of policies. Equity Considerations- As the procedures in this DGO only repeat Vehicle Code and are to protect the safety of all, vulnerable populations are not protected DGO 9.03. Also, having outdated procedures that are unable to be updated flexibly, as are in DGO 9.03, negatively will impact vulnerable populations. Recommendation: PDD recommends rescinding DGO 9.03 and incorporating into the DUI Manual that defers to Vehicle Code as the governing authority for blood testing for DUIs. This action allows for flexible update of SFPD policies to align with legal and best practice changes.	DPA: This DGO should not be rescinded given the volume of DUI cases and the need for public-facing information about the policies and procedures that govern DUI stops and blood draws. It should instead be updated to reflect current law. However, if the DGO were to be rescinded, DPA does not object to the information being converted into the DUI Manual.